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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The ability to communicate in a foreign language has been and is, today probably more than ever, one of the major goals of foreign language instruction. On the surface it appears that this goal has been given much emphasis, especially during the era of audiolingualism with its emphasis on oral skills. In the early days of this era, rash promises were made to students that through this approach they would achieve a near-native ability to communicate in the second language especially in the speaking skill. Unfortunately, these promises were generally not realized due to the failure on the part of audiolingualists to make a very important distinction between the ability to communicate in the language and the ability to manipulate the language orally through such exercises as memorization of dialogues, pattern drills and discrete-item testing. Because this distinction was not taken into consideration, many teachers satisfied themselves with the achievement of goals in which the student displayed an ability to manipulate the language phonologically and grammatically. The primary goal of communicative competence was neglected in favor of linguistic competence goals. Com-
mercially prepared materials, tests and classroom procedures emphasized linguistic abilities, such as the ability to pronounce isolated sounds and words and the ability to produce correct morphological and syntactical forms. This so-called "linguistic competence" became the ultimate goal for many language teachers and pervaded the profession in its textbooks and tests. Teachers were led to believe that if their students were capable of successfully completing such linguistic competence exercises and tests, then the student would have the ability to communicate in the language. But to the dismay of many foreign language teachers and students, linguistic competence did not seem to assure an ability to communicate in the language. How many times has the complaint been heard not only from teachers but also from students that after they had mastered all the drills and successfully completed all the tests, they still could not use the language in a communicative way.

The pedagogues supply ample anecdotal evidence not only that there are students who can perform beautifully on substitution drills, transformation drills, etc., yet with whom communication is virtually impossible, but also that there are students who do miserably on your tests, but we can talk about anything together.¹

In spite of this apparent paradox, however, it still seems obvious and most logical that linguistic competence must be a necessary component of the ability to communicate in a foreign language. However, the question arises: Is linguistic competence the only or even the most important component of this rather illusive concept which we currently are calling communicative competence? Savignon points out

*Linguistic accuracy in terms of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary is but one of the major constituents in this complex interaction. 2*

Because of an apparent lack of transfer from linguistic knowledge to the ability to perform communicatively in a second language, it becomes evident that there must be other components, or "constituents" which play some role in the learner's ability to use the language for communication.

In the past it had been assumed that these constituents or components were mainly a function of the classroom, i.e. the teacher and the methods he used in the classroom. Much emphasis in research and teacher training centered on the teacher and what he should do in the classroom to achieve the goals of foreign language instruction. This was especially true during the height of audiolingualism in which teacher training institutes flourished and in which research emphasized

methodological comparative studies. Recently, however, the field has become more aware of a need for a better understanding of the learner himself and his unique role in this process of second-language acquisition. This is evidenced by the recent emphasis on individualized learning and instruction. The learner is becoming more and more the focal point of instruction and research. As Jakobovits points out

Psychologists and educators have known for a long time that "active learning" is 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. 3

It is these "learner factors" which become even more important and crucial at a time when there seems to be a shift in emphasis from linguistic competence to communicative competence. Recent studies, such as Savignon's cited above, show that there is a "difference" between linguistic competence and communicative competence.

The lack of significant difference among group means on standardized (CEEB) tests of listening and reading as well as on final grades, in spite of the consistently significant differences on tests of communicative competence and instructor's evaluation of oral skills, suggests that there is indeed a difference between

linguistic competence on the one hand and communicative competence on the other.  

Savignon also points out that there are other factors involved in the ability to communicate in a foreign language than just linguistic competence.

Success in any of these communicative tasks depends largely on the individual's willingness to express himself in the foreign language, on his resourcefulness in making use of the lexical and syntactical items which he has at his command...

This "willingness" and "resourcefulness," if important components of the communicative ability, fall into the area of learner personality, attitude, aptitude, and intelligence, which should be clearly defined and researched in order to be useful to the teacher. Research should also show whether evaluation of linguistic competence alone is a true measure of the student's ability to communicate in the second language and if other measures in addition to discrete-point linguistic measures should be employed to evaluate communicative competence.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study are threefold. First, to discover to what extent certain learner factors are related to the ability to communicate in a foreign language (German); second, to discover if evaluation of...
linguistic competence alone is a sufficient measure of the student's ability to communicate in the foreign language; third, to develop hypotheses for future testing of communicative competence in foreign language learning.

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested for the purposes of this study:

\( H_1: \) There is no significant relationship between communicative competence and linguistic competence of German students as measured by instruments used in this study.

\( H_2: \) There is no significant relationship between communicative competence and personality factors of German students as measured by instruments used in this study.

\( H_3: \) There is no significant relationship between communicative competence and creativity of German students as measured by instruments used in this study.

\( H_4: \) There is no significant relationship between communicative competence and foreign language aptitude of German students as measured by instruments used in this study.

\( H_5: \) There is no significant relationship between communic-
ative competence and attitude toward German speaking people and culture as measured by instruments used in this study.

$H_6$: There is no significant relationship between communicative competence and attitude toward the study of foreign language as measured by instruments used in this study.

$H_7$: There is no significant relationship between communicative competence as measured by instruments of this study and age of German students used in this study.

$H_8$: There is no significant relationship between communicative competence as measured by instruments of this study and sex of German students used in this study.

$H_9$: There is no significant relationship between communicative competence as measured by instruments of this study and the number of years the students of this study were enrolled in a German course.

Need for the Study

A better understanding of the role that certain learner factors play in the ability to communicate in a foreign language is needed today in the field of foreign language education. The evaluation and testing of communicative competence based mostly on instruments which measure
linguistic competence may be an invalid procedure of evaluation if communicative competence is a major goal of foreign language instruction. If linguistic competence is not a good predictor or measure of the ability to communicate in a foreign language, then new and better instruments to measure communicative competence are needed. In order to develop such instruments, exploratory research such as this is needed to define more clearly the construct and how it relates to those components which the learner himself already possesses.

**Definition of Terms**

1. Communicative Competence:

   Communicative competence may be defined as the ability to function in a truly communicative setting—that is, in a dynamic exchange in which linguistic competence must adapt itself to the total informational input, both linguistic and paralinguistic, of one or more interlocutors.  

   Clark defines the concept as follows:

   The ability to get a message across to an interlocutor with specified ease and effect.

   The implication in both definitions above is that there must be a message involved in order for the act to be "communicative."

   Meaning alone is not sufficient for true communication, i.e. mean-

---

6 Sandra J. Savignon, Communicative Competence, p. 8

ing of isolated words or phrases. The student must be involved
in either message sending or receiving. He must display the
ability to either comprehend a message or send a message which
is comprehensible to the native speaker. For the purposes of
this study communicative competence will be defined as the abili-
ity to transmit and receive a message orally and in writing in the
foreign language. The message is defined here as a specified
content which must be transmitted or received so that there is
comprehension by the receiver of the message.

2. Linguistic Competence is

... the ability to control the phonology, vocabulary
and grammar of a given language. 8

For the purposes of this study, linguistic competence will be de-
defined as the ability to manipulate the second language in all four
skills on the phonological, morphological, and structural level
without any concern for the ability of the student to receive or
send a message in the foreign language.

3. Learner Factors:

It is hypothesized for the purpose of this study that there are cer-
tain learner factors other than, but including linguistic compe-
tence, which may be related to the ability of the student to

communicate in the foreign language he is studying. Hypotheses concerning these factors have been developed by others in the profession; but to the knowledge of this writer, these factors have not been empirically identified. One such hypothesis is outlined by Jakobovits. Much of the work by Jakobovits is based on his study of numerous investigations including Carroll, Carroll and Sapon, Flauther, Gardner and Lambert, Pimsleur, Sundland and McIntyre. This research was mainly concerned with the development of instruments for the measurement of foreign language aptitude. It will not be the prime purpose of this study to develop or discover aptitude components for second language learning, but rather to discover the relationship of certain learner factors with the ability to communicate in the second language.

Based on the research mentioned above (which will be elaborated on in Chapter II) the following student factors were correlated with the students' scores on the communicative competence tests:

a. Linguistic competence
b. Foreign language aptitude
c. Selected personality factors

---

9 Leon A. Jakobovits, Foreign Language Learning, p. 105.

d. Creativity

e. Attitude

Other factors such as age, sex, years of German study, etc., were also included. The relationship of these to communicative competence will be discussed in Chapter IV.

**Overview**

The report of this study is divided into five sections followed by appendices and a bibliography. The first section presents the problem which was investigated, the objectives of the study, the hypotheses to be tested and the definition of certain concepts that are referred to throughout the report. The second section is a review of the pertinent literature and an attempt to show how this particular study relates to research that has already been done. The third section describes the procedures of the investigation, the testing instruments used, and the statistical analysis employed. In the fourth section the findings are analyzed based on the interpretation of the statistical results. Finally, in the last section there is a discussion of the implications and limitations of the study, recommendations for further research, conclusions and a short summary of the study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The nature of this study demands a review of research in two basic areas. The first and most vital area, one which is most closely related to this study, is in foreign language aptitude. A mass of research was carried out during the 1950s and early 1960s to determine what learner factors are involved in the ability to learn a foreign language and from these to devise instruments which can predict whether or not a student will be successful in the study of a foreign language. This research, however, concerned itself primarily with the ability to "learn" a foreign language as defined by criteria such as course grades and certain standardized achievement tests. The attempt to relate learner factors specifically with the ability to communicate in a foreign language was largely ignored in this research.

The second area with which this review will be concerned is foreign language testing and evaluation. Much research was done in this area during the era of audiolingualism. Because of the nature of the goals of audiolinguists and because of a striving for "objectivity" in
in foreign language testing, instruments devised during this period tended to measure discrete linguistic components in all four skills, rather than the overall ability to communicate in a foreign language. This was a reaction to foreign language testing of the pre-audio-lingual era which relied on instruments involving translating and grammatical manipulation limited to the reading and writing skills. Great effort was expended to devise tests which would involve the oral skills; however, the attempt to focus on objectivity resulted in instruments which evaluated the linguistic ability of the student, his ability to produce and comprehend correct pronunciation and grammatical structure. Not until recently has there been some evidence of the inadequacy of this type of evaluation in terms of communicative proficiency.

Research in Foreign Language Aptitude

In a review of the studies undertaken to determine what learner factors contribute to the ability to "learn" a foreign language, Pimsleur, et al., report in a review\(^1\) on some forty studies which deal with this topic (herein after referred to as the "Pimsleur Review"). He divides the studies into seven groups as follows: (1) intelligence, (2) verbal ability, (3) pitch discrimination, (4) order of language study and bilin-

ualism, (5) study habits, (6) motivation and attitudes, and (7) personality factors.

In the area of intelligence as a factor in foreign language learning, the Pimsleur Review reports on nine studies. These studies were conducted between 1938 and 1955. In most of these studies correlational computations were carried out between a test of intelligence and either a standardized foreign language achievement test or foreign language grades. In general all the studies cited show that intelligence correlates positively with either some measure of achievement or grades. The authors do point out that further research is needed into the differential effect of intelligence in the case of good as opposed to poor students, and in the case of boys as opposed to girls.²

In the second area, verbal ability, the authors of this review cite thirteen studies. In most of these studies correlations were carried out between some measure of native language ability (English) and either foreign language grades or achievement tests. Again as in intelligence there seems to be a positive relationship between verbal ability in one's native language and success in foreign language study. However, several of these studies did show that this is not consistently true. A study by Traxler concludes that

verbal ability does not seem equally important for success in all foreign languages.\(^3\)

and a study by Carroll concludes

that verbal ability is not highly related to success in the first stages of the learning of a language.\(^4\)

In the area of pitch discrimination, research is reported as early as 1934; however, only a few studies have been carried out in this area. In the 1934 study (Dexter and Ohmwake), ratings of accent of upperclass college students of French were correlated with scores on the Seashore Pitch Discrimination Test and found to be significant \((r = .210)\). A second study with high school students by the same researchers shows a higher correlation between accent rating and pitch discrimination ability. The mean correlation between pitch discrimination and accent rating was .639. A recent study shows nonsignificant correlations between pitch discrimination and eleven foreign language variables including three tests of oral ability.\(^5\)

Pimsleur and Stockwell in a study in preparation at the time of the Pimsleur Review found very low correlations between the Seashore Pitch


\(^4\)Ibid.

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 163.
Discrimination Test and several measures of language proficiency. Only one showed significance at the .05 level, the Pictorial Auditory Comprehension Test. As Pimsleur, et al., point out, it is very difficult to arrive at any conclusions from these studies because they were so few in number and because the results were inconsistent. Another problem was that so many different criteria were used as measures of foreign language achievement.

The fourth area with which the Pimsleur Review concerns itself is called "Order of Language Study and Bilingualism." As the authors admit, this is a very complex factor, and the research they cite does not offer any simple or clear conclusions. In this area, two studies are cited. One of these, Kettelkamp, showed that the initial study of French had a positive influence on subsequent grades in Latin and German while the initial study of Latin had only a "negligible" influence on the subsequent grades in German and French. Another study by Halloran shows that students with low intelligence who studied Esperanto before French were superior in French to those students of low intelligence who studied only French while in the high intelligence group the reverse was


7Ibid.
true. The Pimsleur Review cites three studies in bilingualism which are rather inconclusive. A general review of the literature of bilingualism by Aresenian\(^8\) shows evidence that young bilinguals tend to have intellectual, scholastic, and emotional difficulties. Another study by Spoerl\(^9\) shows there is no significant difference between bilinguals and monolinguals in verbal ability and other measures of English skills. This conclusion has, however, been challenged by a very recent study by Garcia\(^10\) which found that

\[
\text{Mexican American bilingual migrant children are less proficient in oral Standard English than monolingual Anglo migrant children.}^{11}
\]

In the area of study habits, the Pimsleur Review cites three studies by Wittenborn and Larsen\(^12\) which were carried out between 1942 and 1945. In general these studies show that students' study habits seem to exert some "influence as a factor in foreign language learning."

A much more complex and comprehensive area in the Pimsleur

\(^{8}\text{Paul Pimsleur, et al., "Student Factors," p. 164.}\)

\(^{9}\text{Ibid.}\)


\(^{11}\text{Ibid., p. 126.}\)

\(^{12}\text{Paul Pimsleur, et al., "Student Factors," p. 165.}\)
Review concerns motivation and attitudes toward second language learning as a factor in success in foreign language study. Most studies cited in this section of the Pimsleur Review indicate that motivation and attitude do play a significant role in the student's achievement in foreign language study. In a study by Pimsleur and Stockwell\textsuperscript{13} a twenty-item questionnaire to determine student interest in foreign languages was administered to 203 second-semester French students in college and the results were correlated with their achievement scores. Significant correlations of .44 with the Cooperative French Test, .25 with oral proficiency rating, and .23 with the Pictorial Auditory Comprehension Test were found. Gardner and Lambert\textsuperscript{14} conducted research in which they studied seventy-five English-speaking 11th-grade students in Montreal. They found correlations between the instructor's rating of oral and aural skills and measures such as: intensity of motivation, .40; attitudes toward French-Canadians, .10; "orientation index," .34. Gardner and Lambert also carried out a factor analysis and concluded that

There are two main factors in achievement in second language learning: (1) verbal intelligence

\textsuperscript{13}Paul Pimsleur, et al., "Student Factors," p. 166.

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 167.
and (2) motivation of a particular type, characterized by a willingness to be like valued members of the language community.\textsuperscript{15}

The authors of the Pimsleur Review conclude that in the area of "motivation and attitudes toward second language learning," interest in languages both in general and in the particular language being studied correlates positively with achievement. Subsequent work by Gardner and Lambert in this area and reported in their book, \textit{Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning}\textsuperscript{16} supports the above conclusion.

The last area which the Pimsleur Review deals with is called "Personality Factors." The empirical studies cited in this section seem to indicate that there may be some relationship between certain personality factors and achievement in foreign language study. Cox\textsuperscript{17} found after studying a number of Australian soldiers who were learning Russian and Chinese that high scores on the personality measures indicating maladjustment correlated with poor performance in their language courses. Dunkel\textsuperscript{18} found that high scoring subjects in a Latin placement test fell into three personality types: (1) well adjusted and mature, (2) compuls

\textsuperscript{15}Paul Pimsleur, \textit{et al.}, "Student Factors," p. 167.


\textsuperscript{17}Paul Pimsleur, \textit{et al.}, "Student Factors," p. 168.

\textsuperscript{18}\textit{Ibid}. 
sively oriented and, (3) maladjusted students who seemed to channel most of their energy into school work.

In contrast the low scoring students consistently showed Rorschach patterns suggestive of emotionality, inner conflict, and anxiety.\(^1\)

Pritchard\(^2\) found a correlation of .72 between his measures of "sociability" and the capacity to speak fluently in French.

Other "studies" reported in this section, "Personality Factors," were mostly non-empirical suggesting hypotheses on which further research could be based. One such proposal is made by Nida\(^3\) who comments that

perhaps too much attention has been paid to the 'outside' variables in language learning (e.g. drill, length of study, etc.) to the neglect of more important psychological problems.\(^4\)

In general the study of personality factors and their influence on the study of foreign languages has been scant and inconclusive.

The Pimsleur Review concludes that the student factors which have been most thoroughly investigated are intelligence and native language

---


\(^2\)Ibid.

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 167.

\(^4\)Ibid.
verbal ability. It further states that these two factors could be thought of as one, verbal intelligence, since they are known to be highly related. It is pointed out, however, that a correlation of .45 of verbal intelligence with foreign language achievement accounts for only about 20% of the variance in foreign language achievement and that perhaps motivation accounts for another 15% of the variance. Together these two factors account for only 35% of the variance in foreign language achievement.

Clearly the greater part of the variance in foreign language achievement remains to be investigated.23

The authors of this review point out an important weakness in the research they have cited.

(1) The criterion of teacher grades is quite unreliable and (2) the objective-type Cooperative Tests are reliable but their validity may be questioned in view of changes in goals of foreign language instruction since these tests were constructed.24

This latter "weakness" would seem most important not only because of changing goals, but also because of instructional variables such as vocabulary taught, structures taught, type of instruction with emphasis on different skills, etc., which result in numerous biases in these tests. Another weakness of the studies cited, pointed out by the authors, is


24Ibid.
that most of this research dealt with a rather select group of students, namely college students and adults. Whether one can infer or generalize from these studies to a below college level population is questionable.

Most of the research cited above predates 1962 at which time the Pimsleur Review was written. Research in the area of student factors in foreign language learning of the past decade or those not included in the Pimsleur Review will be enumerated below.

In a study\textsuperscript{25} referred to above, but which was not completed at the writing of the Pimsleur Review, the authors make the following conclusions:

\begin{quote}
It is concluded from the studies thus far completed (a) that achievement in a traditional (grammar-reading) language course may be predicted with reasonable validity by a set of tests, each of which taps only one rather precise characteristic of the learner; (b) that non-intellectual characteristics, notably motivation, must be included as well as intellectual ones; (c) that oral and aural achievement are less subject to satisfactory prediction at the present time, probably due to the lack of adequate criterion tests for achievement in these skills; (d) that although better criterion tests will improve prediction somewhat, substantial improvement probably demands the inclusion of entirely new factors as predictors; (e) that among such new factors, the personality of the student and the characteristics of the teachers are
\end{quote}

those which appear most promising and are most in need of research attention.26

Hascall27 reports a study in which findings show that final grades in English immediately preceding language study is one of the best predictors of foreign language grades and scores in foreign language cooperative tests. This would seem to support some of the earlier studies reported above in which verbal ability in one’s native language contributes to success in the study of a foreign language.

In a rather extensive study carried out by von Wittich reported in 196228 in which 230 ninth grade students were the subjects, it was found that

1. I. Q. was the poorest single predictor of achievement in foreign languages. (2) English grade point average, highly correlated with total grade point average, contributed little to the prediction scheme if total grade point was used as a predictor, and therefore was eliminated. It proved, however, to be the second best single predictor. (3) When total grade point was used in the prediction equation, no significant loss in prediction ability occurred when mathematics grade point was eliminated. (4) Total grade point average, which showed the highest correlation with both prediction


variables and criterion, was the best single predictor of success in foreign language study. Its combination with I.Q., however, furnished a prediction of slightly higher accuracy. The difference, though, being only slight, total grade point average eventually could be used alone to predict foreign language success. (5) This investigation confirmed the results of previous research that success in foreign language study is a result of capacity and of motivation as reflected by achievement.29

Both the Hascall study and the von Wittich study seem to show that English grade point average contributes to success in foreign language study. On the other hand, it is interesting to note that I.Q. alone is not an especially good predictor of foreign language success, but does have a slight relationship to such success as reported above in the Pimsleur Review.

Leon A. Jakobovits in his book, Foreign Language Learning,30 has attempted to synthesize some of the research referred to in this review. To quote from his work:

There have been various attempts at predicting success in second language learning. On the basis of these studies (Carroll, 1965; Carrol and Sapon, 1959; Flaugher, 1967; Gardner and Lambert, 1961; Pimsleur, Sundland and McIntyre, 1964), we can draw up the following table that shows the variance contribution of various factors involved:31


31 Ibid., p. 93.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>% of Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aptitude</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance or Motivation</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author points out justifiably,

that this table does not represent exact data, but is rather an approximation based on various studies reported in the literature. 32

Another important consideration which the author makes and is in part a justification for this study,

In general, these studies have made use of either grades attained in foreign language courses or scores on standard achievement tests of the discrete-point variety. As has been discussed... these measures can be quite inappropriate and unrelated to over-all language proficiency defined in terms of ability to use language for communicative purposes. 33

In looking at the four variables listed in the chart above, the one variable which needs closer scrutiny and a clearer definition is "perseverance." As Jakobovits himself points out,

**Perseverance:** The time the learner is willing to spend in learning. This definition is not adequate since it is not clear what is involved in "willing to." Thus, are[sic] factors such as distractibility, frustration, anomic, disinterest, all of which may reduce perseverance, pertain to "willingness to spend time in learning" or are they beyond the

---


33 Ibid.
control of the individual? . . . These are unresolved issues that need further study and elucidation. 34

Recently two studies have been conducted in which personality factors as measured by the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire 35 were used. The findings of a study by Neufeld 36 showed

no significant correlation between total achievement (in foreign language) and personality as anticipated. Students who received high scores in speaking, however, were, according to the 16PF, more assertive, unconventional and independent. Persons who scored high in listening and reading comprehension were identified as being better informed, thinking more analytically, self-sufficient and resourceful. Those who excelled in writing a foreign language were said to be tough-minded, realistic and self-reliant. 37

Again in this study, criterion measures used were standardized tests of foreign language achievement (Modern Language Association Cooperative Achievement Tests) and the sample was taken from a population of college students.

34 Leon A. Jakobovits, Foreign Language Learning, p. 96.

35 The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, Champaign, Ill.: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1972.


In another study in which the 16PF test was used, it was found that a successful language learner can be described as follows: Persevering, intellectual, analytical, trusting, easy to get along with, adaptable, outgoing, resourceful, imaginative, creative, warm and spontaneous.

A recent study investigated the relationship of self-concept to achievement in foreign language study. The researcher stated the problem as

The need . . . to explore possible relationships between academic performance and personal and emotional variables rather than the traditional links with intelligence and aptitude (which) prompts examination of nonintellectual variables operative in academic failure, namely the possible relevance of the self-concept as a foreign language student (SCFL) to achievement in foreign language study, with considerations of grade, sex grade point average (GPA) and I. Q.

Foreign language grades were correlated with scores on a "self-concept" instrument and with GPA and I.Q. The achievement criterion was based solely on foreign language grades which, as pointed out earli-

---


39 Florence H. Prawer, "The Self-Concept as Related to Achievement in Foreign Language Study," American Foreign Language Teacher, 4, #3 (Spring 1974), 7-10.

40 Ibid., p. 7.
er, may be a rather unreliable measure of achievement. However, the following findings were cited:

The data indicate a strong tendency for those who receive good grades in foreign language to have a more positive self-image with respect to foreign language ability and for those who receive poor grades a more negative self-image. . . I. Q. is a better predictor for foreign language accomplishment for girls, which is consonant with previous research. . . The relationship between foreign language grade and I.Q. was not very high (r = .55), indicating other factors inoperative[sic] in foreign language achievement. . . The SCFL (Self Concept-Foreign Language) may be a better predictor of achievement in foreign language, as measured by foreign language grades than I.Q. 41

It is difficult to see how the last statement above can be justified since the researcher herself indicates that

The self-concept as a foreign language student and the foreign language grade are mutually reinforcing variables. 42

Rather than the SCFL being a predictor of foreign language grades, it would seem, based on this study, that the opposite is true; foreign language grades are a good predictor of scores on the SCFL. It is interesting, however, to note that the relationship between I. Q. and foreign language achievement, though significant, again in this research is not extremely high.


42 Ibid.
Research in foreign language aptitude has given us some basis on which to hypothesize the existence of certain learner factors which contribute to success in foreign language learning. These factors may be divided into two major categories: first, intellectual or cognitive factors such as intelligence, verbal ability, auditory ability, memory, etc., and second, affective factors such as motivation, interest and attitude. There is recent evidence that a third category dealing with psychological factors is beginning to be investigated. This study has made an attempt to investigate all three categories with respect to their relationship to the ability to communicate in a foreign language.

**Research in Foreign Language Testing**

Instruments for evaluating achievement in foreign language education were developed to a great extent during the late 1950s and the 1960s. This was the era of the "New Key" in which a need developed to evaluate the goals and objectives of the audiolingual approach with its emphasis on the oral skills. Prior to this most foreign language testing was limited to the evaluation of the reading and writing skills; this was done mainly with exercises involving translation and grammatical manipulation. The turning point came in the year 1954 as reported by Pimsleur in which the first tests involving oral skills were developed.

---

and administered. This test was a listening comprehension test developed by Nelson Brooks\textsuperscript{44} and eventually became part of the College Entrance Examination Board tests. Here for the first time modern statistical techniques such as item analysis, norms, and test reliability were used in the construction of the test. This was a giant step forward considering that one year earlier a report published in the Modern Language Journal by Furness\textsuperscript{45} revealed that a review of aural-oral tests in Spanish showed no tests in this area had given evidence of validity and reliability.

This major step in the history of foreign language testing resulted in the construction of three major test batteries all of which were "standardized" and constructed with the aid of statistical methods to establish validity and reliability. The three batteries which are still in use today are: (1) Pimsleur Modern Foreign Language Proficiency Tests,\textsuperscript{46} (2) Modern Language Association Cooperative Foreign Lan-


\textsuperscript{46} Paul Pimsleur, Listening, Speaking, Reading & Writing Tests, Forms A & C (French, Spanish, German), New York, N. Y.: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1967.
guage Tests, and (3) Modern Language Association Foreign Language Proficiency Test for Teachers and Advanced Students.

A detailed description of these tests will not be included here; however, it is important to note that these three major tests developed during the 1960s have influenced and pervaded the field as models of evaluation of foreign language proficiency. This influence was due greatly to the overall impact on foreign language instructional methodology of the audiolinguists and through widely used books like Robert Lado's Language Testing in which the theories of structural linguistics were used and espoused as the basis for foreign language instruction and evaluation. Davies has aptly summarized the viewpoint of the disciples of the structuralists by pointing out that this view of language learning and consequently language proficiency testing is based on the premise that language is

a machine which acts as a stimulus-response mechanism. . . Language itself, as a machine, has no direct connexion with the environment; . . .


since language is separated from the environment in this way there is little recourse to meaning: there is little need felt to link language in any meaningful way with the world to which it refers. . . This position which we have labelled the separate but equal one is in linguistic terms structuralist, and in psychological terms, behaviorist. Testing inevitably follows on by providing drills for completion, gaps for filling and multiple choice answers for selection. . . Those who have taken up the second position (separate but equal supporters) have mechanized their testing so that after construction a test becomes automatic. What is more, a test in this tradition will provide information as to learning in this tradition (audiolingual) because trouble is taken to select suitable teaching material and sequence it; such a test will say nothing about whether the student knows the language at any level or can speak it in any real situation. 51

The criticism of foreign language testing which is based upon the structuralist or audiolingual tradition has continued to the present time. 52 It is felt that goals of foreign language instruction today do not focus upon the linguistic, discrete knowledge which the audiolinguists emphasized; thus our evaluation of such knowledge alone is inadequate. This is especially true if we consider the above mentioned tests as

"proficiency" tests in which the purpose is to evaluate what Clark\textsuperscript{53} calls "real-life competencies." Tests of proficiency should not attempt to provide information about the student's achievement in a given course of instruction, but rather measure his ability to use the language for real-life purposes without regard to the manner in which the competence was acquired.\textsuperscript{54}

The evaluation of the student's proficiency in "real-life" situations certainly is not reflected in the "standardized" tests developed in the 1960s; on the contrary, these tests evaluated a method, a tradition or theory of language acquisition, namely the so-called audiolingual approach which was based on behavioristic and structuralist theories of psychology and linguistics. Little has been done in the field to alter evaluation instruments to comply with the changes which have occurred in foreign language instruction since the height of audiolingualism.

Clark points to a need for such change:

Of all the foreign-language testing techniques, proficiency testing is the least well advanced at the present time... because valid and usable real-life proficiency tests are so clearly needed as criterion measures of the language competencies which present-day teaching programs are intended to develop, linguistic and psychometric research aimed


\textsuperscript{54}\textit{Ibid.}
at the creation and utilization of tests of this type should be considered a matter of highest priority. 55

The basic question today is whether one should still base the development and construction of foreign language tests on a theory or approach of foreign language instruction which has become questionable and is no longer considered most effective. As Jorstad points out

The emerging problem is whether language skill is best tested by using discrete-point items tied to contrastive analysis data as recommended by Lado or by more global methods which examine more than one skill per item. 56

This leads us to one of the basic questions with which this study is concerned, whether the testing of such linguistic components evaluates the communicative proficiency of a student. This question is also raised by Jorstad

Still open to question is whether foreign language teachers are actually testing language process, including all four skills and the ability to integrate the skills, or whether they are concentrating on those parts that are easiest to isolate and thus to teach and test. . . 57


57 Ibid.
There is evidence, however, of some recent work as reported by Upshur\textsuperscript{58} to develop tests which evaluate communicative competence. The techniques described in this report involve such tasks as description of a single picture from a series of pictures by the examinee after which the examiner chooses which picture he thought was being described by the examinee. Other techniques similar to this were used. Scorer reliability on tests of this type were reported as high as \( .99 \) and test-retest reliability for a 36-item test was \( .92 \). Other interesting findings by Upshur which are very significant in terms of further research in the testing of communication are:

\begin{enumerate}
\item 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;
\item That scores (especially amount of communication) do reflect a general language proficiency factor; and
\item That the test does provide information not available from discrete-point tests.\textsuperscript{59}
\end{enumerate}

It is encouraging to note that research in communicative competence testing will be continued by Upshur, as he states:

In the conclusion I will just note that the arguments about the inadequacy of discrete-point testing are convincing enough, and our preliminary work with

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., p. 182.
\end{flushright}
communicative testing is encouraging enough that we will continue our work directed towards the development of generally usable test instruments. 60

Savignon 61 developed a series of communicative competence tests in her study; unfortunately no data on reliability was furnished. Techniques used in the Savignon study, however, may be useful for further research and for the establishment of reliability and validity of such tests. Savignon used four basic techniques in her evaluation of communicative competence. (1) Discussion, an information interaction between the student and a native speaker of French, (2) Information getting, student interviewed a native speaker of French, (3) Reporting, student reported in French on some topic such as your family, your winter vacation, etc., and (4) Description, student described an ongoing activity performed by an actor.

In summary, it appears that the profession has just begun to explore the possibilities and the problems involved in the testing of communicative competence. A reaction to the overemphasis on discrete-point testing as emphasized by the audiolinguists is beginning to be felt. Much more work needs to be done to develop reliable tests of


communication, and more importantly, tests which are practical so that they can be used by the classroom teacher. This research, it is hoped, will be one step in that direction.
Chapter III

PROCEDURES AND DESIGN

This chapter of the study is divided into four main sections: (1) Population and Sample -- A brief description of the population used in this study and a description of the sampling procedure. (2) Instrumentation -- A description of the instruments used and a description of the development and analysis of those instruments made by the researcher. (3) Data Collection Procedures -- A description of the administration of the instruments and the evaluation and scoring procedures. (4) Statistical Analysis -- A description of the statistical procedures used to analyze the data.

Population and Sample

The population of high school German students for this study was comprised of all German students in level II and above at Westland High School, Galloway, Ohio and Grove City High School, Grove City, Ohio. The total number of students in the population was 130 of which a random sample of 70 was selected. It was necessary to obtain permission from the parents of the students in order for them to participate in the study. (See Appendix H for a copy of the letter sent to parents.) A sample of 50 students was desired; thus, the original sample was set at 70 with

38
the hope that there would not be more than 20 rejections. Of the 70 in the sample, only four parents did not give permission for their children to participate in the study. In order to reduce the sample size to 50, sixteen students were randomly eliminated from the sample.

Grove City High School and Westland High School are located in the Southwestern School District of Franklin County, Ohio. Both schools are comprised of students from a middle class suburb of Columbus, Ohio, which includes a mixture of "working class" and a small percentage of rural students. The students enrolled in German are generally college bound students who have selected German either because they feel that they will need a foreign language for college entrance, or in some cases they are simply interested in studying German because of their German heritage or their contacts with Germany or German people. Because of a lack of consistent data in the students' records concerning I.Q. and other student characteristics, it is impossible to report such information; however, data was obtained from tests administered in the process of this study such as foreign language aptitude, (Pimsleur Language Aptitude Battery), intelligence (Factor B of the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire), and creativity (Torrance Test of Creative Thinking). Table 1, page 40, shows the mean and standard deviation of the sample on the above measures.
Table 1
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF SAMPLE ON CERTAIN MEASURES OF APTITUDE, INTELLIGENCE AND CREATIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pimsleur Language Aptitude Battery</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85.06(73.6)(^{a})</td>
<td>10.60(13.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradepoint</td>
<td>13.04(10.9)</td>
<td>2.38(2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>6.08(5.1)</td>
<td>1.81(2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>24.60(22.2)</td>
<td>6.10(6.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory</td>
<td>41.76(35.4)</td>
<td>5.97(7.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16PF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor B (intelligence)</td>
<td>6.74(^{b})</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrance Test of Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>51.68(^{c})</td>
<td>9.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>64.86</td>
<td>10.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>78.06</td>
<td>12.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)Statistics in parentheses are reported in Pimsleur Language Aptitude Battery, Manual for Form S, p. 15.

\(^{b}\)A mean of the sample sten scores (mean 5.5) based on p. 21 of Tabular Supplement #1 to the 16PF Handbook.

\(^{c}\)Based on T-scores where the mean is 50 and the standard deviation is 10.

As can be seen from Table 1, the sample used in this study achieved consistently higher scores on the Pimsleur Language Aptitude Battery than the means reported by Pimsleur. This is perhaps due to the fact that the norms reported by Pimsleur were based on a sample of students who had only one year of foreign language study while this sample had two years or more. The mean sten score on the 16PF intelligence
factor is also above the mean (sten 5.5). On the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking this sample was very close to the normed average (T-score 50) on the Fluency score; however, the sample scored higher on the Flexibility and Originality scale.

In summary, the sample used for this study appears to be "above average" in terms of the measures reported above.

Table 2 gives a composite view of the characteristics of the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIOGRAPHIC DATA OF SAMPLE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of German Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*aIncludes years of German study on the junior high school level.
**Instrumentation**

**Communicative Competence Speaking Test (CCS)**

The construction of a communicative competence speaking test was carried out by first piloting an instrument based to some degree on instruments used by Savignon.¹ This test, like all tests of communicative competence in this study, is based on the theory that communication involves a minimum of two elements, the sender and the receiver; and that the extent to which communication takes place in the communicative process depends on the ability of the sender to encode his "purpose" for communication into a message and in turn also depends on the ability of the receiver to decode the sender's "purpose" into a message which is comprehensible to him and has meaning for him.² Communication is always a two-way process with the message the central element. Communication is not complete until there is exact correspondence between the intended message of the sender and the comprehension of this message by the receiver. To evaluate to what degree a student of foreign languages can carry out this process, instruments were constructed in which the student would function as both the sender and the re-


The Pilot CCS was divided into four parts; in Parts I and II, the student functioned solely as the sender of a message while in Parts III and IV his role alternated between sender and receiver. In Part I the student was given a short English paragraph to read after which he was asked with the aid of a list of important points of information from the paragraph to relate in German what he had read in English. (See Appendix A for a copy of paragraph and list.) In the second part the student was given a picture to describe first in English and then German. In the third part the student was interviewed by the examiner in which specific points of information were elicited. In Part IV the student interviewed the examiner. He was given a list in English of the points of information to be elicited from the examiner. This is a brief description of the pilot CCS (See Appendix A for a complete copy of the FCCS.) which was administered to 48 of the students in the sample.

The pilot test was administered for two reasons: (1) to discover the feasibility of such testing procedures and (2) to expose the students in the sample to the testing procedure in order to prevent anxiety and confusion during the administration of the final CCS. The Pilot CCS was administered during the month of December 1973 and January 1974. The evaluation and scoring was carried out by two native speakers who were present during the administration of the test. The evaluation of each student's performance was scored on four six-point scales, (1) Fluency, (2) Quality of Communication, (3) Amount of Communication and (4) Effort
to Communicate (See Appendix A for description of the scales.). During the pilot testing the scales were revised at the request of the evaluators until they felt they could use them reliably and efficiently. Training sessions had been held with the evaluators before the testing began. After the pilot was completed interrater reliability was computed with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total PCCS</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency Scale</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Communication Scale</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Communication Scale</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort to Communicate Scale</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was felt at the time that these reliability coefficients were rather low; however, considering the revisions of the scales which took place during the testing and the practice which the evaluators needed, improvement on the final CCS was anticipated.

To discover relationships between the scales and the parts of the PCCS, correlation computations were carried out between the scales and between the parts of the test. A correlation matrix showing the relationship between scales is found in Table 3, page 45. High correlations existed between the Fluency and Quality of Communication scale, and between Quality of Communication and Amount of Communication scale. The Effort to Communicate scale shows the lowest relationship to the rest of the scales. It was decided to retain all four scales on the final CCS to discover if revision of scales and practice with evaluation would lower the relationship among the scales.
A correlation matrix showing the relationship between parts of the test is found in Table 4. Rather low correlations were found between the parts of the test; thus it was concluded that each part of the test seems to be testing something quite different and all four parts should be retained in the final CCS.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a_1 = Fluency, 2 = Quality of Communication, 3 = Amount of Communication, 4 = Effort to Communicate.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Means and standard deviations were computed for each part of the PCCS and for each evaluation scale. Table 5 shows these statistics. It appears that Parts I and III of the PCCS were relatively "easy" since the mean is considerably higher than the midpoint of the evaluation scale (3.5). The pilot was designed purposely this way to minimize anxiety problems and to make the student feel more confident when taking the final CCS.

Table 5

| MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE PARTS AND THE SCALES OF THE PILOT CCGS |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Mean | S.D. |
| Part I | 4.17 | .70 |
| Part II | 3.79 | .86 |
| Part III | 4.36 | .85 |
| Part IV | 3.53 | 1.16 |
| Fluency | 3.51 | .97 |
| Quality | 3.82 | 1.07 |
| Amount | 3.82 | .70 |
| Effort | 3.61 | .53 |
| Total | 3.97 | .77 |

\[ a \text{Scores based on a possible range of 1-6.} \]
The Pilot CCS served as a basis for the construction of the final CCS. Based upon the information from the PCCS, the final CCS was revised only in content; that is, the basic tasks of the four parts were retained with a different content, in general, more complex. (See Appendix A for a copy of the test.)

The final CCS was administered during the month of March 1974. Means and standard deviations were computed for each part and for each evaluation scale. (See Table 6.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part I</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scores based on a possible range of 1-6.*
In comparing this to the statistics on the Pilot CCS (See Table 5) the means are slightly lower and the standard deviations slightly higher. This was anticipated since the content of the final CCS was made more difficult and the scales were revised to achieve greater variance in the scores.

As with the FCCS, correlation coefficients were computed between the scales and between the parts of the test. A correlation matrix showing the relationship between the scales is found in Table 7, page 49. Again as in the pilot (See Table 3, page 45.) the highest relationship exists between Fluency and Quality of Communication and between Quality of Communication and Amount of Communication; the lowest relationship is Effort to Communicate and the rest of the scales. However, the magnitude of all correlations on the final CCS was somewhat lower.

A correlation matrix showing the relationship between parts of the tests is in Table 8, page 49. In comparison to the pilot (See Table 4, page 45.) correlations between parts were substantially higher. This may be due in part to the fact that the degree of difficulty may be more consistent in all four parts on the final CCS. However, the coefficients of correlation still indicate that different skills are being tested in each part.

Validity of the CCS, as well as all tests of communicative competence used in this study, is based upon a theoretical framework of what communication is as defined earlier in this chapter (See page 42.) and
Table 7
CORRELATION MATRIX OF THE FOUR SCALES
OF EVALUATION ON THE FINAL CCS TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)1 = Fluency, 2 = Quality of Communication, 3 = Amount of Communication, 4 = Effort to Communicate.

Table 8
CORRELATION MATRIX OF THE FOUR PARTS OF
THE FINAL CCS TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

on the operational definition found in Chapter I. The components involved in true communication can, of course, only be approximated in a testing situation; thus in any test of communicative competence the student is involved in a simulated communicative situation in which he
has to perform. Construct validity at this point can only be judged on the basis of how closely the testing procedure approximated the "real" communicative situation. An attempt to establish content validity was made by restricting the tasks of all communicative competence tests to vocabulary and structure based on materials the students had been exposed to in instruction. The nature of the sample, however, causes some problems in this area since there were students of different levels. One of the objectives of the study was to discover if a difference in content as reflected by linguistic competence would have a relationship to communicative competence, thus justifying the use of some items based on content not covered by all the students in the sample.

In order to discover the reliability of the CCS, other procedures than those normally used for discrete-point tests had to be employed. It was felt since the basic format of both the pilot CCS and the final CCS were very similar, that the test-retest (alternate forms) procedure was one means available for establishing a reliability coefficient. The result of a Pearson Product Moment correlation computation on the scores of these two tests was $r = .85$. A rather low reliability coefficient had been anticipated because during the administration of the pilot test, constant revisions were being carried out. Also during the pilot testing the evaluators needed a period of time for practice in evaluation.
Communicative Competence Listening Test (CCL)

The CCL was designed to evaluate to what extent the student could comprehend a spoken message in the German language. In this test a communicative situation was established in which the student functioned solely as the receiver. The student heard a telephone message which was read twice by the examiner. While the student was listening to the message he took notes in English. After he had heard the message he wrote it in English. (See Appendix B for a copy of the test.) Discrete points of information were scored. Detailed description of evaluation and scoring of all tests are discussed in the next section of this chapter, Data Collection Procedures.

Reliability was determined by using the split-half (odd-even) Spearman-Brown computation and Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 with the following results: $S-B = .73$, $K-R 20 = .75$.

The nature of this test may violate a basic assumption of the two procedures used above because there may be a problem as to whether or not the items are independent, i.e. if the student did not comprehend one isolated point of information, would this influence his ability to comprehend subsequent information? It is difficult to be certain whether or not the "wrong" comprehension of one point of information caused the student to "comprehend" or perhaps change subsequent points of information in order to make a logical sequence in the message. This may have occurred in some instances; however, it was found on inspection of re-
sponses very few such instances were apparent.

The total possible points of information scored was 18 with a mean of 10.38 and a standard deviation of 3.96.

**Communicative Competence Writing Test (CCW)**

The CCW test was designed to evaluate the student's ability to send a comprehensible written message in German. In this test a communicative situation was established in which the student functioned solely as the sender. The student was given the task of writing a summary of his background in German in an application for a job as a waiter or waitress. (See Appendix C for a copy of the test.) Certain specific points of information were asked for.

Total possible points were 11 with a mean of 8.28 and a standard deviation of 1.72.

Reliability was determined by using the split-half (odd-even) Spearman-Brown computations and the Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 with the following results: S-B = .48; K-R 20 = .40.

**Communicative Competence Reading Test (CCR)**

The CCR test was designed to evaluate to what extent the student could comprehend a written message in German. In this test a communicative situation was established in which the student functioned solely as the receiver. The student was given a short paragraph in German to read. While he was reading he took notes in English. After he had read the paragraph twice he gave it back to the examiner and wrote the mes-
sage in English contained in the paragraph. (See Appendix D for a copy of the test.) Discrete points of information were scored.

Reliability was determined by using the split-half (odd-even) Spearman-Brown computation and the Kuder-Richardson formula 20 with the following results: $S-B = .78; K-R 20 = .69$.

Again as in the CCL there is a question as to the independence of items. As discussed in page 50 a lack of independence of items may violate a basic assumption necessary for the above reliability computations; however, as in the CCL on inspection of responses there is little evidence of this being a problem.

The total possible points of information scored was 26 with a mean of 20.62 and a standard deviation of 3.82.

**Linguistic Competence Speaking Test (LCS)**

One of the objectives of this study was to determine whether linguistic competence as defined in Chapter I has any significant relation to communicative competence. The evaluation of discrete linguistic knowledge of German was carried out with instruments adapted from tests which accompany the text used in the classes of the sample.\(^3\) Most items in these textbook tests are appropriate for the measurement of linguistic competence as defined in this study.

---

The LCS test was divided into three major parts, (1) Pronunciation, (2) Pattern Response and (3) Directed Drill. (See Appendix F for a copy of the test.) The test was administered individually and scored by two evaluators. Details of administration and scoring are discussed in the next section of this chapter. A total of 63 points was possible on the test with a mean of 42.74 and a standard deviation of 8.31.

Validity of all linguistic competence tests is based upon the operational definition of linguistic competence as found in Chapter I. The construct validity of these instruments can only be determined in so far as they measure discrete linguistic knowledge based on the ability to manipulate the language on the phonological, morphological and syntactical level. An attempt to establish content validity in all linguistic competence tests was made by using test items from the textbook materials used in the classrooms of the sample.

Reliability of the LCS was computed using the Spearman-Brown split-half (odd-even) and the Kuder-Richardson formula 20 with the following results: $S-B = .91; K-R 20 = .87$.

**Linguistic Competence Listening Test (LCL)**

The LCL test was part of a larger instrument which included the Linguistic Competence Reading test (LCR) and the Linguistic Competence Reading/Writing test (LCR/W). Five multiple-choice pure listening comprehension items made up this test. (See Appendix F for a copy of the test.) To give the test more weight in the total score of the instru-
ment, two points were assigned to each item; thus there were a total possible points of 10 with a mean of 7.12 and a standard deviation of 2.18.

Determination of reliability was not established separately for this part of the instrument. Reliability coefficients on the total instrument are reported below (LCL, LCR and LCR/W).

Linguistic Competence Reading Test (LCR)

Again as in the LCI test five multiple-choice pure reading comprehension items were part of the larger instrument. Two points were assigned to each item; thus there was a total of ten possible points with a mean of 4.68 and a standard deviation of 2.61.

Linguistic Competence Reading/ Writing Test (LCR/W)

In order to evaluate the student's ability to manipulate the language in writing on the morphological and syntactical level a test was devised based on items found in the Test Manual accompanying the student text. 4 (See Appendix F for copy of the test.)

The test was composed of eight parts. Each part evaluated a different aspect of morphology and syntax. Total possible points were 80 with a mean of 32.74 and a standard deviation of 13.61. The rather low mean may be due to the nature of the sample. As was discussed

earlier, some items included on various tests may not have had content validity for all subjects since there was a range of three levels of instruction in this sample. The question of content validity, considering the nature of the study, however, should not be a problem because one of the objectives was to discover relationships between linguistic competence and communicative competence. If some students could not complete certain items in the LCR/W, or for that matter on any linguistic competence test, thus achieving lower scores, similar low scores should exist on the communicative competence tests if any relationship exists between these two constructs.

Reliability coefficients for the whole instrument (LCL, LCR, and LCR/W were computed with the Spearman-Brown split-half (odd-even) and with the Kuder-Richardson formula 20 with the following results: S-B = .91; K-R 20 = .93.

Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (TTCT)

The nature of this study required measures which would provide scores in areas other than foreign language ability. Based on past research in foreign language aptitude (See Chapter II.) and other relevant research dealing with learner factors and their relationship to foreign language learning, instruments were used which purport to measure such factors as creativity, personality, aptitude and attitude. Two of the areas which have shown significant relationships with foreign language achievement are English grades and I.Q. It was, however, difficult to
obtain reliable and consistent data on these two factors from the records of the sample. Therefore, the TTCT Verbal Test, Form B was used in this study because of its apparent high relationship to intelligence and general achievement as measured by standardized achievement tests and grade point average. Torrance reports\(^5\) a correlation coefficient of \( r = .72 \) with the Iowa Tests of Educational Development and an \( r \) of \( .62 \) with GPA. Reviews of the TTCT also suggest that it may indeed be a good indicator of general intelligence:

Most of the scoring practices commented upon in the Technical Manual seem to yield results that are hard to distinguish from assessment of general intelligence. At least no convincing empirical separability from intelligence has yet been demonstrated.\(^6\)

It was also felt that the verbal forms of this instrument would be a good measure of the student’s ability to express himself in his native language; this would in turn serve as a basis for relating such ability to a similar ability in the foreign language.

The TTCT, Verbal Test, Form B\(^7\) is composed of seven activities


as follows: (1) Asking, (2) Guessing Causes, (3) Guessing Consequences, (4) Product Improvement, (5) Unusual Uses (Tin Cans), (6) Unusual Questions, and (7) Just Suppose. The student gives free responses in writing to these semi-structured tasks. Instructions for administration as outlined in the Manual\(^8\) were strictly adhered to. The test yields three scores: Fluency, Flexibility, and Originality. Test-retest reliability coefficients on the verbal form range from .61 to .93.\(^9\)

**Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF)**

It was reported in Chapter II that there has been a lack of research in the area of personality factors as they relate to foreign language achievement. A call for such research was also noted and therefore a search was made for an instrument which would measure personality traits of the sample. Practical considerations such as ease of administration and scoring had to be taken into account since many available instruments require specially trained personnel for administration and scoring. The 16PF can be administered and scored by the layman, thus making it feasible for use in a study such as this. Much criticism of this instrument has been made with warnings not to use the test for

---


purposes "in which scale or profile interpretations is desired."\(^{10}\) However, this same reviewer states:

> In conception and design, the 16PF is unique and a priori may well be the best personality inventory there is . . . the 16PF should (only) be used for derivation of prediction and classification functions. . . .\(^{11}\)

In this study data acquired from this instrument was, of course, in no way used to develop personality profiles on individual students. Scores were simply used as correlates with the criterion measures of communicative competence.

The 16PF yields scores on 16 primary factors and four second-order factors. A brief description of each factor can be found in the Manual.\(^{12}\) Each of the factors has an alphabetic designation (A through Q\(_{IV}\)). The title of each factor is listed below with the technical titles in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>vs.</th>
<th>Outgoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Reserved (Sizothymia)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Affectothymia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{11}\)Ibid., p. 333.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>vs.</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Less Intelligent (Lower scholastic mental capacity)</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>More Intelligent (Higher scholastic mental capacity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Affected by Feelings (Lower ego strength)</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Emotionally Stable (Higher ego strength)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Humble (Submissiveness)</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Assertive (Dominance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sober (Desurgency)</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Happy-go-lucky (Surgency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Expedient (Weaker superego strength)</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Conscientious (Stronger superego strength)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Shy (Threctia)</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Venturesome (Parmia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Tough-minded (Harria)</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Tender-minded (Premsiia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Trusting (Alaxda)</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Suspicious (Protension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Practical (Praxernia)</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Imaginative (Autia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Forthright (Artlessness)</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Shrewd (Shrewdness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Placid (Untroubled adequacy)</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Apprehensive (Guilt proneness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Conservative (Conservatism)</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Experimenting (Radicalism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Group-dependent (Group adherence)</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Self-sufficient (Self-sufficiency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Undisciplined Self-conflict (Low integration)</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Controlled (High self-concept control)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Relaxed (Low ergic tension)</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Tense (High ergic tension)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Second-Order Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Introversion</th>
<th>vs.</th>
<th>Extraversion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QII</td>
<td>Low Anxiety</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>High Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIII</td>
<td>Tenderminded Emotionality</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Tough Poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QIV</td>
<td>Subduedness</td>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Validity and reliability data for the instrument are reported in the Manual. Test-retest correlation coefficients range from .23 to .93. Validity was determined and defined as follows:

The validity of the test itself is meant to be a concept (or "construct") validity. That is to say, the test questions (or items) are chosen as being good measures of the personality factors as these factors are represented in research analysis. This concept validity of the scales can be evaluated directly by correlating the scale score with the pure factor it was designed to measure. A table reporting this data shows a range of correlation coefficients from .35 to .94.

The 16PF has 187 items of a multiple-choice format with three alternatives in each item. The test is not timed and average administration time is about 50 minutes. The questionnaire was administered to the sample in groups, and in a few cases individually. Instructions for administration as outlined in the Manual were strictly adhered to.

Pimsleur Language Aptitude Battery (PLAB)

Based on extensive research in foreign language aptitude as reported in Chapter II, an instrument was developed and constructed by


[14] Ibid., p. 11.

Pimsleur to predict success in foreign language achievement. As was noted earlier, this instrument purports to predict foreign language success in terms of standardized achievement tests and foreign language course grades. One of the objectives of this study was to see if similar relationships hold with foreign language communicative competence. Pimsleur reports correlation coefficients of the PLAB with final foreign language grades ranging from .22 to .79. With standardized achievement a range of .14 to .78 is reported.\textsuperscript{16} Validity is claimed based on these findings and it is noted that

\textit{In light of the developmental procedures and the above findings, it appears that the PLAB is a potentially useful instrument for predicting success in learning a modern foreign language.}\textsuperscript{17}

Reliability data is also reported based on split-half reliability coefficients (as corrected by Spearman-Brown formula). Reliability coefficients ranging from .57 to .89 were established.\textsuperscript{18}

The PLAB is divided into six parts as follows: (1) Grade point average in academic areas other than foreign language, (2) Interest in learning a foreign language, (3) Vocabulary—word knowledge in English,
(4) Language Analysis—ability to reason logically in terms of a foreign language. (5) Sound Discrimination—ability to learn new phonetic distinctions and to recognize them in different contexts and (6) Sound-Symbol Association—an association of sounds with their written symbols. 19

The test was administered in groups with only a few individual administrations. Parts 1 and 2 were completed by the student at the direction of the examiner. Parts 3–6 were entirely on audiotape; total time of the tape was 36 minutes. All instructions for administration were strictly adhered to by the examiner.

**Attitude Toward Germany and German-Speaking People (ATG) and Attitude Toward Learning Foreign Language (ATFL)**

It appears from extensive studies done in the area of motivation and attitude as reported by Gardner and Lambert (See Chapter II) that attitude is also significantly related to success in foreign language study. Savignon points out, however, that the findings of Gardner and Lambert may have been misinterpreted since findings of her study suggest that it is achievement which influences attitude toward French study rather than vice versa. 20

19 Paul Pimsleur, Pimsleur Language Aptitude Battery-Manual for Form S, p. 3.

Nevertheless, attitude whether it is a result of success or vice versa, has been found to be a factor related to achievement in foreign language study. Thus for this study attitude scores were used to relate this learner factor with the criterion of communicative competence. Attitude scales developed by Lambert and his associates, quoted in Jakobovits\(^{21}\) were revised for use in this study. As is pointed out by Jakobovits:

> These scales many of which were originally developed by Professor W. E. Lambert and his collaborators at McGill University, reflect a specific interest in the study of French as a second language in Canada. However, these can easily be adapted by the teacher for his specific purposes; in most cases nothing more is needed than replacing references to "French," "French culture," "Canada," etc. by appropriate equivalent terms.\(^{22}\)

The instrument used in this study is a revision of the scales referred to above and contains 22 items, 15 of which make up the ATG and seven items make up the ATFL. (See Appendix G for a copy of the instrument.) An identical scale was used for each item, ranging from 1-5, defined as follows:

- 5 strongly agree
- 4 agree
- 3 undecided
- 2 disagree
- 1 strongly disagree


\(^{22}\)Ibid., p. 261.
Reliability of the instrument was computed by using the Kuder-Richardson formula 8 with the following results: ATG .68 and ATFL .84. The instrument was administered in groups from the sample with few individual administrations.

**Data Collection Procedure**

Procedures of administration, in as much as they have not been described above, will be dealt with in this section in greater detail, especially those instruments which were complex to administer such as the CCS and LCS tests. Administration of instruments which required relatively simple procedures was discussed above. Also in this section the evaluation and scoring procedures of all instrumentation is described.

**Communicative Competence Speaking Test (CCS)**

Both the pilot and final CCS test were administered on an individual basis. A small room in each school was used where the students were scheduled to arrive at half-hour intervals. Upon arrival the student was introduced to the two evaluators and an attempt was made to put him at ease by explaining that the test he was about to take would in no way be used to influence his German grade and that the results of his performance would be kept strictly confidential. A short explanation of the purpose of the test was then made, again trying to put the student at ease. During the actual administration of the test the student faced the examiner but the two evaluators were situated in such a way that the student would not be facing them. All directions were carefully read to the stu-
dent as he followed them on a printed sheet. The student was given a chance to ask questions on procedure any time during the test.

During the administration of the test the evaluators rated each student on four scales. Each part of the test was rated separately on all four scales. As indicated earlier the four scales were developed and refined during the CCS pilot testing. A detailed description of the revised scales is found in Appendix A. All scales contained the numerical range of 1-6. The evaluators were free to score not only on the whole numbers, but also on the mid-points, such as 3.5, 1.5, etc. (See Appendix A for a copy of the sheet used by the evaluators.)

The evaluation and testing of the speaking skill in foreign languages has always posed a problem. Attempts to evaluate this skill have been made by concentrating on the discrete linguistic elements of speech: phonology, morphology, and syntax. This could, of course, not be done in the evaluation of communicative competence for inherent in the objectives of this study is the need that the two concepts, communicative competence and linguistic competence, be evaluated separately. Thus, scales were devised which allowed the evaluation of communicative competence without any regard to linguistic "error" as long as it did not interfere with the communicative process. Two dimensions of evaluation were considered in the development of the scales, the quantity and the quality dimension. To measure the quantity dimension a scale called "Amount of Communication" was used. (See Appendix
A detailed description of the scale.) To measure the quality dimension, two scales were used, "Quality of Communication" and "Fluency." The quality dimension was considered much more complex; thus, two aspects of quality were evaluated by these scales. The Fluency scale evaluated the "smoothness" of delivery while the Quality scale was concerned with the ability of the student to produce "native-like" utterances appropriate to the communicative situation. Intercorrelations reported earlier (r = .83), between these two scales, however, show a high relationship; therefore, collapsing these two scales may be advisable.

The evaluation of a third dimension was also considered necessary based on findings by Savignon\textsuperscript{23} which show that successful communication depends to some extent on the "willingness" of the student to express himself in the foreign language. This dimension was measured by means of the "Effort to Communicate" scale. It appears that this scale had the lowest relationship to the total score of the CCS. The correlation coefficients of each scale to the total CCS score were:

\begin{align*}
\text{Fluency, } r &= .83 \\
\text{Quality of Communication, } r &= .94 \\
\text{Amount of Communication, } r &= .96 \\
\text{Effort to Communicate, } r &= .80
\end{align*}

The relationship of the Effort scale to the total score is, however, still substantial. All scales were developed by this researcher except for the Fluency scale which is based in part on a scale described in an Educational Testing Services xeroxed publication entitled, "Description of the Peace Corps Language Proficiency Interview."^24

The evaluators scored each student's performance on the CCS independently. Both evaluators are native speakers of German. One has received all of her formal education in Germany and is presently a housewife living in this country. The other evaluator was born in Germany and received all of her primary and most of her secondary education in Germany. In this country she attended a university and was trained and certified to teach German on the secondary level.

Interrater reliability for each scale and for each part of the CCS test is found in Table 9, page 69. Exceptionally high interrater reliability on the final CCS may be due in part to the extremely conscientious effort of the raters to score consistently. Although they scored independently and after the administration of each test handed in their evaluation sheets immediately to the examiner, they did subsequently discuss individual students and problems of scoring between test administrations. This communication may have contributed to the high interrater reliability

---

which could not have been expected if the individual raters had never been in contact with each other.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( r^a )</th>
<th>( IR^b )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Communication</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Communication</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort to Communicate</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( ^a \) Intercorrelation between raters

\( ^b \) The interrater reliability for the two judges over fifty subjects.

Communicative Competence Listening Test (CCL)

The CCL was administered in groups to the sample. The telephone message was read by the examiner twice after which the students with the aid of their notes wrote up in English the message they had heard. Points of information were listed to aid in evaluation and scoring. (See
Appendix B for the list.) The test was scored by checking off each point of information which the student had in his English message. Any point of misinformation was scored negatively. To arrive at a total score, all points of information were totaled including the negative points.

*Communicative Competence Writing Test (CCW)*

This test was administered in groups to the sample. As described earlier, a list of biographical information was required in the application for a job. The scoring procedure was carried out independently by three evaluators who read each test and determined the number of points of information based on a check list which was conveyed in writing by the student. (See Appendix C for a copy of the list.) The criteria for judging whether information was or was not conveyed by the students was carefully explained to the evaluators in a training session and also given to them in printed form. (See Appendix C for a copy of the criteria.) Inter-rater reliability was computed with the following result: \( r = .87 \) (average correlation between raters) and IR (Interrater Reliability for the three over 50 subjects) = .95.\(^{25}\)

*Communicative Competence Reading Test (CCR)*

The CCR was administered in groups to the sample. The students

were given the German paragraph and were told to read it twice and to take notes in English. They were told not to translate word for word, but to make notes so that they would remember the important points of information. Time did not permit them to do more than brief note taking. No students did more than note taking and there was no evidence of direct translation into English. Both the notes and the English summary were handed into the examiner. (See Appendix D for a copy of the answer sheet.) Again as in the CCL, points of information were listed to aid in evaluation and scoring. (See Appendix D for list.) Scoring was carried out by checking off each point of information found in the English summary. Any point of misinformation was scored negatively. To arrive at a total score, all points of information were totaled including the negative points.

**Linguistic Competence Speaking Test (LCS)**

The LCS was administered individually at the same time that the final CCS was given. Evaluation of the LCS was done independently by the same two evaluators who scored the CCS. Explicit instructions of evaluation on a separate evaluation sheet for each student were given. (See Appendix E for a copy of evaluation sheet.) Interrater reliability for the LCS was: \( r = .97 \) and \( IR = .99 \).

**Linguistic Competence Listening Test (LCL), Linguistic Competence Reading Test (LCR), and Linguistic Competence Reading/Writing (LCR/W)**

All three tests were administered in groups to the sample. The
five-item, multiple-choice LOL was read by the examiner to each group. Scoring of the combined instrument was carried out by the researcher. Points for evaluation were determined and strictly adhered to in scoring. (See Appendix F for a copy of test with detailed scoring procedure.)

The Published Instruments Used in the Study

The published instruments used in this study were all administered in groups to the sample. Evaluation and scoring of these instruments was carried out by the researcher. All instruments could be scored objectively using keys furnished by the publisher for the tests, or keys constructed by the researcher. One exception was the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking, which was sent to the publishers for evaluation and scoring.

Statistical Analysis

A computerized program, BMD-03D Correlation with Item Deletion developed by the Health Sciences Computing Facilities at UCLA was used to compute correlations between all variables. A computerized program, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, SPSSH - Version 5.01 was used for the stepwise regression analysis to further define the relationship among selected variables.

---


CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The results of the study are reported in this chapter which is divided into two main sections. The first section is an analysis of the findings as they relate to each hypothesis presented in Chapter I. The second section will provide an analysis of the findings in terms of multiple regressions which further define the relationship of the dependent variable and its components with the independent variables as outlined in Chapter I.

The Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were used to focus on the components of the study for analysis. The hypotheses are discussed in the order in which they were presented in Chapter I. No attempt was made to categorically reject or retain individual hypotheses except in certain instances where overwhelming evidence is in favor of rejection or retention.

Hypothesis 1. There is no significant relationship between communicative competence and linguistic competence of German students as measured by instruments used in this study.

Table 10, page 74, shows the total linguistic competence score correlated significantly with the total communicative competence score
Table 10

CORRELATION OF COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE SCORES WITH LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</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>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><strong>.469</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.403</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.431</strong></td>
<td><strong>.274</strong></td>
<td><strong>.210</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.464</strong></td>
<td><strong>.275</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.284</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.287</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.410</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.458</strong></td>
<td><strong>.295</strong></td>
<td><strong>.351</strong></td>
<td><strong>.357</strong></td>
<td><strong>.477</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>*<strong>.414</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.675</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.592</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.394</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.421</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.447</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.460</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.554</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.509</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.410</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.446</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.676</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.490</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.619</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.735</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>*<strong>.460</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.569</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.543</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.355</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.365</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.504</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.284</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.496</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.513</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.526</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.556</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.477</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.445</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.518</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.531</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>.312</strong></td>
<td><strong>.360</strong></td>
<td><strong>.287</strong></td>
<td><strong>.360</strong></td>
<td><strong>.366</strong></td>
<td><strong>.381</strong></td>
<td><strong>.347</strong></td>
<td><strong>.367</strong></td>
<td><strong>.351</strong></td>
<td><strong>.302</strong></td>
<td><strong>.157</strong></td>
<td><strong>.343</strong></td>
<td><strong>.244</strong></td>
<td><strong>.387</strong></td>
<td><strong>.576</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>*<strong>.576</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.533</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.570</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.455</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.434</strong></td>
<td><strong>.385</strong></td>
<td><strong>.408</strong></td>
<td><strong>.477</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.330</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.472</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.550</strong></td>
<td><strong>.613</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.572</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.475</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.672</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>*<strong>.426</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.505</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.403</strong></td>
<td><strong>.516</strong></td>
<td><strong>.426</strong></td>
<td><strong>.404</strong></td>
<td><strong>.475</strong></td>
<td><strong>.513</strong></td>
<td><strong>.216</strong></td>
<td><strong>.265</strong></td>
<td><strong>.495</strong></td>
<td><strong>.656</strong></td>
<td><strong>.490</strong></td>
<td><strong>.646</strong></td>
<td><strong>.580</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>*<strong>.420</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.555</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>.597</strong></td>
<td><strong>.469</strong></td>
<td><strong>.431</strong></td>
<td><strong>.418</strong></td>
<td><strong>.486</strong></td>
<td><strong>.572</strong></td>
<td><strong>.552</strong></td>
<td><strong>.446</strong></td>
<td><strong>.558</strong></td>
<td><strong>.635</strong></td>
<td><strong>.560</strong></td>
<td><strong>.643</strong></td>
<td><strong>.666</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance level = .10
**Significance level = .05
***Significance level = .01

Note: Dots indicate tests have been omitted.

*List of Variables by number:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fluency Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quality of Commun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amount of Commun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Effort to Commun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Part I, CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Part II, CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Part III, CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Part IV, CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Total CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Total Oral CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>DCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Total Written CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Total TC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>LCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>LCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Total Oral LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>LCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>LCR/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Total Written IC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Total IC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Factor A, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Factor B, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Factor C, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Factor E, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Factor F, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Factor G, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Factor H, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Factor I, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Factor J, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Factor K, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Factor L, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Factor M, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Factor N, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Factor O, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Factor P, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Factor Q1, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Factor Q2, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Factor Q3, 16FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Factor Q4, 16FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Factor Q5, 16PP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Factor Q6, 16FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Factor Q7, 16FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Factor Q8, 16FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Factor Q9, 16FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Factor Q10, 16FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Factor Q11, 16FF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Factor Q12, 16FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Factor Q13, 16FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Factor Q14, 16FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Factor Q15, 16FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Years of FL Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Absent to Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>German Spoken at Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(variables 15 and 22). In addition, an overwhelming majority of the component scores of the linguistic competence tests correlated significantly with most of the components of the communicative competence tests. The only variable which has consistently low correlations with
communicative competence, though significant in most cases, is the linguistic competence reading score (variable 19). Intercorrelations of the skill component scores (speaking, variables 9 and 17; listening, variables 10 and 16; reading, variables 13 and 19; and writing, variables 12 and 20) are all significant at the .01 level except for the reading scores which correlate only at the .10 level. Only two correlation coefficients did not attain significance at the .10 level, the Communicative Competence Listening with the Linguistic Competence Reading scores (variables 10 and 19) and the total oral communicative competence score with the Linguistic Competence Reading score (variables 11 and 19). On the basis of these findings the hypothesis of no significant relationship between communicative competence and linguistic competence is rejected.

Hypothesis 2. There is no significant relationship between communicative competence and personality factors of German students as measured by instruments used in this study.

Table 11, page 76, shows that only one factor score of the 16PF attained a significant correlation coefficient with the total communicative competence score (variables 15 and 39). This factor, Q1: Introversion vs. Extraversion, correlated negatively with total communicative competence indicating that students scoring high on the communicative competence tests generally scored low on this factor thus displaying characteristics of introversion defined as follows:
Table 11
CORRELATION OF COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE SCORES WITH PERSONALITY FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</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>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.255</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
<td>* *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance level .10
** Significance level .05

Note: Decimal have been omitted.

Table 10, page 74, provides a list of variables by number.

The person who scores low on Factor Q1 tends to be shy, self-sufficient, and inhibited in interpersonal contacts. This can be either a favorable or unfavorable finding, depending upon the particular situation in which the person is expected to function; e.g., introversion is a favorable predictor of precision workmanship.1

This is perhaps a surprising finding, in that one would normally assume

that a more outgoing person would have more success in the kinds of
tests which were used for the evaluation of communicative competence.
However, these results show that it is not so much the outgoing person-
ality which is successful in these measures of communicative competence
as a personality with traits of self-sufficiency, precision and shyness.
Important to note is that this correlation attained significance only at the
.10 level, indicating a rather high probability of chance. It is also im-
portant to note that the opposite trait (extraversion) measured by this
factor is not "necessarily favorable as a general predictor, e.g. of scho-
lastic achievement."² Since it has been shown in previous studies that
scholastic achievement as revealed by grade point average is a rather
good predictor of success in foreign language study, it might be expected
that students who score high on measures of foreign language achieve-
ment would tend to score in the direction of the introversion trait as
measured by the 16PF. As shown in Table 11, there is a tendency for this
factor (Q1) to correlate negatively at varying degrees of significance with
a majority of the component scores of communicative competence. Nega-
tive correlation coefficients significant at the .05 level were found to
exist with three component scores, the Quality of Communication scale
of the CCS (variables 39 and 2), Part II of the CCS (variables 39 and 6),
and the total CCS score (variables 39 and 9). Negative correlation co-

efficiently significant at the .10 level existed with four component scores, the Amount of Communication scale of the CCS (variables 39 and 3), the Effort to Communicate scale of the CCS (variables 39 and 4), Part IV of the CCS (variables 39 and 8), and the total communicative competence score (variables 39 and 11).

No other factors of the 16PF correlated significantly with the total communicative competence score. The remaining significant correlations involve component scores of the communicative competence tests. Two factors which show a substantial number of significant correlations with component scores are factor Q2 (variable 36) and F (variable 27). All significant correlations with factor Q2 are positive thus indicating that students who scored high on the components involved tended to score high on this factor which is defined as follows:

Group-dependent vs. Self-sufficient: The person who scores high on Factor Q2 is temperamentally independent, accustomed to going his own way, making decisions and taking action on his own. He discounts public opinion, but is not necessarily dominant in his relations with others. . . He does not dislike people but simply does not need their agreement or support.\(^3\)

Significant correlations of this factor at the .05 level were established with the following communicative competence component scores: the Fluency scale of the CCS (variables 36 and 1), the Quality of Communi-

\(^3\)Manual for 16PF, p. 22.
cation scale of the CCS (variables 36 and 2), Part I of the CCS (variables 36 and 5), Part IV of the CCS (variables 36 and 8), and the total oral communicative competence score (variables 36 and 9). Correlations at the .10 level were established with the Amount of Communication scale of the CCS (variables 36 and 3), the Effort to Communicate scale of the CCS (variables 36 and 4), Part II of the CCS (variables 36 and 6), Part III of the CCS (variables 36 and 7), and the Communicative Competence Writing test (variables 36 and 12). From these findings indications are that the "self-sufficient" personality as defined above performs better on tests of communicative competence especially when the productive skills (speaking and writing) are involved.

Factor F (variable 27) also shows a number of significant relationships with component scores. This factor consistently correlates negatively thus indicating that students who scored high on the components involved tended to score low on this factor which is defined as follows:

Sober vs. Happy-go-lucky:
The person who scores low on Factor F tends to be restrained, reticent, introspective. He is sometimes dour, pessimistic, unduly deliberate, and considered smug and primly correct by observers. He tends to be a sober dependable person.4

---

Significant correlations at the .05 level of this factor were established with the following communicative competence component scores: the Effort to Communicate scale of the CCS (variables 27 and 4), Part II of the CCS (variables 27 and 6), and the total communicative competence speaking score (variables 27 and 9). Correlations at the .10 level were established with the Fluency Scale of the CCS (variables 27 and 1), the Amount of Communication scale of the CCS (variables 27 and 3), Part I of the CCS (variables 27 and 5), and Part IV of the CCS (variables 27 and 8). From these findings indications are that the "sober" personality as defined above performs better on tests of communicative competence in which the speaking skill is involved.

Factor O of the 16PF (variable 34) produced four significant correlation coefficients, two at the .05 level and two at the .10 level. In all four instances the factor correlates negatively with component scores of communicative competence tests thus indicating students scoring high on the components involved tended to score low on this factor which is defined as follows:

Placid vs. Apprehensive:
The person who scores low on Factor O tends to be placid, with unshakable nerve, he has a mature unanxious confidence in himself and his capacity to deal with things. He is resilient and secure, but to the point of being insensitive of when a group is not going along with him, so that he may evoke antipathies and distrust.\(^5\)

Significant correlations of this factor at the .05 level were established with two components of the communicative competence tests, Part II of the CCS (variables 34 and 6) and the total communicative competence written score (variable 34 and 14). Two significant correlations at the .10 level were established, one with the Communicative Competence Reading test (variables 34 and 13) and one with the Communicative Competence Writing test (variables 34 and 12). From these findings indications are that the "placid" personality as defined above performs somewhat better on tests of communicative competence especially where the written skills are involved.

Other significant correlation coefficients are scattered throughout the remaining factors of the 16PF. No other factors showed an overall tendency of correlating significantly with total communicative competence scores or any of its components. Two isolated correlations at the .05 level remain involving Factor B and Factor E. Factor B correlates positively with Part III of the CCS (variables 24 and 7). High scores on this factor are defined as follows:

Less Intelligent vs. More Intelligent:
The person who scores high on Factor B tends to be quick to grasp ideas, a fast learner, intelligent. There is some correlation with level of culture and some with alertness. High scores contraindicate deterioration of mental functions in pathological conditions.6

---

Part III of the CCS as described earlier was an interview in which the student had to supply specific points of information asked for by the examiner. Successful performance on this part of the CCS may have been easier for a student who possesses traits as described above since it was necessary for the student to respond within a relatively short period of time to each question because the examiner would proceed to the next question after a period of time passed which appeared "unnatural" in a "real" communicative situation. In other parts of the CCS the time element may not have played such an important role.

Factor E correlates negatively with the Communicative Competence Listening test (variables 26 and 10). Low scorers on this factor are defined as follows:

**Humble vs. Assertive:**
The person who scores low on Factor E tends to give way to others, to be docile, and to conform. He is often dependent, confessing, anxious for obsessional correctness. This passivity is part of many neurotic syndromes.\(^7\)

The Communicative Competence Listening test required careful attention to the telephone message and a conscientious effort in note-taking. Students possessing the traits described above were more successful in this type of testing situation.

Four factors are involved in the remaining correlation coefficients which are significant at the .10 level. Factor M correlates positively

---

\(^7\) *Manual for 16PF*, p. 18.
with the Communicative Competence Writing Scores (variables 32 and 12).

This factor is described as follows:

Practical vs. Imaginative
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.\(^8\)

Factor Q\(_3\) correlates positively with the Effort to Communicate scale of the CCS (variables 37 and 4) and Part II of the CCS (variables 37 and 6). This factor is described as follows:

Undisciplined Self-conflict vs. Controlled:
The person who scores high on Factor Q\(_3\) tends to have strong control of his emotions and general behavior, is inclined to be socially aware and careful, and evidences what is commonly termed "self-respect" and regard for social reputation. He sometimes tends, however, to be obstinate. Effective leaders, and some paranoids, are high on Q\(_3\).

Factor Q\(_{II}\) correlates negatively with the Communicative Competence Writing test (variables 40 and 12) and the total written communicative competence score (variables 40 and 14). This factor is described as follows:

\(^8\) Manual for 16PF, p. 20.

\(^9\) Ibid., p. 22.
Low Anxiety vs. High Anxiety:
The person who scores low on this factor tends
to be one whose life is generally satisfying and
one who is able to achieve those things that seem
to him to be important. However, an extremely
low score can mean lack of motivation for diffi-
cult tasks, as is generally shown in studies re-
lating anxiety to achievement. ¹⁰

Factor QⅣ correlates positively with the Communicative Compe-
tence Writing test (variables 42 and 12). This factor is described as
follows:

Subduedness vs. Independence:
The person who scores high on this factor tends
to be an aggressive, independent, daring, incisive
person. He will seek those situations where such
behavior is at least tolerated and possibly rewarded,
and is likely to exhibit considerable initiative. ¹¹

On the basis of the above findings several personality factors as
measured by the 16PF display some relationship to the ability to communi-
cate in a foreign language (German). There is substantial evidence that
students who show traits of introversion tend to score higher on tests of
communicative competence, especially in the components which involve
the speaking skill. Students who show traits of "self-sufficiency" as
measured by the 16PF tend to score higher on the tests of communicative
competence involving both productive skills. The more "sober" student
excels in tests of communicative competence in which the speaking

¹¹Ibid., p. 28.
skill is involved. The student who tends to be "placid" scores higher on communicative competence tests of reading and writing. Other findings as noted above do not show any general trends but are isolated significant relationships with isolated components of the communicative competence battery of tests. Intelligence as measured by the 16PF shows some relationship to only one component of the communicative competence tests, Part II of the CCS which is an interview where the student gives information. A "humble" student performs significantly better on the communicative competence listening test used in this study. Other isolated relationships between communicative competence and personality factors must be interpreted very cautiously since only a low significance level of .10 was attained.

Hypothesis 2, stated above, cannot be categorically rejected on the basis of these findings since many of the personality factors measured did not show significant relationships with communicative competence scores. However, 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.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant relationship between communicative competence and creativity of German students as measured by instruments used in this study.

Table 12, page 86, shows that there are no significant relation-
Table 12
CORRELATION OF COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE SCORES WITH
CREATIVITY SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</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>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>*0.267</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>**0.204</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.117</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>**0.343</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>*0.276</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>**0.225</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>**0.276</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>**0.287</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>**0.280</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>0.160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance level = .10
** Significance level = .05

Notes: Decimals have been omitted.
*Table 16, page 74, provides a list of variables by number.

ships between the total communicative competence score and scores of creativity as measured by the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking. Significant relationships do, however, exist with component scores of the communicative tests. The TTCT, Verbal Form B, yields three scores, Fluency, Flexibility and Originality. The Fluency scores produced two significant coefficients of correlations with components of the communicative competence tests at the .10 level. One of these was established with Part I of the CCS (variables 43 and 5) and the second with the Communicative Competence Writing test (variables 43 and 12). The Fluency component of the TTCT is defined as follows:

This score reflects the test taker's ability to produce a large number of ideas with words. 12

The ability to score high on the Fluency component as described above did correlate with the ability to relate orally in German information read in English as measured by Part II of the CCS and also with the ability to write in German a summary of one's background as measured by the Communicative Competence Writing test.

The Flexibility scores produced two significant coefficients of correlation with components of the communicative competence tests at the .05 level and one at the .10 level. There were significant correlations between the Flexibility and the Fluency scale of the CCS and Part I of the CCS at the .05 level (variables 44, 1 and 5). Also, significance at the .10 level was attained between Flexibility and the Communicative Competence Writing test. The Flexibility score of the TTCT is defined as follows:

This score represents a person's ability to produce a variety of kinds of ideas, to shift from one approach to another, or to use a variety of strategies. . . In some cases, however, extremely high flexibility scores in relation to fluency may characterize the person who jumps from one approach to another and is unable to stick to any one line of thinking long enough to really develop it. ¹³

High scores on Flexibility as defined above were positively related to the ability of the student to express himself orally in German in terms of

¹³Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking, p. 73.
smoothness and continuity as measured by the Fluency scale of the CCS and to the ability to relate orally in German information read in English as measured by Part II of the CCS. A relationship exists between Flexibility and the ability to write a summary of one's background in German as measured by the CCW.

The Originality scores produced six significant coefficients of correlation with components of the Communicative competence tests, four at the .05 level of significance and two at the .10 level. Correlations at the .05 level were established with the Fluency scale of the CCS (variables 45 and 1), Part I of the CCS (variables 45 and 5), Part III of the CCS (variables 45 and 7) and the Communicative Competence Writing test. Correlations at the .10 level of significance were established with the Effort to Communicate scale of the CCS (variables 45 and 4) and the total CCS score (variables 45 and 9). The Originality score of the TTCT is defined as follows:

This score represents the subject's ability to produce ideas that are away from the obvious, commonplace, banal, or established. The person who achieves a high score on Verbal Originality usually has available a great deal of intellectual energy and may be perceived as rather nonconforming. He is able to make big mental leaps or "cut corners" in obtaining solutions, but this does not mean that he is erratic or impulsive in his behavior. In fact, the making of original responses requires the ability to delay immediate gratification or reduction of tension in order to get away from the obvious,
easy, but low quality response.\textsuperscript{14}

Of the three component scores on the TTCT this score, Originality, was the most productive in terms of a substantial number of relationship with communicative competence test scores. From this it is evident that the Originality score is related positively to scores on tests of communicative competence in which the productive skills are involved (speaking and writing).

Based on the findings above it can be concluded that the TTCT does show some relationship with communicative competence, but only on those tests which evaluate the productive skills (speaking and writing). No significant correlations were established with components of the communicative competence tests which involved the receptive skills (listening and reading); neither was there any significant relationship with the total communicative competence score, thus hypothesis 3 stated above cannot be categorically rejected. However, there is evidence of a relationship between this measure of creativity and the ability to communicate in the foreign language (German) where the productive skills are involved.

\textbf{Hypothesis 4. There is no significant relationship between communicative competence and foreign language aptitude of German students as...}

\textsuperscript{14}Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking, p. 73.
Table 13 shows that there is a significant relationship between the total foreign language aptitude score as measured by the Pimsleur Language Aptitude Battery and the total communicative competence tests score at a .01 level (variables 50 and 15). In addition, the total PLAB correlates significantly with all components of the communicative competence tests attaining significant levels of at least .05 (variables 50 and 1-15).

The PLAB yields four component scores, grade point (academic areas other than foreign language), interest, verbal, and auditory. The grade point component is a self-reporting task in which the student indicates his highest grade in each of four major subject areas: English, arithmetic-mathematics, social studies-history, and science. The second component is a single item in which the student indicates his interest in the study of a foreign language on a five-point scale ranging from "rather uninterested" to "strongly interested." Component three, the verbal component, is the total score of Parts 3 and 4 of the instrument. Part 3 is an English vocabulary test and Part 4 is a language analysis
test in which the student displays his "ability to reason logically in terms of a foreign language."¹⁵ The fourth or auditory component of the PLAB is the total score of Parts 5 and 6. Part 5 of the instrument is a "sound discrimination test requiring students to differentiate between pitch, orality, and nasality in spoken words."¹⁶ The language used is Ewe, a West African language. Part 6 is a sound-symbol association test in which the student must display his ability to associate sounds with their written symbols. Nonsense words with English pronunciation are used.

The components of the PLAB which established the largest number of significant correlation coefficients with components of the communicative competence test were the interest and the verbal components. The interest component correlated significantly at the .01 level with all components of communicative competence except with the Fluency scale of the CCS (variables 47 and 1), the Communicative Competence Reading test (variables 47 and 13), and Part I of the CCS (variables 47 and 5) where the level of significance was .05. The verbal component of the PLAB also correlated significantly with all components of the communicative competence tests except with the Communicative Competence Listening test where no significance was attained (variables 48 and 10).

¹⁶ ibid., p. 15.
The majority of the remaining correlation coefficients are significant at the .01 level with only three attaining significance at the .05 level. Both the interest and verbal components also correlate significantly at the .01 level with the total communicative competence score (variables 47, 48 and 15). These findings show overwhelming evidence that the interest and verbal components of the PLAB relate significantly to communicative competence as measured by instruments used in this study.

The grade point and auditory components of the PLAB showed few significant relationships with communicative competence scores. The grade point component correlated significantly at the .01 level with the Communicative Competence Writing test, the Communicative Competence Reading test and with the total written communicative competence score (variables 46, 12, 13, and 14). It did not, however, correlate significantly with the total communicative competence score, or any of the oral components. The auditory component achieved only two coefficients of correlation significant at the .05 level. The remaining correlations are significant at the .10 level. This component of the PLAB correlated at the .05 level with the total oral communicative competence score (variables 49 and 11) and the total communicative competence score (variables 49 and 15). With the oral components of the communicative competence tests it attained significance only at the .10 level as follows: the Quality of Communication scale of the CCS (variables 49 and 2), Part II of the CCS (variables 49 and 6), Part IV of the CCS (variables 49 and 8), the
total communicative competence speaking score (variables 49 and 9), and the Communicative Competence Listening test (variables 49 and 10). No significant correlations were achieved with the written components of the communicative competence tests. From this data there is evidence that the grade point components of the PLAB relates significantly only to the written components of communicative competence while the auditory component is only related to the oral components of communicative competence.

From these findings there is evidence that the *Pimsleur Language Aptitude Battery* relates significantly to communicative competence, especially the total score and the interest and verbal component scores. The grade point component shows a significant relationship with the written components of communicative competence while the auditory component shows a significant, though not as strong, relationship with the oral components of communicative competence.

Conditional rejection of hypothesis 4 can be made on the basis that two components of the PLAB, interest and verbal, and the total score of the PLAB showed an overall significant relationship with the communicative competence scores; however, the remaining two components of the PLAB, grade point and auditory, showed no overall significant relationship but were limited to certain skill areas.
Hypothesis 5. There is no significant relationship between communicative competence and attitude toward German-speaking people and culture as measured by instruments used in this study.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</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>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.164</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Decimals have been omitted.

*Table 10, page 74, provides a list of variables by number.*

Table 14 shows that there are no significant coefficients of correlation between any of the components of the communicative competence tests or the total communicative competence score and the Attitude toward Germany and German-Speaking People scale (ATG). This attitude scale was based on scales developed by Lambert as found in Jakobovits (see Chapter III, page 63). Although Jakobovits does recommend these scales for use by substituting references to "French" with the appropriate country and language involved, it appears that many of the items were designed in such a way that it is difficult for the student to respond discriminantly without having had any actual contact with the foreign people and culture. The original scale was designed for Canadians who had close contact with French-speaking people and their culture. Therefore the average American high school student seems to find it difficult to "agree" or "disagree" with many of the items on the instrument, marking them "undecided" (3). This becomes evident on inspection of the re-
sponses and also when considering the mean on this instrument which
was 3.56 with a standard deviation of .37. The mean is close to the
category of "undecided" (3) with a very small "spread" in the scores.
This low variance in scores may have contributed to the fact that no sig-
nificant correlations were achieved with the communicative competence
scores. However, on the basis of these findings the hypothesis of no
significant relationship must be retained.

Hypothesis 6. There is no significant relationship between communica-
tive competence and attitude toward the study of foreign language as
measured by instruments used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORRELATION OF COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE SCORES WITH THE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORE ON THE ATTITUDE TOWARD STUDY OF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREIGN LANGUAGE SCALE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</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>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td><strong>342</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>438</strong></td>
<td><strong>318</strong></td>
<td><strong>287</strong></td>
<td><strong>307</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>376</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>365</strong></td>
<td><strong>356</strong></td>
<td><strong>394</strong></td>
<td><strong>079</strong></td>
<td><strong>216</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>407</strong></td>
<td><strong>247</strong></td>
<td><strong>365</strong></td>
<td><strong>310</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance level = .10
**Significance level = .05
***Significance level = .01

Note: Decimals have been omitted.

*Table 15, page 74, provides a list of variables by number.

Table 15 shows that there is a significant relationship between the
total communicative competence score and the Attitude Toward Learning
Foreign Language scale (ATFL); see variables 52 and 15. Significant
relationships also exist with all but two of the component scores of
communicative competence, the Communicative Competence Listening
test (variables 52 and 10) and the total oral communicative competence
score (variables 52 and 11). A very low correlation (significance level, .10) exists with the Communicative Competence Reading test (variables 52 and 13). This suggests that the ATFL has a greater relationship with communicative competence where the productive skills (speaking and writing) are involved. Hypothesis 6 can be rejected conditionally on the basis that there is a significant relationship between the ATFL and the total communicative competence score, but no significant relationship with the listening component and a very slight relationship with the reading component.

Hypothesis 7. There is no significant relationship between communicative competence as measured by instruments of this study and age of German students used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CORRELATION OF COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE SCORES WITH AGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significance level = .05
*** Significance level = .01

Note: Decimals have been omitted.
*Table 10, page 74, provides a list of variables by number.

Table 16 shows that there is a significant relationship between the total communicative competence score and the age of the students in the sample at the .01 level (variables 56 and 15). Significant relationships also exist with all but three of the component scores of communicative
competence, the Communicative Competence Writing test (variables 56 and 12), the Communicative Competence Reading test (variables 56 and 13), and the total written communicative competence score (variables 56 and 14). Positive correlations indicate that the older the student is, the better he performs on the measures involved. The results suggest that the age of the students has a stronger relationship to communicative competence where oral skills (speaking and listening) are involved with a nonsignificant relationship to the measures which involve the written skills (reading and writing). Hypothesis 7 can be rejected conditionally on the basis that there is a significant relationship between age and total communicative competence, but no significant relationship with the written components of the communicative competence measures.

Hypothesis 8. There is no significant relationship between communicative competence as measured by instruments of this study and sex of German students used in this study.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</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>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>-019</td>
<td>029</td>
<td>053</td>
<td>-006</td>
<td>016</td>
<td>017</td>
<td>052</td>
<td>022</td>
<td>041</td>
<td>019</td>
<td>035</td>
<td>025</td>
<td>026</td>
<td>034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Decimals have been omitted.
*Table 10, page 74, provides a list of variables by number.

Table 17 shows that no significant relationship exists between the total communicative competence score (variables 58 and 15) or between any of its components (variables 58 and 1-14) and the sex of the students. On the basis of these findings, hypothesis 8 of no significant relation-
ship must be retained.

**Hypothesis 9.** There is no significant relationship between communicative competence as measured by instruments of this study and the number of years the students of this study were enrolled in a German course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</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>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significance level = .10
**Significance level = .05
***Significance level = .01

Note: Decimals have been omitted.

*Table 16, page 74, provides a list of variables by number.

Table 18 shows that there is a significant relationship between the total communicative competence score and the years of German study of students in the sample at the .05 level of significance (variables 53 and 15). Similar to the age variable, significant relationships exist with all but three of the component scores of communicative competence, the scores involving the written skills (reading and writing). Hypothesis 9 can be rejected conditionally on the basis that there is a significant relationship between years of German study and total communicative competence, but no significant relationship with the written components of the communicative competence measures.

**Summary**

In this section significant relationships of variables with the
criterion variables (communicative competence) were reported. Important findings of this study include the rejection of one hypothesis of no significant relationship: Hypothesis 1 (linguistic competence). Conditional rejection as detailed above can be made of the following hypotheses: Hypothesis 2 (personality factors), Hypothesis 3 (creativity), Hypothesis 4, (aptitude), Hypothesis 6 (attitude toward the study of foreign language), Hypothesis 7 (age), and Hypothesis 9 (years of German study). The following hypotheses of no significant relationship must be retained: Hypothesis 5 (attitude toward German-speaking people and culture), and Hypothesis 8 (sex).

The rather high relationship of linguistic competence with communicative competence was anticipated (See Chapter I, page 3). The question, however, still remains whether a correlation of .66 (See Table 10, page 74.) is a sufficient relationship to evaluate communicative competence solely on the basis of linguistic competence tests. Other factors such as attitude, aptitude, personality, creativity, and years of German study also related significantly to communicative competence in varying degrees as detailed above. In order to determine the predictive power of these factors a stepwise regression analysis was carried out with communicative competence and its components as the dependent variable and selected learner factors as the independent variables. The next section of this chapter details the findings of this analysis.
The Findings of the Multiple Regression

A computerized program, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, SPSSS - Version 5.01, was used to compute the following stepwise regressions. The purpose of the analysis was to discover which variables served as the best predictors of the dependent variable, communicative competence. The program is described as follows:

Stepwise regression is a powerful variation of multiple regression which provides a means of choosing independent variables which will provide the best prediction possible with the fewest independent variables.

The selection process is based to some degree on the simple correlation coefficient (r); thus the researcher selected those independent variables for the regression analysis which showed significance at least at the .10 level. These variables were then processed in the following manner:

There are two pieces of information which are used in this selection process. The first is the normalized regression-coefficient value $b$ that the prospective independent variable would have if it were brought into the equation on the next step. The significance of $b$ is measured by the $F$ statistic. If $F$ is too small, there is little reason to add the independent variable to the prediction equation. The second piece of information used in the selection process is the pivot element that would be involved in bringing that variable

---


18 Ibid., p. 180.
into the equation. This value is known as tolerance. If tolerance is small then that variable is nearly a linear combination of variables already in the equation. If it is really a linear combination of independent variables already in the equation, then the tolerance will be zero. A large tolerance indicates that a new "dimension" is being added to the prediction equation. The tolerance is never larger than one. The amount of additional variance explained by adding the new variable is the product of the normalized regression coefficient $b$ squared and the tolerance. Thus, even if the prospective $b$ is large a small tolerance value will negate the value of that variable being added to the equation. Consequently, stepwise regression never brings a variable into the equation if the tolerance is below a specified minimum.\textsuperscript{19}

In order to avoid low tolerance levels in the analysis, two regressions were run with each component of the dependent variable, one with only total scores of the independent variable and scores that are not part of a total and one with only the component scores and those scores which were not part of a total.

In the tables that follow (Tables 19-32) the dependent variable (communicative competence) and its components are analyzed by using the regression analysis as described above. For each component of communicative competence and its total there are two tables. The first always involves total scores and component scores that are not part of a total. The second table involves only the component scores and again

scores not part of a total of the independent variable. The tables show the sequence in which each independent variable was entered and the multiple $R$ which resulted. The $RSQ$ column shows the square of the multiple $R$ which is interpreted as "the proportion of the variance in the dependent variable accounted for by the regression equation." The $RSQ$ Change column shows the increase of the $RSQ$ as each variable is entered into the regression equation. Variables that contributed less than a .01 change in the $RSQ$ are not included in the tables.

Tables 19 and 20 on page 103 show the regression analysis of the total communicative competence score with the independent variables. On the basis of these findings the best predictor of communicative competence in the first analysis was the total linguistic competence score. The component of linguistic competence which proved to be the best predictor in the second analysis was the Linguistic Competence Speaking test (LCS). The second highest predictor was the total foreign language aptitude score (PLAB) which contributed an additional 6.97% of the variance in the predicted variable. The components of the PLAB which were predictors as shown in the second analysis were the Verbal and the Interest score. The third and final variable which proved to be a predictor of total communicative competence was the Years of German Study which contributed an additional 5.74% to the variance in the predicted variable.

\[20\] Nie, et al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, p. 185.
### Table 19

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE TOTAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE SCORE (VARIABLE 15) WITH TOTAL SCORES OF LEARNER FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>RSQ</th>
<th>RSQ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a 22 (LCT)</td>
<td>.6659</td>
<td>.4434</td>
<td>.4434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50 (FLAT)</td>
<td>.7163</td>
<td>.5131</td>
<td>.0697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>53 (Yrs. of G.)</td>
<td>.7553</td>
<td>.5705</td>
<td>.0574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 20

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE TOTAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE SCORE (VARIABLE 15) WITH COMPONENT SCORES OF LEARNER FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>RSQ</th>
<th>RSQ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a 17 (LCS)</td>
<td>.7349</td>
<td>.5401</td>
<td>.5401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53 (Yrs. of G.)</td>
<td>.7905</td>
<td>.6248</td>
<td>.0847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>48 (FLAV)</td>
<td>.8205</td>
<td>.6732</td>
<td>.0483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47 (FLAI)</td>
<td>.8341</td>
<td>.6957</td>
<td>.0223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aTable 10, page 74, provides a listing of variables by number.

In the second analysis where only component scores were used, this variable ranked the second highest, contributing in combination with the LCS score 62.48% of the variance in the predicted variable. In these
findings a total of 57.05% of the variance is accounted for in the predicted variable when total scores are used in the regression analysis. A total of 69.54% of the variance is accounted for when component scores of the independent variables are used. It appears that the following component scores, the Linguistic Competence Speaking test (LCS), the PLAB Verbal, and the PLAB Interest in combination with years of German study are the best predictors of the total communicative competence score.

Tables 21 and 22 show the regression analysis of the Communicative Speaking test (CCS) with the independent variables. The best predictor of the CCS in the first analysis was the total linguistic competence score. The component of linguistic competence which proved to be the best predictor in the second analysis was the Linguistic Competence Speaking test (LCS). The Years of German Study variable was the second highest predictor in both analyses contributing an additional 12.43% of the variance in the predicted variable in the first analysis and an additional 14.67% in the second analysis. The third variable entered into the regression equation in the first analysis was the personality factor Q2 (Group-dependent vs. Self-sufficient). This variable also appears in the second analysis as the fourth variable. In the first analysis three more variables were selected as predictors of the dependent variable (CCS), the Attitude toward Study of Foreign Language Scale, the total foreign language aptitude score (PLAB) and the variable indicating whether or not
## Table 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>RSQ</th>
<th>RSQ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22(LCT)</td>
<td>.5916</td>
<td>.3500</td>
<td>.3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53(Yrs. of G.)</td>
<td>.6887</td>
<td>.4743</td>
<td>.1243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36(Q₂)</td>
<td>.7494</td>
<td>.5615</td>
<td>.0872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>52(ATFL)</td>
<td>.7816</td>
<td>.6110</td>
<td>.0494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50(FLAT)</td>
<td>.7965</td>
<td>.6343</td>
<td>.0234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>54(Abroad)</td>
<td>.8036</td>
<td>.6458</td>
<td>.0114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Table 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>RSQ</th>
<th>RSQ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17(LCS)</td>
<td>.5901</td>
<td>.3483</td>
<td>.3483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53(Yrs. of G.)</td>
<td>.7035</td>
<td>.4950</td>
<td>.1467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>48(FLAV)</td>
<td>.7497</td>
<td>.5617</td>
<td>.0667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36(Q₂)</td>
<td>.7824</td>
<td>.6121</td>
<td>.0504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>52(ATFL)</td>
<td>.8100</td>
<td>.6561</td>
<td>.0441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>54(Abroad)</td>
<td>.8218</td>
<td>.6754</td>
<td>.0193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20(LCR/W)</td>
<td>.8284</td>
<td>.6862</td>
<td>.0108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>39(Q₁)</td>
<td>.8391</td>
<td>.7042</td>
<td>.0180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aTable 10, page 74, provides a listing of variables by number.*
the student has been abroad (to Germany). The component of the language aptitude battery which appeared in the second analysis was the Verbal component of the PLAB. Two additional variables which do not appear in the first analysis are found when only component scores were used in the regression analysis, the Linguistic Competence Reading/Writing score (LCR/W) and the personality factor Q₁ (Introversion vs. Extraversion). These two variables each contribute, however, only about 1% of the variance in the predicted variable. A total of 64.58% of the variance is accounted for when total scores are used in the regression analysis and a total of 70.42% is accounted for when component scores are used. It appears that the combination of the component scores as shown in Table 22 are the best predictors of the Communicative Competence Speaking test.

Tables 23 and 24, page 107, show the regression analysis of the Communicative Competence Listening test (CCL) with the independent variables. The best predictor of the CCL in the first analysis was the total linguistic competence score. The component of linguistic competence which proved to be the best predictor in the second analysis was the Linguistic Competence Speaking test (LCS). The predictor which ranked second was again the Years of German Study variable and this occurred in both analyses. The variable which ranked third in both analyses was the personality factor E (Humble vs. Assertive). The final variable in the first analysis was the total foreign language aptitude score of the
### Table 23

**Regression Analysis of the Communicative Competence Listening Score (Variable 10) with Total Scores of Learner Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>RSQ</th>
<th>RSQ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(^a)22(LCT)</td>
<td>.4456</td>
<td>.1985</td>
<td>.1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53(Yrs. of G.)</td>
<td>.5399</td>
<td>.2915</td>
<td>.0930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26(E)</td>
<td>.5681</td>
<td>.3227</td>
<td>.0312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50(FLAT)</td>
<td>.5884</td>
<td>.3462</td>
<td>.0235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 24

**Regression Analysis of the Communicative Competence Listening Score (Variable 10) with Component Scores of Learner Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>RSQ</th>
<th>RSQ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(^a)17(LCS)</td>
<td>.5679</td>
<td>.3226</td>
<td>.3226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53(Yrs. of G.)</td>
<td>.6519</td>
<td>.4249</td>
<td>.1024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26(E)</td>
<td>.6688</td>
<td>.4473</td>
<td>.0224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47(FLAT)</td>
<td>.6830</td>
<td>.4665</td>
<td>.0192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Table 10, page 74, provides a listing of variables by number.
PLAB and its component, the Interest score, was the final variable in the second analysis. A total of 34.62% of the variance is accounted for when total scores are used in the regression analysis and a total of 46.64% is accounted for when component scores are used. From these findings the combination of the components scores as shown in Table 24 are the best predictors of the Communicative Competence Listening test.

Tables 25 and 26, page 109, show the regression analysis of the total oral communicative competence score with the independent variables. The best predictor of the total oral communicative competence score in the first analysis was the total linguistic competence score. The component of linguistic competence which proved to be the best predictor in the second analysis was the Linguistic Competence Speaking test (LCS). The predictor which ranked second was again the Years of German Study variable and this occurred in both analyses. The third variable entered into the regression equation was the personality factor Q1 (Introversion vs. Extraversion). The final variable in the first analysis was the total foreign language aptitude score of the PLAB and its component, the Interest score, was the final variable in the second analysis. A total of 52.35% of the variance is accounted for when total scores are used in the regression analysis and a total of 64.13% is accounted for when component scores are used. From these findings the combination of the components scores as shown in Table 26 are the best predictors of the total oral communicative competence score.
Table 25

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE TOTAL ORAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE SCORE (VARIABLE 11) WITH TOTAL SCORES OF LEARNER FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>RSQ</th>
<th>RSQ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a22(LCT)</td>
<td>.5584</td>
<td>.3118</td>
<td>.3118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53(Yrs. of G.)</td>
<td>.6651</td>
<td>.4424</td>
<td>.1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>39(Q1)</td>
<td>.6987</td>
<td>.4881</td>
<td>.0458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50(FLAT)</td>
<td>.7236</td>
<td>.5235</td>
<td>.0354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE TOTAL ORAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE SCORE (VARIABLE 11) WITH COMPONENT SCORES OF LEARNER FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>RSQ</th>
<th>RSQ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a17(LCS)</td>
<td>.6460</td>
<td>.4174</td>
<td>.4174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>53(Yrs. of G.)</td>
<td>.7517</td>
<td>.5651</td>
<td>.1477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>39(Q1)</td>
<td>.7759</td>
<td>.6020</td>
<td>.0369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>47(FLAI)</td>
<td>.8008</td>
<td>.6413</td>
<td>.0394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aTable 10, page 74, provides a listing of variables by number.

In summary, the Linguistic Competence Speaking test (LCS) is con-
sistentely the best predictor of the oral components of communicative competence. This was also true when the total communicative competence score was used. Years of German study, as should be anticipated, proved to be the second most important predictor of success on the oral components of communicative competence. Personality factors which showed some predictive power to the oral components were Introversion, Humbleness, and Self-Sufficiency. Introversion was a predictor when the total oral communicative competence score was involved, contributing 4.58% to the variance in the first analysis (total scores) and 3.69% to the second analysis (component scores). Humbleness was a predictor when the Communicative Competence Listening test was the dependent variable, contributing 3.12% to the variance in the first analysis (total scores) and 2.24% in the second analysis (component scores). Self-sufficiency was a predictor of the Communicative Competence Speaking test, contributing 8.72% of the variance in the first analysis and 5.04% in the second analysis. The foreign language aptitude score as measured by the PLAB appeared as a predictor in all of the analysis; however, in the component analysis only the Interest score and the Verbal score served as predictors. The Verbal and Interest score were predictors of the total communicative competence score, contributing 4.83% and 2.23% respectively to the variance. In the analysis of the total oral communicative competence score only the Interest score proved to be a predictor, contributing 3.94% to the variance. In the component scores of oral communicative competence
the Interest score was a predictor of the Communicative Competence Listening test and the Verbal score was a predictor of the Communicative Competence Speaking test.

Other variables which showed some predictive power to oral communicative competence appeared in the analysis when the Communicative Competence Speaking test was the independent variable. The variable which added substantial predictive power was the Attitude toward Study of Foreign Language score; it contributed 4.41% to the variance of the CCS. The other three variables involved here, (Abroad in Germany, LCR/W, and Q1) were very weak predictors since each one contributed only about 1% to the variance of the CCS.

From these findings one can conclude that the oral component of communicative competence is best predicted by scores on the Linguistic Competence Speaking test, Years of German Study, Personality factors such as introversion, humbleness and self-sufficiency as measured by the 16PF and the Verbal and Interest score of the PLAB.

Tables 27 and 28, page 112, show the regression analysis of the Communicative Competence Reading test (CCR) with the independent variables. The best predictor of the CCR in the first analysis is the total linguistic competence score. The component of linguistic competence which proved to be the best predictor in the second analysis was the Linguistic Reading/Writing test (LCR/W). The variable which ranked second as a predictor of the CCR was the total foreign language aptitude
Table 27

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE READING SCORE (VARIABLE 13) WITH TOTAL SCORES OF LEARNER FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>RSQ</th>
<th>RSQ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22 (LCT)</td>
<td>.5072</td>
<td>.2572</td>
<td>.2572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50 (FLAP)</td>
<td>.5591</td>
<td>.3126</td>
<td>.0554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE READING SCORE (VARIABLE 13) WITH COMPONENT SCORES OF LEARNER FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>RSQ</th>
<th>RSQ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 (LCR/W)</td>
<td>.5720</td>
<td>.3271</td>
<td>.3271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>46 (FLAGP)</td>
<td>.6153</td>
<td>.3786</td>
<td>.0515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>48 (FLAV)</td>
<td>.6415</td>
<td>.4115</td>
<td>.0329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17 (LCS)</td>
<td>.6619</td>
<td>.4381</td>
<td>.0265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10, page 74, provides a listing of variables by number.

In the second analysis the components of foreign language aptitude as measured by the PIAB which were predictors are the Grade Point...
score and the Verbal score. One additional variable was selected as a predictor in the second analysis, the Linguistic Competence Speaking test which contributed an additional 2.65% to the variance. A total of 31.26% of the variance is accounted for when total scores are used in the regression analysis and a total of 43.81% is accounted for when component scores are used. From these findings the combination of the components scores as shown in Table 28 are the best predictors of the Communicative Competence Reading test.

Tables 29 and 30, page 114, show the regression analysis of the Communicative Competence Writing test (CCW) with the independent variables. The best predictor of the CCW in the first analysis is the total linguistic score. The component of linguistic competence which proved to be the best predictor in the second analysis was the Linguistic Competence Speaking test. The predictor which ranked second on the first analysis was the Flexibility score of the TTCT. The third variable entered into the regression equation was the personality factor M (Practical vs. Imaginative). The Attitude toward Study of Foreign Language score ranked fourth on the first analysis and the total foreign language aptitude score was the last variable entered with a contribution to the variance of only 1.78%. In the second analysis the components of the foreign language aptitude score which proved to have predictive powers were the Grade Point score and the Verbal score. In this analysis the Fluency score of the TTCT also showed some predictive power, contribut-
Table 29

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE WRITING SCORE (VARIABLE 12) WITH TOTAL SCORES OF LEARNER FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>RSQ</th>
<th>RSQ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a22(LCT)</td>
<td>.6347</td>
<td>.4029</td>
<td>.4029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>44(CFlex)</td>
<td>.6879</td>
<td>.4732</td>
<td>.0703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32(M)</td>
<td>.7215</td>
<td>.5207</td>
<td>.0475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>52(ATFL)</td>
<td>.7449</td>
<td>.5549</td>
<td>.0343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50(FLAT)</td>
<td>.7568</td>
<td>.5727</td>
<td>.0178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF THE COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE WRITING SCORE (VARIABLE 12) WITH COMPONENT SCORES OF LEARNER FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>RSQ</th>
<th>RSQ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a17(LCS)</td>
<td>.6756</td>
<td>.4564</td>
<td>.4564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>46(FLAGP)</td>
<td>.7321</td>
<td>.5359</td>
<td>.0796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>43(CFI)</td>
<td>.7626</td>
<td>.5816</td>
<td>.0457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>48(FLAV)</td>
<td>.7838</td>
<td>.6144</td>
<td>.0328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>54(Abroad)</td>
<td>.8058</td>
<td>.6493</td>
<td>.0349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19(LCR)</td>
<td>.8126</td>
<td>.6603</td>
<td>.0110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>34(O)</td>
<td>.8209</td>
<td>.6739</td>
<td>.0136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40(QH)</td>
<td>.8326</td>
<td>.6932</td>
<td>.0194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 10, page 74, provides a listing of variables by number.*
ing 4.57% to the variance of the CCW; however, the Flexibility score of this same instrument did not appear in the second analysis. The variable indicating whether the student had been to Germany or not was entered in fifth place in the second analysis contributing 3.49% to the variance of the CCW. The remaining variables which showed very low predictive power were the Linguistic Competence Reading test, the personality factor O (Placid vs. Apprehensive) and QII (Low Anxiety vs. High Anxiety). All three of these variables contributed only approximately 1% to the variance of the CCW. A total of 57.27% of the variance is accounted for when total scores are used in the regression analysis and a total of 69.32% is accounted for when component scores are used.

From these findings the combination of the component scores as shown in Table 30 are the best predictors of the Communicative Competence Writing test (CCW).

Tables 31 and 32, page 116, show the regression analysis of the total written communicative competence score with the independent variables. The best predictor of the total written scores in the first analysis is the total linguistic competence score. The second analysis shows that two component scores of linguistic competence, the Linguistic Competence Reading/Writing test (LCR/W) and the Linguistic Competence Speaking test (LCS) are in this order the best and second best predictors. The total foreign language aptitude score appears as the second predictor in the first analysis. The components of this score in the second analysis
Table 31

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF TOTAL WRITTEN COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE (VARIABLE 11) WITH TOTAL SCORES OF LEARNER FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>RSQ</th>
<th>RSQ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>^22(LCT)</td>
<td>.6437</td>
<td>.4144</td>
<td>.4144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50(FLAT)</td>
<td>.7010</td>
<td>.4914</td>
<td>.0771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>54(Yrs. of G.)</td>
<td>.7180</td>
<td>.5155</td>
<td>.0241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32

REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF TOTAL WRITTEN COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE (VARIABLE 14) WITH COMPONENT SCORES OF LEARNER FACTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step Number</th>
<th>Variable Entered</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>RSQ</th>
<th>RSQ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>^20(LCR/W)</td>
<td>.6751</td>
<td>.4557</td>
<td>.4557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17(LCS)</td>
<td>.7213</td>
<td>.5203</td>
<td>.0646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>46(FLAGP)</td>
<td>.7696</td>
<td>.5923</td>
<td>.0719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>48(FLAV)</td>
<td>.7933</td>
<td>.6293</td>
<td>.0370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>54(Abroad)</td>
<td>.8138</td>
<td>.6622</td>
<td>.0329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>34(O)</td>
<td>.8216</td>
<td>.6750</td>
<td>.0128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aTable 10, page 74, provides a listing of variables by number.
which show some predictive power are the Grade Point score and the Verbal score. The third and final variable entered into the first analysis is the Years of German study which contributes 2.41% to the variance of the total written score. Other variables which appear in the second analysis are the Travel Abroad (to Germany) variable which contributes 3.29% to the variance and the personality Factor O (Placid vs. Apprehensive) which contributes only 1.28% to the variance of the total written communicative competence score. A total of 51.55% of the variance is accounted for when total scores are used in the regression analysis and a total of 67.50% is accounted for when component scores are used. From these findings the combination of the component scores as shown in Table 32 are the best predictors of the total written communicative competence score.

Again as in the regression analysis of the oral components of communicative competence, one of the best predictors of the written components of communicative competence is the linguistic competence score; however, in this case the Linguistic Competence Reading/Writing score proves to be a more powerful predictor than the Linguistic Competence Speaking score. One exception to this is in the analysis of the Communicative Competence Writing score where the Linguistic Competence Speaking score again shows the highest predictive power. The Years of German Study variable does not appear as a strong predictor of written communicative competence as it did of oral communicative compe-
tence. The foreign language aptitude scores are again good predictors; however, in this analysis of the written components of communicative competence the Interest scale of the PLAB does not appear. Instead the Grade Point score shows a rather substantial predictive power. The Verbal score, however, is again a good predictor. Personality factors involved in the prediction of the written components of communicative competence are few. The only personality factor which shows any substantial predictive power is the M factor (Practical vs. Imaginative) which contributed 4.75% to the variance in the analysis of the Communicative Competence Writing test. The O Factor (Placid Vs. Apprehensive) and the Q 11 Factor (Low Anxiety vs. High Anxiety) are weak predictors of the Communicative Competence Writing test. The O Factor also appears in the analysis of the total written communicative competence score.

Two learner factors which appear here, but did not appear as predictors in the analysis of oral communicative competence were the Flexibility and Fluency score of the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking. These two factors have substantial predictive power for the Communicative Competence Writing test (CCR). In the analysis of total scores with the CCR the Flexibility score contributes 7.03% to the variance and in the analysis of components scores the Fluency score contributes 4.57%.

From these findings one can conclude that the written component of communicative competence is best predicted by scores on the Linguistic Competence Reading/Writing test, the Linguistic Competence Speak-
ing test, personality factors such as Imagination as measured by the 16PF, creativity factors of Flexibility and Fluency measured by the TTCT, and the Grade Point and Verbal score of the PIAB. The variable which indicated whether the student had been to Germany contributed to the prediction of written communicative competence in the Communicative Competence Writing test and the total written communicative competence score of about 3% to the variance in each case.

Summary

In this section the findings of a regression analysis of the communicative competence scores with selected independent variables of the learner factors was reported. Important findings here are that in addition to the total score of all the linguistic competence tests the Linguistic Competence Speaking and the Linguistic Competence Reading/Writing test are the best predictors of communicative competence. Of these two the Linguistic Competence Speaking test shows a stronger predictive power in that it appears as the best predictor in the analysis of the total communicative competence score (Table 20) contributing 54.01% to its variance. The Years of German Study variable also shows substantial predictive power especially with the oral components of communicative competence. The Verbal, Interest and Grade Point scores of the Pimsleur Language Aptitude Battery also rate as one of the important predictors of communicative competence. The personality factor which shows the most substantial and consistent predictive power is the QI Factor of the 16PF
(Introversion vs. Extraversion). It appears in the prediction of the total oral communicative competence score and the Communicative Competence Speaking score. The other factors of creativity, attitude, age and sex play very minor roles in prediction or none at all.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, LIMITATIONS, CONCLUSIONS
AND
RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The major purpose of this study was to determine what learner factors are related to the ability to communicate in a foreign language (German). The discovery of the relationship between linguistic and communicative competence was to ascertain whether the evaluation of linguistic competence alone is a sufficient measure of the ability to communicate in a foreign language. In the process of this study it was necessary to construct and develop instruments for the evaluation of communicative competence; thus, the determination of the feasibility, reliability, and validity of such evaluation was also a concern of this study.

A total of 50 high school students was selected from a population of all level II and above German students at Grove City High School and Westland High School located in the Southwestern School District of Franklin County, Ohio. Tests of communicative competence, linguistic competence and instruments measuring personality, aptitude, creativity, and attitude were administered during the months of December 1973 and January through March 1974. Instruments for the evaluation of communi-
ative competence were developed by the researcher. Instruments for the evaluation of linguistic competence were adapted from tests accompanying the text used in the classes of the sample. The instruments used to measure personality factors was the 16 Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF). Foreign language aptitude was measured by the Pimsleur Language Aptitude Battery (PLAB). The Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking, Verbal Form B (TTCT) was used to evaluate the creativity of the sample. Instruments based on those developed by Lambert were revised to measure Attitude toward Germany and German Speaking People (ATG) and Attitude toward Learning Foreign Language (ATFL).

All testing was carried out at the respective schools of the students during their German class periods or during their study hall periods.

Correlations were computed to discover relationships of all variables. A stepwise regression analysis was performed to define further the relationships among selected variables. The correlations were computed by the BMD-03D Correlation with Item Deletion Program developed by the Health Sciences Computing Facilities at UCLA and the stepwise regression analysis was carried out by the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences SPSSH - Version 5.01 program.

Limitations of the Findings

The following limitations should be taken into account in considering the findings of this study.
Instruments

A limiting factor in this study is the extent to which all instruments used for the evaluation of communicative competence are valid and reliable in determining the ability of the students to communicate in German. As in all testing only a sample of the student’s ability can be evaluated so also in these instruments only a sample of all possible communicative tasks that could arise in real life were used to evaluate the student’s ability to communicate in German. The same is true for the evaluation of linguistic competence, in that the instruments used were limited in range and number of linguistic features that were evaluated.

Sample

The students used in this study do not necessarily represent the larger population of American high school students enrolled in German II and above. Whether these findings can be generalized to students enrolled in other foreign languages must also be questioned. Findings can be generalized to the population from which this sample was randomly selected and to similar populations as characterized and described in Chapter III.

Conclusions

The conclusions outlined in this section are based on the findings of the analysis of the data for this study. Numerous findings not detailed below were made. The reader is referred to Chapter IV for these. Conclusions based on the three primary objectives of this study are discussed
Objective 1: To discover to what extent certain learner factors are related to the ability to communicate in a foreign language (German).

In terms of overall communicative competence, linguistic competence shows the strongest relationship with the ability to communicate in German. Of a total of 105 relationships established between components of the communicative competence tests and the linguistic competence tests only two did not show a significant relationship at the .10 level. The Linguistic Competence Speaking test consistently proved to be the best predictor of communicative competence especially in terms of the oral skills. The Linguistic Competence Reading/Writing test also was a good predictor in terms of the written skills of communication. Thus, the knowledge of German phonological, morphological and structural features does relate to the ability to send or receive a message in German in a simulated communicative situation.

The second learner factor which showed strong relationships with communicative competence was foreign language aptitude, especially the interest score, the verbal score and the total score of the PLAB. The grade point and auditory component of this instrument showed little relationship to communicative competence. The grade point component does, however, relate with the written components of communicative competence. This supports earlier findings that grade point is related to foreign language achievement in terms of standardized instruments which emphasized the
evaluation of the written skills.

A relatively strong relationship also existed between communicative competence and years of German study. This is an interesting finding especially when one considers that no significant relationship existed between this variable and linguistic competence (see Appendix I, page 185, variables 16-22 and 53). This is also true of the age variable. A substantial number of significant relationships existed between age and communicative competence, but not between age and linguistic competence. This suggests that years of German study and age do not influence the acquisition of discrete linguistic knowledge of the language, but do relate to the ability to communicate in the language.

Personality factors which show some relationship to the ability to communicate in German are introversion, sobriety and self-sufficiency. Students with these three traits tended to score higher on the oral components of communicative competence. Students with traits of imagination, placidity, and low anxiety tended to score higher on the written components of the communicative competence tests.

A positive attitude toward the study of German and an interest in this study showed a strong relationship with success in the communicative competence tests. However, attitude toward Germany and German-speaking people did not relate to communicative competence.

The creative ability of the students as measured by the TTCT showed some moderate relationships with communicative competence, but only
with those components where the productive skills, speaking and writing, were evaluated.

Objective 2: To discover if evaluation of linguistic competence alone is a sufficient measure of the student's ability to communicate in the foreign language.

In terms of the learner factors which were measured in this study, linguistic competence proved to be the best predictor of communicative competence. However, it should be noted that of all the measures used in the prediction analysis only the linguistic competence variable was in any way a measure of foreign language achievement. Therefore, it was anticipated that in comparison with the other variables, linguistic competence would have a relatively high predictive power. The findings show, however, that the total linguistic competence score accounts for only 44% of the variance in the total communicative competence score (see Table 19, page 103). It is evident from this finding that if linguistic competence is the sole predictor of communicative competence it serves as a rather inadequate measure of communicative competence. It must also be concluded that the communicative competence instruments measure dimensions of foreign language learning which are not accounted for by the linguistic competence tests. The Linguistic Competence Speaking test when used alone in the prediction analysis contributes an additional 10% to the variance in the total communicative competence score (see Table 20, page 103); however, 46% of the variance is still unaccounted for. It
would appear from these findings that the evaluation of linguistic competence alone is not a sufficient measure of the student's ability to communicate in the foreign language and that a more direct evaluation of this ability should be employed.

Another finding which may be relevant to this objective of the study was noted earlier. The years that the students had been enrolled in German did not correlate significantly with linguistic competence scores, on the other hand this same variable showed a significant relationship with communicative competence. From this it appears that the communicative competence tests were a better measurement of the "cumulative" ability of the students than the linguistic competence tests. This inability of the linguistic competence tests to measure overall proficiency also points to the inadequacy of evaluating foreign language ability solely with tests of linguistic competence.

**Objective 3: To develop hypotheses for future testing of communicative competence.**

Four instruments were constructed and developed to evaluate communicative competence for the purpose of this study. Each instrument was designed to evaluate a specific skill. The Communicative Competence Speaking test (CCS) was made up of four parts, two of which were "pure" tests of the speaking skill (Parts I and II) and two involved both speaking and listening (Parts III and IV). Four scales were used to carry out the evaluation of the CCS. The use of four scales in a classroom situation
would be impractical, if not impossible. It is therefore recommended that only one scale be used if testing of this type is to be part of classroom evaluation. The two scales which had the highest intercorrelation are the Quality of Communication scale and the Amount of Communication scale \((r = .89)\). Of these two scales the Amount of Communication scale had the highest relationship to the total CCS score \((r = .96)\). This scale, therefore, accounted for 92.16% of the variance in the total CCS score.\(^1\)

Thus, if for practical reasons, only one scale could be used in evaluation of tests of this type, the Amount of Communication scale would serve as the best single estimate of the student's score.

As in all tests of the speaking skill, administration must be done on an individual basis. This is especially important when testing the speaking skill in a communicative situation. It is, however, time consuming for the classroom teacher to administer many tests of this type. Of the four parts of the CCS, Part III and Part IV, showed the highest intercorrelation \((r = .87)\). Part IV had the highest relationship to the total CCS \((r = .94)\). This part, therefore, accounted for 88.36% of the variance in the total CCS score. Based on this finding it is recommended that tests of the type used in Part IV of the CCS be employed if time is a

---

limiting factor. Part IV of the CCS was an interview in which the student played the role of the interviewer eliciting specific points of information from the examiner.

In testing communicative competence of the speaking skill, it appears from these findings that tests of the type used in Part IV of the CCS in conjunction with the Amount of Communication scale would serve as the most efficient means of evaluation and would be the best estimate of the student's ability. These findings are, of course, limited to tests used in this study.

The Communicative Competence Listening test (CCL) was designed to evaluate only the listening skill. The administration of this test can be done with groups; thus, time is not the problem as it was in the administration of the CCS. This test proved to be highly related to the total oral communicative competence score ($r = .94$). The intercorrelation between the CCS and the CCL was only $.54$. Indications are from these findings that the CCL accounted for a higher percentage of the variance in the total oral communicative competence score and that it measured a different dimension than the CCS. Based on these findings it is recommended that a listening comprehension test of the type used in this study be a part of the evaluation of oral communicative competence.

The Communicative Competence Writing test (CCW) was designed to evaluate only the writing skill. This test proved to be the least reliable measurement of the communicative competence tests (see Chapter
This may have been due partly to the low number of items in this test (11) and a rather low standard deviation (1.72). As Guilford points out:

Like intercorrelations of different variables, self-correlations are affected by the range of ability or of a trait present in the population samples. The narrower the range, the smaller the \( r_{tt} \) tends to be.

It was indicated... that the whole test is more reliable than either half and that in general terms there is an increase in reliability with an increase in the length of the test.\(^2\)

It is therefore recommended that a test of this type contain more items with a greater variance in the degree of difficulty. The scoring procedure used for this test did, however, result in a satisfactory interrater reliability (see Chapter III, page 68), thus indicating that the scoring procedure was reliable and feasible. The correlation of this test with the total written communicative competence score is identical to the correlation between the CCR and the total written communicative competence score (\( r = .89 \)). The intercorrelation between these two tests is .57 indicating that each test does measure a different dimension of the communicative competence written skills. It is recommended that a test of this type be employed in the evaluation of the written skills, however, the problem with reliability as noted above should be taken into account.

---

The Communicative Competence Reading test (CCR) was designed to evaluate only the reading skill. As was discussed above, this test showed a substantial relationship to the total written score, but did not show a very substantial relationship to the CCW. Therefore, it is also recommended that a test of this type be employed in the evaluation of the written skills. This test, as well as the CCW, can be administered to groups of students thus making it practical and suitable for use in normal classroom situations.

The component of the complete battery of communicative competence tests which showed the highest relationship to the total communicative competence score was the Amount of Communication scale of the CCS ($r = .83$). This scale alone accounted for 68.89% of the variance in the total communicative competence score. From this one may conclude that communicative competence as measured by instruments used in this study was to a great extent determined by the measurement of the Amount of Communication scale of the CCS. This supports similar conclusions above that this scale seems to be the most productive in evaluating student's ability to communicate in the foreign language. Amount of communication must therefore be considered as an extremely important dimension in the evaluation of communicative competence.

Based on these findings a composite of student characteristics necessary for successful communication in a foreign language can be hypothesized to include the following: (1) a good knowledge of the
phonological, morphological, and syntactical features of the foreign language; (2) high foreign language aptitude as reflected by the interest and verbal scores of the PLAB; (3) a substantial number of years of foreign language study, preferably more than two years; (4) personality factors such as introversion, sobriety, self-sufficiency, imagination, placidity, and low anxiety; (5) a positive attitude toward the study of a foreign language; and (6) creative ability for success in written communication.

Tests which would serve as good measures of the ability to communicate in a foreign language and which would be practical and reliable could be characterized as follows: (1) a speaking test of the type used in Part IV of the CCS in which the student interviewed the examiner eliciting specific points of information; (2) an evaluation scale for the speaking test similar to the Amount of Communication scale used in this study; (3) a listening test of the type used in this study, (CCI); (4) a writing test similar to the CCW, but with a greater number of items and a greater variance in the degree of difficulty of the items; and (5) a reading test similar to the CCR.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

Findings in this study are based on the evaluation of one foreign language (German); it is therefore recommended that similar research be conducted which would involve other commonly taught foreign languages.
To further define the relationship of personality factors with the ability to communicate in a foreign language further research is recommended using instruments which are more restricted in their measurement, emphasizing such traits as introversion vs. extraversion, anxiety, placidness, soberness and self-sufficiency.

Experimental research is recommended to determine if the teaching variable has any effect on the ability to communicate in a foreign language, i.e. would the emphasis in the classroom on the teaching of linguistic detail versus an emphasis on communication with very little attention to linguistic detail result in a different relationship between linguistic and communicative competence as was found in this study? Would the relationship between linguistic and communicative competence be the same for a group of students who had been taught in classrooms where linguistic detail was emphasized as opposed to a group who were taught in classrooms where communicative skills were emphasized? The answers to such questions would give a still better understanding of the role that linguistic competence plays in the acquisition of a second language.

The data of this study should be further analyzed to determine the relationship of learner factors with linguistic competence in order to ascertain whether prediction of linguistic competence follows a similar pattern as it did in the prediction of communicative competence. This would further explain and define the two constructs in terms of the other
learner factors measured in this study.
APPENDIX A

COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE SPEAKING TEST (CCS)

1. The Pilot Instrument
2. The Final Instrument
3. The Evaluation Scales
4. The Evaluation Sheet
Pilot Communicative Competence Speaking Test

The test you are about to take is a test of how well you can make yourself understood in German in different situations. Pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary are, of course, important but for this test you will be judged on how well you get your meaning across and on how hard you try to express yourself. Don't try too hard to speak perfect German, but rather concentrate on getting your ideas across and making yourself understood with gestures, pointing, etc. Your German grade will not in any way be affected by this test. Therefore, try to relax and do the best you can.

Part I - Relating Information Orally (1-way)

READ:

In this part of the test you will be asked to tell in German something you have read in English. Pretend you are talking to a German in Germany and use everything you can think of - gestures, pointing, etc. to help get your meaning across, even an occasional English word is all right, if you can make it clear what you mean or better yet ask me how to say a word in German. You will read the following English paragraph over and then tell first in English what you have read. The purpose of having you talk first in English is to give you the opportunity to organize what you are going to say. You need not, however, say the same things in German that you said in English. Start now to read the paragraph and tell me in English what you have read...

Walter gets up at seven o'clock in the morning and goes to school at eight. He usually eats a piece of toast and drinks a glass of milk for breakfast. He comes home for lunch. After school he does his homework. Sometimes he plays tennis or goes to the movies.

Now read the paragraph above once more and then give me the paper with the paragraph on it. I will now give you a list of the important facts of the paragraph. You may refer to these as you tell me in German what the paragraph contained. Try to give the information in the most natural way you can by making as many sentences as you can and you may add any additional information even if it isn't in the paragraph.
Part II - Oral Description (1-way)

READ:

In this part of the test you will be shown a picture. Look at the picture and tell me all you can about it in English in the time allotted (3 minutes). Again the purpose of having you talk first in English is to give you the opportunity to organize your ideas. You need not, however, say the same things in German that you said in English. You may leave out some things and add others. It makes no difference. Start now to tell me about the picture in English...

You will now tell me about the picture in German. Again pretend you are talking to a German in Germany and use everything you can think of - gestures, pointing, etc. to help you get your meaning across, even an occasional English word is all right, if you can make it clear what you mean, or better yet ask me how to say a word in German. Start now to tell me about the picture in German...

Part III - Interview (Giving Information) 2-way

READ:

For the next 4 minutes you will play the role of someone being interviewed by a German. I will play the role of the interviewer. I will pretend that I cannot speak or understand any English so you will have to try very hard to make yourself understood. I will ask you questions about yourself, try to answer in the most natural way you can by making as many sentences as you can and by giving me as much information as you can, the more the better.

Part IV - Interview (Getting Information) 2-way

READ:

For the next 4 minutes you will play the role of a newspaper reporter who is interviewing me, a foreign student, to find out as much as you can about me and my background. Try to conduct the interview in as natural a manner as you can, remembering to introduce yourself to me and to close the interview in some appropriate manner. Remember we will pretend that I cannot speak or understand any English so you will have to try very hard to make yourself understood. You should take notes as you ask questions and at the end of the interview you will write up, in English, all that you have found out about me. Try to find out the following information, and more if at all possible.
Information to be elicited by student in Part IV of PCCS

Name of person interviewed
Where he comes from
Why he is here
How long he will be here
How old he is
Where he lives here
What he likes about the U.S.
When he is going back to Germany
This accompanies Part I of the test. (PCCS)

After student has read paragraph and told in English what he remembers of it, he is asked to relate in German the important facts of the paragraph with the following list as a reference to avoid memory problems.

Walter

gets up - seven o'clock

to school - 8

breakfast - toast and milk

lunch - home

after school - homework, plays tennis, to movie
Part III - Interview (giving information) (PCCS)

The Administrator of the OCC test asks the following questions:

1. Wie heissen Sie?
2. Wie alt sind Sie?
3. Wann stehen Sie morgens auf?
4. Was essen Sie zum Frühstück?
5. Wann gehen Sie in die Schule?
6. Wie gehen Sie zur Schule?
7. Was haben Sie in der ersten Klasse?
8. Wo essen Sie zum Mittag?
9. Wann kommen Sie nach Hause?
10. Was machen Sie nach der Schule und abends zu Hause?
Final Communicative Competence Speaking Test

General Instructions:

The test you are about to take is similar to the individual test you took in January (December). The purpose of the test is to find out how well you can make yourself understood in German. Don't try too hard to speak perfect German, but rather concentrate on making yourself understood. Your German grade will not be affected by this test, so relax and do the best you can.

Part I  Relating Information (1-way)

In this part of the test you will be asked to tell in German something you have read in English. Pretend you are talking to a German in Germany. If you can't think of how to say a word in German, say it in English or ask me how to say it in German. Read the paragraph over twice and then I will give you a list of the important facts in the paragraph. With the help of the list tell all you can in German about the paragraph. Try to give the information in the most natural way you can.

Karl and Jane are friends. Karl lives in Germany and studies English. Jane lives in America and studies German. Last summer Jane went to Germany and lived with Karl's family. She stayed there for six weeks. Next summer Karl is coming to America to visit Jane. Karl will travel with Jane's family in their new car. They will go from New York to California.

Part II  Oral Description (1-way)

In this part of the test you will be shown a picture. Look at the picture and tell me all you can about it in English. This is to give you an opportunity to organize your ideas, but you don't need to say the same things in German later than you now say in English. Now tell me about the picture in English...

Now tell me about the picture in German. Pretend you are describing the picture to a German. Try very hard to get your meaning across. Here again you may use an occasional English word or ask me how to say a word in German. Now start...
Part III Interview (Giving Information)

In this part of the test you will play the role of someone being interviewed by a German. I will play the role of the interviewer. I will pretend that I cannot speak or understand any English so you will have to try very hard to make yourself understood. I will ask you questions about yourself, try to answer in the most natural way you can by making as many sentences as you can and by giving me as much information as you can, the more the better.

Part IV Interview (Getting Information)

In this part of the test you will play the role of the interviewer interviewing me. Try to conduct the interview in as natural manner as you can, remembering to introduce yourself and to close the interview in some appropriate manner. Remember we will pretend I cannot speak any English so you will have to try very hard to make yourself understood. Take notes as you ask me questions in English and at the end of the interview write up in English all you have found out about me. Try to find out the following information, and more if at all possible.

Name of person interviewed
Where he comes from
How long he will stay in the U.S.
What he is doing here
What he has seen of U.S.
Which part of the country he likes best
If he would like to live here
Why? (Why not?)
What he will do when he gets back home
Information list for Part I of CCS (Final)

Karl and Jane – friends

Karl – Germany – studies English

Jane – America – studies German

Last summer – Jane to Germany – Karl’s family – 6 weeks

Next summer – Karl to America – travel – Jane’s family – new car – New York – California
Questions to be asked by examiner on Part III of FCCS

1. Wie heissen Sie?
2. Wo wohnen Sie?
3. Wie lange haben Sie schon deutsch studiert?
4. Warum studieren Sie deutsch?
5. Wenn Sie mit der "high school" fertig sind, was wollen Sie dann machen?
   (studieren: Wo? Was?)
   (arbeiten: Wo? Was?)
6. Was haben Sie im letzten Sommer gemacht?
7. Was machen Sie im nächsten Sommer?
8. Was für Hobbies haben Sie?
9. Waren Sie schon (je) in Deutschland?
   (Ja, wo? wie lange? was haben Sie dort gemacht?)
   (Nein, Wollen Sie nach Deutschland, Warum? Warum nicht? Wann?)
10. Wenn Sie sehr viel Geld hätten, was würden Sie damit tun?
Communicative Competence Speaking Evaluation Scales (Original—used for, and revised during pilot test)

1. **Fluency**

**General Definition:**

Fluency does not refer here to absolute speed of delivery, since native speakers of any language often show wide variation in this area. Fluency refers to overall smoothness, continuity, and naturalness of the student's speech, as opposed to pauses for rephrasing sentences, groping for words, and so forth. Ask yourself the question: To what degree does this student's delivery approach a native's in terms of smoothness and continuity?

**Definition of each level on the scale**

1. Speech is so halting and unnaturally fragmentary that it is impossible for a native speaker to understand almost anything.
2. Speech is **generally** halting and fragmentary, uneven and very slow, except for **short** routine sentences.
3. Speech is **frequently** halting and fragmentary, hesitant and jerky, some sentences may be left uncompleted.
4. Speech is **occasionally** halting and fragmentary, with some unevenness caused by rephrasing and groping for words.
5. Speech is almost effortless and smooth, but perceptibly non-native in speed and evenness.
6. Speech is as effortless and smooth as a native speaker's.

*Based in part on Educational Testing Service Pamphlet, "Description of the Peace Corps Language Proficiency Interview," ETS/6/70.

2. **Quality of Communication**

**General Definition:**

Quality of Communication refers to the ability of the student to use the language in a manner which would be considered "natural" or "normal" in a given communicative situation. Ask yourself the question: To what degree does the student produce native-like responses or utterances as the situation demands?
Definition of each level on the scale:

1. Speech consists mostly of isolated words and/or incomplete sentences with just a few very short complete sentences.
2. Speech consists of many isolated words and/or incomplete sentences with some very short complete sentences.
3. Speech consists of some isolated words and/or incomplete sentences with many very short complete sentences.
4. Speech consists of hardly any isolated words and/or incomplete sentences with mostly complete sentences.
5. Speech consists of isolated words only if appropriate and almost always of complete sentences.
6. Speech consists of isolated words only if appropriate, otherwise always "native-like" appropriate complete sentences.

3. Amount of Communication

General Definition:

The amount of communication refers to the quantity of information that the student is able to convey to the native speaker which is relevant to the communicative situation. Ask yourself the question: To what degree does the student convey the "total" amount of information a native speaker would in the same situation, i.e. if the native speaker were given the same task or put into the same situation?

Definition of each level on the scale:

1. Virtually no relevant information was conveyed by the student.
2. Very little relevant information was conveyed by the student.
3. Some relevant information was conveyed by the student.
4. A fair amount of relevant information was conveyed by the student.
5. Most relevant information was conveyed by the student.
6. All relevant information was conveyed by the student.

4. Effort to Communicate

General Definition:

The effort to communicate refers to the student's willingness to express himself and to get his meaning across. How hard does the student try to make himself understood? Does he make any attempt to express himself? Does he use gestures to help express himself? Or does he withdraw into an embarrassed silence making it very difficult for
him to communicate at all? Ask yourself the question: To what degree
does the student show an effort and a willingness to express himself
in German?

Definition of each level on the scale:

1. Student withdraws into long periods of silence, without any
apparent effort to complete the task.
2. Student makes little effort to communicate, what he does do
is "half-hearted" without any enthusiasm.
3. Student makes some effort to communicate, but still shows a
rather "disinterested" attitude.
4. Student makes an effort to communicate but does not use any
non-verbal resources such as gestures, etc.
5. Student makes a real effort to communicate and uses some non-
verbal resources such as gestures, etc.
6. Student makes a special (unusually high) effort to communicate
and uses all possible resources, verbal and non-verbal, to express him-
self.
Communicative Competence Speaking Evaluation Scales (Revised—used in part during pilot test and for all of final test)

1. **Fluency**

General Definition:

Fluency does not refer here to absolute speed of delivery, since native speakers of any language often show wide variation in this area. Fluency refers to overall smoothness, continuity, and naturalness of the student's speech, as opposed to pauses for rephrasing sentences, groping for words, and so forth. Ask yourself the question: To what degree does this student's delivery approach a native's in terms of smoothness and continuity?

Definition of each level on the scale:

1. Speech has very many unnatural pauses causing a very halting and fragmentary delivery.
2. Speech has quite a few unnatural pauses causing a frequently halting and fragmentary delivery.
3. Speech has some unnatural pauses causing an occasionally halting and fragmentary delivery.
4. Speech has hardly any unnatural pauses causing a fairly smooth and effortless delivery.
5. Speech has no unnatural pauses causing an almost effortless and smooth delivery, but perceptibly still non-native.
6. Speech is as effortless and smooth as a native speaker's.

* Based in part on Education Testing Service Pamphlet, "Description of the Peace Corps Language Proficiency Interview," ETS/6/70.

2. **Quality of Communication**

General Definition:

Quality of communication refers to the ability of the student to use the language in a manner which would be considered "natural" or "normal" in a given communicative situation. Ask yourself the question: to what degree does the student produce native-like responses or utterances as the situation demands.

Definition of each level on the scale:

1. Speech consists mostly of inappropriate isolated words and/or
incomplete sentences with just a few very short complete sentences.

2. Speech consists of many inappropriate isolated words and/or incomplete sentences with some very short complete sentences.

3. Speech consists of some inappropriate isolated words and/or incomplete sentences with many very short complete sentences.

4. Speech consists of hardly any isolated words and/or incomplete sentences with mostly complete sentences.

5. Speech consists of isolated words only if appropriate and almost always of complete sentences.

6. Speech consists of isolated words only if appropriate, otherwise always "native-like" appropriate complete sentences.

3. Amount of Communication (not revised, see original)

4. Effort to Communicate

General Definition:

The effort to communicate refers to the student's willingness to express himself and to get his message across. How hard does the student try to make himself understood? Does he make any attempt to express himself? Does he use gestures to help express himself? Or does he withdraw into an embarrassed silence making it very difficult for him to communicate at all? Ask yourself the question: To what degree does the student show an effort and a willingness to express himself in German?

Definition of each level on the scale:

1. Student makes little effort to communicate, doesn't seem to care if he completes the task.

2. Student makes some effort to communicate, but does not try very hard to complete the task.

3. Student makes an effort to communicate, tries to complete the task, may add something not required by the task.

4. Student makes a real effort to communicate, tries very hard to complete the task, may add something not required by the task.

5. Student makes a special effort to communicate, shows an extremely high effort to complete the task and goes beyond the required task.

6. Student makes an unusually high effort to communicate, shows an almost over zealous effort to complete the task, goes way beyond the required tasks and uses all possible resources, verbal and non-verbal to express himself.
COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE SPEAKING EVALUATION SHEET

INITIALS OF EVALUATOR__________ NAME OF STUDENT__________

Part I Relating Information Orally (Paragraph)

1. FLUENCY

1 2 3 4 5 6

2. QUALITY OF COMMUNICATION

1 2 3 4 5 6

3. AMOUNT OF COMMUNICATION

1 2 3 4 5 6

4. EFFORT TO COMMUNICATE

1 2 3 4 5 6

Part II Description of Picture

1. FLUENCY

1 2 3 4 5 6

2. QUALITY OF COMMUNICATION

1 2 3 4 5 6

3. AMOUNT OF COMMUNICATION

1 2 3 4 5 6
4. EFFORT TO COMMUNICATE

Part III Interview – Giving Information

1. FLUENCY

2. QUALITY OF COMMUNICATION

3. AMOUNT OF COMMUNICATION

4. EFFORT TO COMMUNICATE

Part IV Interview – Getting Information

1. FLUENCY

2. QUALITY OF COMMUNICATION
3. **AMOUNT OF COMMUNICATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. **EFFORT TO COMMUNICATE**

|   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
APPENDIX B

COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE LISTENING TEST (CCL)

1. The Instrument

2. The Telephone Message

3. Check List of Possible Points of Information for Scoring
Communicative Competence Test Listening

You are living in Germany with a German family (the Schmidts) for the summer. The whole family has gone out of the house and you are left alone. The telephone rings, you answer the phone and after appropriate greetings, the party on the line wants to talk to Frau Schmidt. You try to tell her she is not there, but she insists on giving you a message. You hear her say the following. Listen carefully and take notes in English. Then write up in English your message for Frau Schmidt.

Notes: (IN ENGLISH)

Message for Frau Schmidt: (IN ENGLISH)
Communicative Competence Listening Test

Check List of Possible Points of Information for Scoring

1. neighbor (called) 1.
2. Frau Müller 2.
3. wanted to speak to Frau Schmidt 3.
4. will come by at 8:00 a.m. 4.
5. tomorrow 5.
6. to go shopping 6.
7. in her (Müller's) car 7.
8. (but) Müller can't use her car 8.
9. husband must use it 9.
10. tomorrow morning 10.
11. to go to Hamburg 11.
12. (Müller) would like to shop at supermarket 12.
13. in Bremen 13.
14. one must drive to Bremen 14.
15. (Muller) would like to know whether can use Schmidt's car 15.
16. Schmidt to call Müller 16.
17. this evening 17.
18. at 10 18.

TOTAL
APPENDIX C

COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE WRITING TEST (CCW)

1. The Instrument

2. The Criterion and Procedures for Scoring

3. Check List of Possible Points of Information for Scoring
Communicative Competence Writing Test

You have spent the summer in Europe and you are totally broke. You need some money to get back home. You are in Berlin and you see an ad in a newspaper for a two-week job, working in a restaurant as either a waiter (Kellner) or waitress (Kellnerin). You decide to apply for the job. In order to be considered for the job you have to submit a short summary in German about your background. Write as many sentences as you can, including any information which might be helpful in getting you the job. Be sure to include the following information: (In writing your summary if you can’t think of a German word use an English word to help get your meaning across.)

who you are
where and when you were born
where you live in the U.S.
how long you have studied German
what other languages you speak
how long you will stay in Germany
what you do in U.S. (school/job)
how long you have been in Germany
where else you have traveled in Germany
any other information you would like to add
Criterion and Procedures for Scoring the Communicative Competence Writing Test

I. Criterion: Amount of information conveyed by the student. Certain points of information are asked for in this test. In order to score whether this information was conveyed by the student, the evaluator should ask himself the following questions: WOULD A GERMAN SPEAKER WHO HAS NO KNOWLEDGE OF ENGLISH COMPREHEND EACH POINT OF INFORMATION THE STUDENT IS TRYING TO CONVEY?

II. Procedure: Apply the above question to each sentence in the student's summary. If you feel that a German speaker would comprehend the point of information in a particular sentence, then assign the numerical value to the sentence as outlined below. It is important for the purposes of this evaluation to disregard structural, grammatical, and spelling errors, but only to the point where they would not interfere with the comprehension of the German reader. It is also important to remember that the German reader in a "real-life" situation would be aware of the situational context in which this summary was written; thus he would be able to make some inferences as to what this student meant; however, the extent of these inferences depends on the judgment of the evaluator. Note that the student was permitted to use an occasional English word. This was done to prevent the student from being inhibited and thus stop writing altogether because of one particular word which he may not know. However, for purposes of evaluation, if an English word is used and this is "vital" to the communicative process, the student cannot be given credit for that particular sentence. In other words, it falls back to the basic question, would a German speaker with no knowledge of English comprehend that "bit" of information which the student is trying to convey? Thus in most cases if an English word is used, most likely the sentence which contains this word cannot be given a score.

III. Points: The following points of information were asked for and should be scored as follows:
1. Who you are  
(Note: Several ways of expressing this can be used, e.g. Ich heisse___ or Ich bin___, but just the isolated name should not be credited.)  
2. Where born  
3. When born  
(Several ways can be used to get this across, such as Ich bin___ Jahre alt or Mein Geburtstag ist___, etc.)  
4. Where live in U.S.  
("leben" is acceptable)  
5. How long studied German  
(Both "lernen" and "studieren" acceptable)  
6. What language they speak  
7. How long will stay in Germany  
(Use of "wollen" rather than "werden" is acceptable, or present tense of "bleiben")  
8. What do in U.S.  
9. How long been in Germany  
10. Where else have traveled in Germany  
(Here some past tense must be used, otherwise if present tense is used, reader would misinterpret to imply future)  
11. Any other information would like to add  
(It is important to note here that the student was free to add any information other than what was asked for and he should be given credit for this. It, of course, does not matter if this additional information comes at the end or any other place in the student's summary. However, the information must be relevant to the communicative situation, i.e. in this case, it should have something to do with his background and be relevant to the application of this particular job. Quantify this information and give one point per "bit" of information which in most cases will be a point per comprehensible sentence.)
Communicative Competence Writing Test
Check List of Possible Points of Information for Scoring

Student's Name________________________ Initials of Evaluator____

For each point of information below, check if the student has conveyed the information as defined in the "Criterion and Procedures."

1. Who you are
2. Where born
3. When born
4. Where live in U.S.
5. How long studies German
6. What language speak
7. How long will stay in Germany
8. What do in U.S.
9. How long been in Germany
10. Where else have traveled in Germany
11. Any other information would like to add

Total

Comments: (any usual problems, or questions which may arise)
APPENDIX D

COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE READING TEST (CCR)

1. The Instrument

2. The Paragraph Read by the Students

3. Check List of Possible Points of Information for Scoring
Communicative Competence Reading Test

You will now be given a written paragraph in German. Read it over two times and take notes as you are reading in English. After you have read it twice give the paragraph back to me and write in English with the aid of your notes all that you can remember about the paragraph.

TAKE NOTES BELOW: (IN ENGLISH)

WRITE UP WHAT YOU READ BELOW: (IN ENGLISH)
Communicative Competence Reading Test

Check List of Possible Points of Information for Scoring:

1. R. 15 yrs. old
2. R. goes to school
3. R. in 10th grade
4. When school out
5. in summer
6. goes to his uncle's
7. in Bielefeld
8. has fun at his uncle's
9. gets up early (in the morning)
10. helps uncle
11. usually feeds animals
12. waters animals
13. after this eats breakfast
14. after breakfast
15. helps aunt
16. in house
17. in garden
18. sweeps yard
19. washes car
20. waters flowers
21. cuts grass
22. afternoon
23. may play
24. with neighbor boys
25. plays football
26. also fun

TOTAL
APPENDIX E

LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE SPEAKING TEST (LCS)

1. The Instrument (with directions for scoring

2. The Student's Copy with Instructions
Linguistic Competence Speaking Test

Initials of Evaluator  Name of Student

I. Pronunciation

Directions to the student: Read the following sentences.
Directions to the evaluators: In each of the following sentences there is one critical sound you should be listening for (underlined). It appears at least twice in the sentence. You should score the sound each time it appears in the sentence, thus there will be at least two points per sentence. If you feel the student pronounces the sound in question correctly, give him one point for each time he does it in the sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wyk.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ich bin fleissig.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Otto bekommt heute Post.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Üben Sie übermorgen?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Die Schule ist in der Stadt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Der Füller ist für Dieter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Frau Meier bringt die Karte.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ich habe viel Geld.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ach, sie ist so schwach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Das Wetter ist gewöhnlich schön.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Könnt ihr die Löffel putzen?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Die Rehe rennen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Der Affe isst einen Apfel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Pattern Response

A. Word Order

Directions to the student: I will give you a sentence that you 
are to change by beginning with a word or phrase other than the subject. 
For example, I say: Jochen ist dort drüben. Dort drüben ... You say: 
Dort drüben ist Jochen.

Directions to Evaluators: Score each sentence one point for 
correct position of verb.

1. Ute ist in der Küche. In der Küche...  
2. Sie kommt jedes Jahr nach Hause. Jedes Jahr...  
3. Sie gibt Ihrer Mutter das Öl. Ihrer Mutter...  
4. Er lehnt ihr das Rad nicht. Ihr...  
5. Wir erzählen den Kindern eine Geschichte. 
   Den Kindern...

TOTAL

B. Word Substitution

Directions to the student: I will be saying a series of sen-
tences. After each one, I will give you a word you are to substitute 
for the last word in the sentence. For example, I say: Hier liegt die 
Illustrierte.Buch. And you say: Hier Liegt das Buch.

Directions to evaluators: Score each sentence one point for 
the correct form of the determiner (modifier) preceding the last noun.

1. Dort liegt die Zeitung. Heft.  
2. Ich komme jede Woche. Monat  
3. Fahren wir um die Kirche. Wald  
4. In der Küche ist der Saft. Limonade  
5. Ich möchte einen Schal. Hemd

TOTAL

C. Formal to Familiar

Directions to the student: I will ask you questions using the 
formal form of address. You are to ask the same questions using the 
familiar form of address. For example, I say: Fahren Sie nach Hamburg? 
You say: Fährst du nach Hamburg?

Directions to evaluators: Score each response two points, one 
for the correct pronunciation of the verb and one for the use of "du."

1. Nehmen Sie den Bus?  
2. Laufen Sie Schi?  
3. Essen Sie immer so viel?
4. Treffen Sie die anderen um zwei?
5. Schlafen Sie immer gut?

TOTAL

III. Directed Drill
Directions to the student: I will be telling you to say certain things. For example I say: Sagen Sie, dass Sie heute abend nicht weggehen. You say: Ich gehe heute abend nicht weg.
Directions to evaluators: Score each response as directed below:

1. Sagen Sie, dass Sie gleich anrufen!
   1 point, W.O.; 1 point, pronoun; 1 point, verb.

2. Sagen Sie, dass Sie die Tiere Füttern dürfen.
   1 point, W.O.; 1 point, pronoun; 1 point, verb.

3. Sagen Sie, dass Sie Ihren Eltern eine Karte schreiben.
   1 point, W.O.; 1 point, pronoun; 1 point, verb; 1 point, Ihr to mein.

4. Sagen Sie, dass Sie ein Paar Freunde einladen.
   1 point, W.O.; 1 point, pronoun; 1 point, verb.

5. Sagen Sie, dass Jochen und Hans im Garten sind.
   1 point, W.O.

TOTAL

Total Score for Test
Linguistic Competence Speaking Test

STUDENT'S COPY

I. Read the following sentences loud and clearly at a normal rate of speech.

1. Ich bin fleissig.
2. Otto bekommt heute Post.
4. "Üben Sie übermorgen?"
5. Die Schule ist in der Stadt.
6. Der Fuller ist für Dieter.
7. Frau Meier bringt die Karte.
8. Ich habe viel Geld.
9. Ach, sie ist so schwach.
10. Das Wetter ist gewöhnlich schön.
11. "Konnt ihr die Löffel putzen?"
12. Die Rehe rennen.
13. Der Affe isst einen Apfel.

II. Pattern Response

A. I will give you a sentence that you are to change by beginning with a word or phrase other than the subject. For example, I say: Jochen ist dort drüben. Dort drüben... You say: Dort drüben ist Jochen.

B. I will be saying a series of sentences. After each one, I will give you a word you are to substitute for the last word in the sentence. For example, I say: Hier liegt die Illustrierte. Buch. You say: Hier liegt das Buch.

C. I will ask you questions using the formal form of address. You are to ask the same questions using the familiar form of address. For example, I say: Fahren Sie nach Hamburg? You say: Fährst du nach Hamburg?

III. Directed Drill

I will be telling you to say certain things. For example, I say: Sagen Sie, dass Sie heute abend nicht weggehen. You say: Ich gehe heute abend nicht weg.
APPENDIX F

LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE LISTENING, READING AND WRITING TEST (LCL, LCR and LCW)

The Instrument with Scoring Procedure
Linguistic Competence Test

General Directions: The test you are about to take is a test to find out how much German you know. Parts of the test you may not be able to do because you have not covered or studied that particular topic in your German class. However, try it anyway and see if you can come up with an answer. Do the parts you are sure of first and then go back to those you are having trouble with. Do the best you can on all of the test. Again, your score on this test will be kept confidential; your teacher will not be told how you did on this test.

Part I Listening Comprehension

You will hear either an incomplete statement or a question. For each one you will also hear three or four suggested completions or answers. Choose the most appropriate completion or answer and circle the corresponding letter. Example: You hear: Hans ist jetzt im Wohnzimmer. Er...

A. putzt das Auto
B. sieht fern
C. isst Frühstück

You would circle B, the correct answer, since this is most appropriate and logical.

1. A B C
2. A B C
3. A B C
4. A B C
5. A B C

2 points per item 10

Part II Reading Comprehension

You have in front of you a series of either incomplete statements or questions. For each incomplete statement or question there are either three or four suggested completions or answers. Choose the most appropriate completion or answer and circle the corresponding letter.
Example: Die Armbänder und Ohringe hier sind aus...

A. Schmuck
B. Silber
C. Gummi
D. Geld
You would circle B, the correct answer, since this is most appropriate and logical.

1. Ich kann Ihnen nicht sagen, wie spät es ist. Meine Uhr ist nämlich...
   A. stehengeblieben
   B. sportlich
   C. langweilig

2. Warum kommt dein Hund nicht, wenn du ihn rufst?
   A. Er gehört mir nicht.
   B. Er antwortet mir nicht.
   C. Er gehorcht mir nicht.

3. Der Anruf ist von Peter. Er fragt, ob du ihm dein Erdkundeheft...
   A. kaufst
   B. schreibst
   C. leihst
   D. hast

4. Zeigst du mir, wie du den Rasen mähest?
   A. Nein, er hat jetzt keine Zeit.
   B. Gut! Du darfst mir zuhören.
   C. Klar! Du kannst mir zuschauen.

5. Du kannst den Schinken nicht so in der Schlüssel in den Kühlschrank stellen. Hier, leg doch...!
   A. eine Gabel drauf
   B. eine Schnitte drauf
   C. einen Deckel drauf

   2 points per item

Part III  Reading/Writing

Fill in each blank to complete the determiner. (Put the correct endings on the words in the following sentences.)
Example: Ich habe die Karera von meinem Freund gekauft.

1. Rolf ist mit seiner Freundin durch das Schloss gegangen.
3. Ich gehe nach dem Abendessen ohne meinen Schwester ins Kino.
4. Ernst wohnt bei seinem Onkel gegenüber der Kirche.
5. Hier ist das Bild von unserem Boot für meinen Lehrer.

1 point per ending
Part IV Reading/Writing

Rewrite the following sentences, replacing each underlined word with the appropriate form of the word in parentheses. Make all other necessary changes. Example: Ich frage Sie und Ihre Kollegen. (glauben)
Ans: Ich glaube Ihnen und Ihren Kollegen.

1. Darf ich dich und deine Brüder besuchen? (zuschauen) Points 4
2. Ich habe hier etwas für ihn (von) 1
3. Wir haben die Lehrerin nicht verstanden. (danken) 2
4. Er hat diesen Sommer bei uns gewohnt. (gegenüber) 1
5. Warum hast du mich heute gesucht? (folgen) 3

TOTAL 11

Part V Reading/Writing

For each item below, write a familiar singular command. Use the verb and noun given in parentheses, but change the noun phrase to the appropriate plural form in each command. Example: (wecken/das Kind)
Ans: Weck die Kinder!

1. (essen/der Apfel) Points 2
2. (gehören/der Lehrer) 2
3. (mitnehmen/der Anzug) 3
4. (zuhören/die Lehrerin) 3
5. (streichen/der Hund) 2

TOTAL 12

Part VI Reading/Writing

Write five sentences in the conversational past by making any necessary changes in each of the word groups below.
Example: ich/besuchen/mein Onkel und meine Tante
ich habe meinen Onkel und meine Tante besucht.
1. er/abholen/sein Kollege und seine Freundin  
2. wir/ folgen/der Hund und die Katze  
3. ihr/kaputt machen/der Mäher und der Schlauch  
4. ich/bleiben/mit/mein Vetter und meine Kusine  
5. er/verkaufen/sein Wecker und sein Fernglas  

TOTAL 21

Part VII Reading/Writing

Write an answer to each of the following questions as shown in the example. Example: Ist Ihre Torte auch so hart? Ans: Sie ist härter.

1. Ist Ihr Schnitzen auch so gut?  
2. Ist Ihr Haus auch so hoch?  
3. Kostet Ihr Mantel auch so viel?  

TOTAL 6

Part VIII Reading/Writing

Complete each of the following questions by using genitive case forms of the words given in parentheses. Example: (der amerikanische Arzt) Kennen Sie das Auto des amerikanischen Arztes?

1. (seine zukünftige Braut) Ist das die Mutter?  
2. (das kleine Mädchen) wie heißt der Bruder?  
3. (mein alter Kollege) Kennst du die Wohnung?  

TOTAL 8

Part IX Reading/Writing

Combine each of the following two sentences writing the second one as a relative clause. Example: Valentin war ein Komiker. Er gefiel mir gut. Valentin war ein Komiker, der mir gut gefiel.
1. Ist das die Kellnerin? Sie haben sich mit ihr unterhalten. 2

2. Das ist die Frau. Ich arbeite für ihren Sohn. 2

3. Sein Freund hat mir viel erzählt. Ich habe es aber schon wieder vergessen. 2

TOTAL 6

Part X Reading/Writing

Rewrite each of the following sentences inserting the correct form of the modal verb. Example: Ich gehe jetzt nach Hause. (müssen)
Ich muss jetzt nach Hause gehen.

1. Er kauft sich ein Auto. (dürfen) 2

2. Du isst immer zu Hause. (wollen) 2

3. Ich lese das deutsche Buch nicht. (können) 2

TOTAL 6

GRAND TOTAL 100
Linguistic Competence Test

Items to be read by examiner, read each item twice.

1. Ich möchte den Kindern die Hande waschen, aber ich finde keine...
   A. Salbe
   B. Wasser
   C. Seife

2. Hast du die Blumen für meine Tante?
   A. Ja, ich habe es.
   B. Ja, ich habe sie.
   C. Ja, ich habe meine Tante

3. Ich weiss nicht, wie spät es ist, ich habe keine...
   A. Platte
   B. Uhr
   C. Wecker

4. Herr Müller bringt seine Koffer zum Bahnhof, weil er heute abend...
   A. zurückkommt
   B. verreist
   C. fährt

5. Ich habe keine Briefmarke gehabt, und habe dir deshalb keine Ansichts Karte...
   A. geschickt
   B. gezeigt
   C. aufgelegt
APPENDIX G

ATTITUDE SCALES AND STUDENT INFORMATION SHEET
STUDENT INFORMATION SHEET

Name_____________________________Age_________

Grade_________

When you finish this year, how many years of German will you have studied at this school?_________

Have you studied German anywhere else? Yes No If yes, where__________How long?____________

Have you travelled or lived in a German-speaking country? Yes No If yes, how long?____________Where?____________When____________

Is German spoken in your home? Yes No If yes, by whom?_________

Have you studied any other foreign languages? Yes No If yes, which one?__________________________

In the last three months you have taken a series of tests. Think of the one which tested German. There were five (5) of them. Below I have made a list of these five tests. Try to remember what these tests were like. Next to each test there is a blank. Put a plus (+) next to the type of tests you feel you would like to see used as part of a German course you are taking. Put a minus (-) next to the type of tests you feel you would not like to take as part of a German course.

1. Individual oral test (face to face with me, sometime in January.)

2. Group written (where you had to write a note in German, hear me read something in German, take notes and then write it up in English, read something in German, take notes and then write it up in English.)

3. Group written (multiple choice listening and reading where you filled in blanks and did several grammar type exercises.)

4. This test had two major parts. It was an individual test (face to face) Rate each part separately:
4A. The part where you read some German sentences and did some oral drill type exercises, like substituting a new word into a sentence and then repeating it after me.

4B. The part which was similar to the one you took in January (#1, above).

5. Group written which you took today.

In a few words comment on why you put the plus or pluses where you did.

In a few words comment on why you put the minus or minuses where you did.

The following statements are ones with which many people agree, and many people disagree. There are no right or wrong answers since many people have different opinions. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement by writing on the line preceding each statement the number from the following scale which best describes your feelings.

5 strongly agree
4 agree
3 undecided
2 disagree
1 strongly disagree

1. The Germans who have moved to this country have made a great contribution to the richness of our society.

2. The more I get to know German-speaking people, the more I want to be able to speak their language.

3. German-speaking people are very democratic in their politics and philosophy.

4. German-speaking people have produced outstanding artists and writers.

5. By bringing the old German folkways to our society, they have contributed greatly to our way of life.
6. The German-speaking person has every reason to be proud of his race and his traditions.
7. If America should lose the influence of German-speaking people, it would indeed be a deep loss.
8. German-speaking peoples are much more polite than many Americans.
9. We can learn better ways of cooking, serving food, and entertaining from the German-speaking people.
10. German-speaking people are very dependable.
11. German-speaking people set a good example for us by their family life.
12. German-speaking people are generous and hospitable to strangers.
13. Americans should make a greater effort to meet more German-speaking people.
14. It is wrong to try to force the German-speaking person to become completely American in his habits.
15. If I had my way, I would rather live in Germany than in this country.
16. I would study a foreign language in school even if it were not required.
17. I would enjoy going to see foreign films in the original language.
18. Our lack of knowledge of foreign languages accounts for many of our political difficulties abroad.
19. I want to read the literature of a foreign language in the original.
20. I wish I could speak another language perfectly.
21. If I planned to stay in another country, I would make a great effort to learn the language even though I could get along in English.
22. Even though America is relatively far from countries speaking other languages, it is important for Americans to learn foreign languages.

Please comment briefly on the following question; you may write on the back of this sheet. What do you like best and what do you like least about your German course?
APPENDIX H

LETTERS

1. Letter to Parents of the Students
2. Letter to Students
Dear Parent:

Our school is cooperating with a doctoral research study project the purpose of which is to find out what specific learner abilities are involved in the learning of a foreign language, in this case German. We would very much like your child, along with 50 other students, to participate in this study. The study would require your child to take six tests during a four month period. These tests will be administered during his study hall period or during his regular German class, thus there will be a minimum amount of interference with his daily schedule. The tests will cover the areas of ability, personality and attitude. All information gathered from the tests will be kept in strictest confidence. No names will be divulged in the final study or any time during the study.

The results of this study will help us improve our foreign language instruction and help us determine what kinds of materials and teaching techniques are most advantageous and helpful to make foreign language study a successful experience for all of our students. Your cooperation in this will bring us one step closer in our constant endeavor to improve instruction.

Please check the attached blank and return to this office as soon as possible:

_____ I agree to have my child participate in the above study.

_____ I do not wish to have my child participate in the above study.

__________________________
Parent's Signature
Dear Student:

You have probably been wondering why you have been selected to take part in a study which I will be conducting at your school. First, let me introduce myself. I am a student at Ohio State working on my doctorate degree in foreign language education. I also teach the methods courses in German in which future German teachers are trained. In order for me to get my degree I have to carry out a study and this is what I'll be doing at your school. In this study I am trying to find out how well you can talk and write in German and if there are any abilities which you might have that contribute to your skill in speaking and writing in German. In order to find this out you will be taking a series of tests. In January (for some of you already in December) you will take an individual test where you will be asked to do certain activities using German. Later on (in February) there will be some group tests in German and in the area of ability, aptitude and attitude. In all of these tests you don't have to worry that anyone will know the results. Neither your German teacher or anyone else will be given the results, so just do the best you can and don't be worried that this will be reflected in your grades or go into any record of yours. I will be the only person who will know the results and I will keep them strictly confidential. No names will be used in my study.

Your German teacher will tell you when and where to meet for each test. So try to always be prompt and get to the right room. I hope this won't inconvenience you too much. The test will be spread over a three month period. In January one individual speaking test will be given to each of you and a group writing test. Towards the end of January and through February group tests will be given, and in March again one individual speaking test and a group writing test will be given.

I sincerely appreciate your cooperation. Your German teacher will keep you posted as to when and where you will meet with me.

Thanks,

Walter H. Bartz
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Correlation Matrix of all Variables
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books


**Periodicals**


**Published Tests and Test Manuals**


Unpublished Materials


