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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The Guidelines for the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) Title III, issued by the United States Department of Health Education and Welfare in January 1965 list "effective communication" with a native speaker of the target language as one of the overall goals of modern foreign language study (in Finocchiaro and Bonomo, 5, p. 40). In spite of this long standing ambition, most teachers of a foreign language will agree with Wilga Rivers (9, p. 21), that we have not yet reached this goal, and that the crucial question of how to develop communicative ability in a foreign language has still not been answered. Foreign language teachers continue to be frustrated by the phenomenon of students who seem to have few difficulties doing well on discrete-point classroom achievement tests, but are practically unable to utter a spontaneous coherent sentence on their own.

The problem is a complex one, and it is doubtful that the profession will find one single or simple strategy to teach communicative competence. There are a multitude of student and teacher, personal and instructional variables, including student aptitude, personality, motivation, teacher personality, language fluency and teaching style, instructional materials,
and teaching and testing techniques which need researching as possible factors influencing the development of communicative proficiency in a foreign language.

The scope of this study will be limited to just one of these variables: It will examine the effect of different testing techniques on the building of communication skills.

It is generally accepted that testing determines a great deal of the learning outcome. Given our educational grading system, testing serves as a major source of motivation for learning. In Chastain's (2) words,

... the practical objectives of the course are set by the tests. No matter what the teacher states as the goals of the course, the students study for the test. The tests, then, in spite of all protestations to the contrary, determine what the students emphasize in their study (p. 328).

Agreeing with Chastain, our evaluation instruments should reflect our instructional objectives and should measure whether these objectives have been attained.

After examining some achievement testing programs accompanying currently available textbooks, as well as teacher constructed tests, this writer believes that most tests do not adequately reflect or measure our objective of establishing some level of spontaneous communicative ability in the target language.

Currently prevailing tests sample the student's knowledge of specific abstract linguistic facts and his ability to manipulate mechanically structural units. A survey of oral testing practices conducted by Kalivoda (7) in the Atlanta, Georgia area supports these findings.
Kalivoda noted that teachers tend to avoid actual speech production in a test because it is time consuming, requires expensive sophisticated recording equipment and is rather difficult to grade objectively. The few hardy souls who felt guilty excluding from the testing program the most practical and purportedly the most important skill, communicative speaking, relied on oral tests consisting of recitation of memorized dialogues, translation of dialogue lines, questions on a dialogue, directed conversation based on a dialogue, or simple oral pattern drill.

This reluctance to test language as a medium of communication is also evident in the written tests administered in our classrooms. We test the subunits of language separately in tests on phonology, morphology and syntax, and assume that the total sum of these evaluative samples reflects the student's "knowledge" of the language, --his ability to select, combine and order these subunits into free, creative communicative language. But, unfortunately, foreign language knowledge seems to defy the mathematical principle which states that the sum of the individual parts makes up the whole. As can be witnessed daily in foreign language classrooms, the student is not automatically able to spontaneously combine the parts for communicative use of language.

If we examine current testing procedures from a taxonomic viewpoint, it becomes obvious that most of the test items require the student to perform only the lower level skills outlined in Bloom, et al, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain (1). Bloom et al. order intellectual skills into six hierarchical categories:
On the "knowledge" level, our tests require the student to recognize, identify, and memorize meanings, rules, and patterns. He must be able to recall and discriminate between those patterns, manipulate them, and reproduce them on cue.

As we climb up the taxonomic ladder and examine our tests on the degree to which they assess the student's "comprehension" ability; his ability to rephrase, restate, reorder, summarize and interpret explicit and implicit meanings, they become weaker.

The first serious shortcomings manifest themselves in testing "application", the ability of the student to apply learned vocabulary and structures to new situations, the ability to generalize principles, organize them and interrelate them in actual language use.

Further weaknesses are evident in testing the student's ability to "analyze" utterances in terms of implicit meanings (the special situational and personal meanings that add to and alter explicit lexical meanings).

We hardly ever test the student's ability to "synthesize and evaluate" using the target language. Synthesis can be defined as creativity, and creativeness in language use means the student must be capable of understanding and producing new and original messages which he might never have heard before verbatim.

We agree that language is a complex and creative behavior, and generally accept the definition of overall language proficiency given by Spolsky et al. (11, p. 80) as being "the ability to function in natural language situations", yet we insist on testing this proficiency as an abstract array of discrete items to be manipulated mechanism-
cally, not creatively.

Two of three existing manuals on foreign language testing give only superficial treatment to testing language as a means of communication. Techniques suggested in Lado, Language Testing (8) and in Valette's Handbook Modern Language Testing (12) feature almost exclusively discrete-point test items. This limited treatment of proficiency testing seems to reflect the professions's wishful thinking that there is automatic transfer between linguistic competence and communicative ability. But, as Clark (3) points out, and other experts agree,

one of the most salient characteristics of real-life language use is the absence of a close and easily determined relationship between sheer linguistic ability - defined in such terms as accuracy of pronunciation, range of vocabulary, accuracy and extent of grammatical control, and so forth - and communicative proficiency - defined as the ability to get a message across to an interlocutor with a specified ease and effect (pp. 118-19).

Textbooks on foreign language methodology also neglect to adequately deal with the testing of communicative competence, but rather emphasize discrete item teaching and testing. A recent text intended for teacher training (Finocchiaro and Bonomo, 5), for instance, states

... a well-rounded testing program should make provision for doing three major things:
1) judging problems of growth in the phonological aspects as well as in the structural and lexical aspects of the foreign language;
2) evaluating the students' use of the discrete features of language within the listening, speaking, reading, and writing abilities;
3) ascertaining that the students recognize and make use of the overt and "hidden" aspects of culture needed for appreciation, understanding and communication (p. 205).
The same authors believe that "essay tests should play no part in a beginning language program" (p. 208). Essay tests presumably include any type of free response test.

Several educators, among them Jakobovits (6), Rivers (9), and Savignon (10), disagree with the audio-lingual practice of withholding free response communication tests until the students have reached a more advanced level.

Jakobovits (6, p. 149), one of the most vocal critics of current testing methods, calls discrete-point linguistic tests inadequate, insufficient and irrelevant. He believes that unless our tests encompass the full range of phenomena involved in communicative competence, they "only yield artificial laboratory exercises that have little significant relationship to the use of language in real life situations" (p. 157).

In an article of June 15, 1973, even the popular media (Columbus Dispatch, 4) join in on the critique of current testing practices. Although the article is an attack on multiple-choice and allegedly objective and standardized tests in general and does not concern itself specifically with foreign language testing, a statement attributed to the mathematician Peter Hilton applies pointedly to foreign language testing. It reads:

A particularly unfortunate effect of the confusion between valid test questions and 'objective' statistics is that tests of the efficacy of training are devised and are then held to be valid tests of the success of the education process. This truly disastrous error permeates our entire educational system. . . . The test should be concerned with genuinely important skills and should reproduce as closely as possible the real-life conditions under which the student is going to perform the task being tested (p. 37A).
Looking at currently prevailing foreign language testing methods, the lack of situational realism is very evident. Rarely, if ever, in real life outside the classroom, will the student have to perform linguistic discrete-point tasks similar to those he is asked to perform on a foreign language test.

Clark (3) summarizes the state of proficiency measurement by saying

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 at the creation and utilization of tests of this type should be considered a matter of highest priority (p. 6).

In conclusion, if there is any validity to Chastain's (2) claim that

the teacher cannot expect his students to take seriously any goal which is not tested. Their whole educational background has conditioned them to study for examinations as covering the important objectives of the course (p. 350)

we might have found one of the keys to the problem of developing communicative proficiency in the foreign language, and the question at hand is: Do tests of communicative competence, when administered in lieu of currently prevailing discrete item linguistic competence tests, further the student's spontaneous communicative ability and help us accomplish an important objective of foreign language instruction?

Objectives of the Study

This study was intended as an exploratory, quasi-experimental study, and its purpose was to compare the effect of two testing methods, discrete-
point selection and simulated communication tests, on the development of communicative proficiency in the four language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing at the end of a ten week instructional course of beginning college French. Specifically, the study attempted to provide some insights into the following problems:

1. Does the type of classroom achievement test administered foster the establishment of a learning set by the student which either facilitates or inhibits the development of communicative proficiency in the target language?

2. What is the relationship between linguistic and communicative competence as measured by scores on tests of linguistic and communicative ability?

3. Are simulated communication tests feasible and practical in a foreign language classroom?

4. Which type of test, discrete-point selection or simulated communication tests, do foreign language students prefer and why?

A further objective of this study was to develop a set of simulated communication tests to accompany the textbook used by the classes involved in this study.

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. At the end of one quarter of beginning college French instruction there will be no significant differences between the two experimental groups in student achievement on tests of linguistic and communicative competence testing the listening, reading, writing, and speaking skills.

2. There will be no significant differences in the effectiveness
of the two testing methods in developing discrete-point receptive skills, communicative receptive skills, discrete-point productive skills and communicative productive skills.

3. There will be no significant relationship between individual student scores on discrete-point and communicative tests of listening comprehension, reading, writing, and speaking.

Definition of Treatment Techniques

For each of the ten weekly tests which comprised the experimental treatment of this study, two test forms were constructed. In order to maximize the difference between treatments, it was necessary to clearly define the two approaches to testing intended as independent variables of the study.

The basic treatment difference in the two types of tests consisted of the degree of verisimilitude to real-life communicative situations inherent in the testing task to be performed by the student.

A discrete-point selection item (commonly called "objective" item) was defined as any independent testing item not bound by situational constraints, which required a specific, predetermined response. The student had to select a response from a range of two or more alternatives, either written, oral, or recalled from memory (e.g. conjugation paradigms). Except for items testing factual information such as dates, names, events, etc., the test taker was simply required to manipulate given phonological, morphological or syntactic elements of the language according to specific instructions. Emphasis was on linguistic correctness, on form rather than meaningful content. The student may or may not have understood the full meaning of the utterance. The criterion for evalu-
ation was an absolute right or wrong for each item.

A simulated communication test was defined as any test item which required the student to make a spontaneous (uncued) response (written, oral, or kinetic) in a specified situationally realistic setting. The student was given a communicative situation and within the given situational constraints had to receive or transmit a message interacting with a real or hypothetical person. The student had free choice of interpretation of the situation, sentence content, vocabulary and structures. He was limited only by his own linguistic repertory and situational constraints. The emphasis was on meaning rather than linguistic correctness.

The two approaches to testing will be described in more detail in the Procedures section in Chapter III of this dissertation.

Definitions of Terms

1. Communicative Competence (Communicative Proficiency, Communicative Ability or Integrative Skills Use): the ability of a person to effectively understand, speak, read, or write the target language in specified "real-life" situations to give or obtain information relevant to successfully completing the situationally specified task.

2. Communicative Situation: any realistic situation which requires use of language symbols (oral, written, or paralinguistic) to convey or obtain information.

3. Linguistic Competence: the ability to recall and manipulate discrete linguistic facts about the phonology, morphology or syntax of the target language.

4. Productive Skills: the speaking and writing skills.
5. Receptive Skills: the listening and reading skills.

Value of the Study

This quasi-experimental study is not to be construed as an effort to discredit linguistic discrete-point testing. This method of testing occupies an important place in the evaluation of foreign language learning and is especially valuable for frequent criterion-referenced tests used for diagnostic purposes to determine specific weaknesses a student might have with phonological or grammatical elements of the language. Furthermore, the obvious scoring advantages of "objective" tests cannot be denied. But, as has been pointed out previously in this chapter, discrete-point testing procedures have some serious shortcomings in that such items do not lend themselves very readily to testing skills at the higher cognitive levels, and further, to the student, they lack face validity as far as the communicative objectives of our courses are concerned.

If the results of this study indicate that testing methods utilized in foreign language instruction can indeed influence learning and can help or hinder the accomplishment of our instructional goals, this research would have serious implications for testing experts, classroom teachers, textbook writers and the educational community in general.
Footnotes for Chapter I


CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The interest in the concept of communicative competence is of relatively recent origin in the field of foreign language teaching. It has gained momentum as a result of the growing dissatisfaction with the accomplishments of the audiolingual method. Although one of the professed major goals of audiolingualism is the ability to communicate with native speakers of the target language, adherence to a strict audiolingual methodology with its emphasis on dialogue memorization and structural pattern drill did not accomplish this desired goal.

In the late sixties numerous critics of the structural pattern drill as a major "training" device in language instruction spoke out against the artificiality of drill exercises and the lack of communicative activities in the classroom and emphasized the need for differentiating between techniques for teaching linguistic proficiency and for teaching communicative proficiency.

This writer will first attempt to trace this re-evaluation of teaching techniques to improve communication skills. Secondly, she will review pertinent literature about the testing of communicative competence. The third and fourth section of this chapter will summarize empirical research related to the teaching and testing of communicative competence.
and the final section will briefly review some research findings on the
effect of testing on learning.

Language as Communication Skill

Gaarder (12) in a 1967 article pointed out that to enable the stu-
dent to "generate freely new utterances in the new language . . . his
attention [must] be directed beyond drills from the beginning and [must
be] fixed constantly on the meaning and reality of his life experience
in the new language" (p. 109). He criticized then available instruction-
al materials saying that "the drills and their follow-up exercises—and
usually even the basic dialogs—are in effect so devoid of logical, con-
sistent, situational reality that they do not provide the student with
significant life experience in the foreign language—do not give him
anything meaningful to talk about" (p. 110). Gaarder advocates a "con-
trastive meaning" analysis of language rather than an analysis of ling-
guistic elements.

Newmark and Reibel (27), believing second language acquisition
processes to be similar to native language learning, argued that struc-
ture drills and contrastive analysis are neither necessary nor sufficient
in language learning, and that they should be replaced with sentences
based on common situational context to resemble native language learning
situations in childhood. In their words, "the example of the child
[learning the native language] indicates that situational rather than
grammatical cohesion is what is necessary and sufficient for language
learning to take place" (p. 151).

Palmer (34) also maintains that we need to switch from pattern
practice to communication practice. For this communication practice he
considers the most powerful technique at the teacher's disposal to be the creation of situations which could be relevant to the student's own life and then forcing the student to think about the meaning and consequences of what he would say in such a situation (p. 56).

Rivers (40) in 1972 proposed a model for language teaching which divides the language learning processes into "skill-getting" and skill-using. She points out that the ability to communicate presumes some knowledge of linguistic facts, and that this acquisition of "knowledge" can effectively be brought about by manipulative exercises which she calls "pseudocommunication". But she criticizes that we have traditionally stopped at this pseudocommunication stage and have assumed that there will be automatic transfer to real communicative ability. Rivers maintains that in order to develop this real communicative ability we need to guide the student into the "skill-using" stage. In her words:

> We must work out situations, from an early stage, where the student is on his own, trying to use the language for the normal purposes of language: establishing social relations, seeking and giving information, expressing his reactions, learning to do something, hiding his intentions or talking his way out of trouble, persuading, discouraging, entertaining others, or displaying his achievements (p. 27).

Rivers further suggests that "in this type of practice the student should be allowed to use anything he knows of the language and any aids (gestures, drawings, pantomime) to fill out his meaning, when he is at a loss of words" (p. 27).

Paulston (35) believes that meaningfulness alone does not make for communication. She has devised a classification system of structural pattern drills which differentiates between mechanical drill ("a drill
where there is complete control of the response, where there is only one correct way of responding" p. 189), meaningful drill ("there is still control of the response . . . but the student cannot complete the drill without fully understanding structurally and semantically what he is saying" p. 190), and communicative drill ("there is no control of the response. The student has free choice of answer, and the criterion of selection here is his own opinion of the real world - whatever he wants to say" p. 191).

If a drill is meaningful alone, no communication is taking place, as according to Paulston, an essential characteristic of a communicative drill is that it "adds new information about the real world" (p. 192).

This separation between meaningful and communicative might be useful for drill activity, but it is difficult to maintain in real-life language situations. Paulston, for instance, classifies comprehension-type questions based on assigned readings as meaningful but not communicative, because the teacher knows the answers to the questions he asks and does not obtain new information. However, while communicating in real life, people frequently ask questions to which they know the answer. Speaker intent and situational setting at times motivate such questions. For instance, the mother who asks Johnny, "What did you just do?" after she has observed her son throw rocks at passing cars, certainly is within the realm of communication. Also, comprehension-type questions on reading passages certainly can be communicative, if it is the intent of the inquirer to compare his findings and impressions with those of another person with a similar experience. Incidentally, the responses
in such situations are not truly predictable, because Johnny could conceivably respond, "I am practicing discus throwing for the Olympics.", while the person asked a question based on a reading passage could answer, "Let's not talk about this passage. It bores me to tears...."

All language use has the potential of being communication depending on speaker intent and situational setting, and this writer prefers a more general model of communication which does not make a major distinction between meaningfulness and communication but rather uses meaningfulness within situational constraints as its major criterion.

Simple communication models usually list three basic components of the communication process:

1. Sender
2. Message
3. Receiver (Berlo, 1)

Goyer (13) defines communication as "to make common (to share) experience regardless of the nature of the experiential event or the method of its transmission or projection." He lists a sequence of five events which must occur to produce a communicative event. There must be

1) a generator of a 2) stimulus which is
3) projected to a 4) perceiver which
5) responds discriminatively (assigns meaning) (p. 8-9).

This writer has constructed a simplified model of the communication process for foreign language testing which will be presented in Chapter III of this dissertation.

Testing Communicative Competence

Much of the existing literature in the field concerns itself with teaching techniques to develop communicative competence. Kalivoda (20), Knop (21), Oates (29), Wilson and Wattemaker (54), and Zelson (56) are
only a few of the educators who have approached this topic.

The aspect of measuring communicative competence has received less attention, probably because of the many problems inherent in free response evaluation.

The problems of testing language proficiency remain as yet essentially those summarized in 1956 by the "Report of the Committee on Tests" in the Reports of the Working Committees of the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (28). While the report concerned itself solely with oral production tests, and clearly emphasized linguistic proficiency, the problems of time, space, and equipment needed for individual test administration and scoring of oral tests, the problem of "linguistic realism" in testing procedures, of separating the skills in testing, of obtaining adequate samples of student performance which are representative of his actual achievement, of keeping native and target languages apart, of structuring and controlling responses in order for comparisons of scores, and of course, the problem of finding objective reliable scoring methods, - most of these problems are yet acute in the testing of communicative competence whether it be in oral or written language skills.

Pimsleur (38) in 1966 gave an optimistic review of the state of foreign language testing. Describing multiple-choice reading and listening test procedures of the MLA Cooperative Foreign Language Tests (25) and the Pimsleur French Proficiency Test (39), he believed that problems in testing reading and listening comprehension have largely been solved.

While it is true, that comprehension of spoken and written language meaning can be measured by objective testing methods, these multiple-
choice testing tasks still fall short on situational realism. Davies (10) calls for comprehension tasks "which need resolution actually during the task and are not channelled through the stimulus response funnel of question and answer after the passage" (p. 5). Before multiple-choice testing tasks can be fully accepted as valid predictors of the student's ability to function in a real-life situation, we need to answer the question asked by Spolsky (45), "Is there a serious difference between being able to recognize a definition and being able to give a definition?" (p. 89).

Pimsleur (38), in the above cited review, also summarized progress made in the field of testing speaking proficiency. He described the three parts of the speaking test in the Pimsleur French Proficiency Test (39) which test concrete vocabulary, pronunciation and fluency. The vocabulary and pronunciation parts are clearly aimed at testing discrete-point elements. Fluency is defined as "the student's readiness to give forth a response in French in a conversational situation" (p. 200), and this component approaches the measuring of communicative competence. However, the student is told in advance what the conversation will consist of. While this part meets the criterion of providing a situational setting and situational coherence, the student has no freedom to express what he wishes to say in such a situation. Thus, the testing procedure is a directed dialogue with the difference of cues being given in English rather than in the target language.

Pimsleur also described the "Speaking Test" of the MLA Cooperative Foreign Language Test (25). Its four parts consist of a "Mimicry" section where the student repeats short sentences after a native voice, a
"Reading Aloud" section which requires the student to read aloud a paragraph, a "Picture Question" section requiring the student to answer a question on each of four pictures within an eight seconds per question time limitation, and a "Picture Description" section where the student is given two minutes to describe a sequence of pictures which tell a story. Parts one and two are scored on specific pronunciation features. The third and fourth sections are scored using scales for such criteria as meaningfulness, vocabulary, pronunciation, structure, and fluency.

After reviewing these speaking tests, Pimsleur somewhat optimistically concluded that "the problem of objective testing of speaking ability has largely been overcome in recent years" (p. 205).

This optimism was dampened in 1968 when Spolsky (45) called attention to the "central problem of foreign language proficiency testing" - validity (p. 94). Spolsky recommends that rather than attempting to measure language learning in discrete-point linguistic terms, we should "work for a functional definition of levels: we should aim not to test how much of a language someone knows, but test his ability to operate in a specified sociolinguistic situation with specified ease or effect" (p. 93). This recommendation is endorsed by Jakobovits (17).

Also in 1968, the testing of communicative competence received concentrated attention in the published proceedings of a Language Testing Symposium. Davies (10) points out that three aspects need consideration in language testing: language, learning, and evaluation. He believes that these linguistic, pedagogic, and psychometric considerations have traditionally not been tied closely enough. For instance, the strict grammar translation approach emphasizes language as a thing in itself
which exists in texts only, and uses translation as its main testing device. The structuralist-behaviorist approach considers language as a machine which acts as stimulus-response mechanism separate from the environment and has little recourse to meaning. "Testing inevitably follows on by providing drills for completion, gaps for filling and multiple-choice answers for selection" (p. 3). He describes the ideal approach which presents a "united view" of language and language learning, which considers the two aspects interdependent in the belief that language cannot exist separately from people and learning.

Perren (36) in this same volume recommends that we abandon the artificial four-skills separation in testing and adopt a division into oracy and literacy skills.

Wilkinson (53) lists as first consideration for tests of oral expression, "Do they set out to test the kind of spoken English /ESL/ which, under normal circumstances the candidate will need to use?" (p. 123).

Pilliner (37) quotes Wiseman (55) in decrying the "syllabus content approach" (discrete-point approach) to testing as a "reactionary instrument helping to encapsulate method within the shell of tradition and accepted practice" (p. 32) and advocates the "goal-oriented" test instead. Pilliner also discusses psychometric considerations for proficiency testing.

Jakobovits (17) in 1970 maintained that a test of communicative competence must include three levels of meaning:

1. Linguistic meaning (general lexical meaning of a word or expression, its phonological actualization rules, its syntactic relations and
projection rules);

2. Implicit meaning (particular meaning conveyed by a situational context);

3. Implicative meaning (information conveyed by the speaker about himself, his socio-linguistic background, psychological state, intentions, etc.) (pp. 155-57).

Upshur (48) also lists those three meanings as necessary for communication. He labels them word meaning, utterance meaning and speaker's meaning and agrees with Jakovovits that in real communication the individual must be able to function on all three levels.

Jakovovits (17) makes some tentative suggestions of testing procedures which could be utilized to measure these three levels of meaning. Among them are:

1. Judgments of Acceptability. The student is asked to judge the appropriateness of a word or expression in a certain context, or to pick the most acceptable of two similar utterances.

2. Semantic Differential Technique. The student rates a word on a bipolar adjectival scale. This scale can be divided into seven steps indicating degree of intensity between the two qualities the adjective implies, or it can be a two step scale asking for an "either-or" decision. As an example, the student could be asked to indicate which quality is more intense, - filthy or dirty.

3. Acting out Situations. The student is asked how he would say something under specified conditions, e.g. restate an utterance to express negation, permission, certainty, irony, etc.

4. Paraphrasing. The student rewords an utterance so it retains its
linguistic meaning but changes its implicit or implicative meaning (pp. 161-64).

The suggested techniques have potential for developing a needed sensitivity in the student for certain implicit or implicative meanings, but they might be criticized for being academic exercises lacking in situational realism if utilized in actual communicative competence testing.

Clark (7) in 1972 gave a comprehensive review of recent trends in foreign language evaluation and critically reviewed efforts toward the development of tests of communicative competence such as the face to face interview developed by the Foreign Service Institute (FSI), the Peace Corps "communication task" test, developed by the Educational Testing Service, where the student must convey specific points of information to a native speaker of the target language and is evaluated on the basis of the quantity of information comprehended by the native speaker.

Upshur (49) reports experimentation using a testing technique where a student is presented with four pictures differing significantly on one or two conceptual dimensions (e.g., a person performing different actions, or four possibilities of a man with or without a hat walking up or down a staircase). One picture is randomly selected and the examinee is asked to provide (orally or in writing) a single sentence description of the picture to a "distant" listener or reader. The task is evaluated on the basis of whether the listener/reader can successfully identify which of the four pictures has been described.

In *Foreign Language Testing: Theory & Practice*, Clark (8) gives a
very coherent treatment to general achievement and proficiency testing.
The author points out that linguistic proficiency and communicative ability have a tenuous correlation because

1. the high redundancy of communicative situational language, which is not present in discrete-point linguistic tests, often preserves the meaning of a message even though the message might be linguistically defective or not be received in its entirety;

2. in communicative use of a language, the non-native can select vocabulary and structures he "knows", while in discrete-point tests he is forced to respond utilizing prescribed words and grammatical forms which he might not yet fully control;

3. the "social acceptability factor" inherent in special situational and interpersonal settings which is part of communicative proficiency cannot be measured in discrete-point testing (p. 120).

Clark concludes that testing procedures based on a determination of the accuracy and extent of a student's linguistic command of the foreign language cannot serve to measure directly his communicative proficiency. Rather, what appear to be needed are workable tests of communicative proficiency in which the student's performance is evaluated not on the basis of extent of vocabulary, accuracy of morphology and syntax, excellence of pronunciation, and so forth, but rather in terms of the adequacy with which the student can communicate in specified language-use situations (p. 120).

Clark points out that unfortunately, in classroom testing, "language-use situations" usually are by necessity of an artificial simulated nature because of practical constraints inherent in foreign language learning away from the country and the people who actually use the target language.
as a tool of communication.

The section entitled "Aspects of Testing" in the excellent little volume edited by Oller and Richards (33) provides a good overview of some of the recent efforts in the field of English as a second language (ESL) integrative skills testing and some of the remaining problems.

Oller (31), rather than dichotomizing testing into procedures for linguistic competence and communicative competence, considers testing techniques to lie on a continuum ranging from discrete-point items at one end of the scale to full scale language use at the other (p. 190). He points out that a multiple-choice test does not necessarily have to be a discrete-point item test and he suggests some "objective" items which would lend itself to integrative skills evaluation.

The call for the development of communicative competence tests is not unanimous in the field. Carroll (6), for instance, feels that it will be more efficient and useful in the long run to obtain good assessments of basic language competences, by more traditional means, for . . . as far as the foreign language teacher is concerned, the teacher is responsible only for developing in the students those basic competences on which successful use of language depends. The foreign language teacher cannot be held responsible if a student possessed of all the basic language competences fails to use them in practical situations (p. 9).

The above argument assumes that we have isolated the "basic language competences" which assure the ability to communicate in a language. To this researcher's knowledge, it is precisely this difficulty in determining what factors constitute communicative ability which motivates current interest in the topic.
Empirical Research Findings Relating to the Development of Communicative Competence

Few educators have attempted to investigate empirically which procedures lend itself to the development of communicative proficiency. Jarvis (18) compared the effect of two kinds of classroom practice on the achievement in all four skills. His study utilized fourteen classes of first-semester college French students (N = 292), taught by seven instructors, each instructor teaching a "drill" and a "contextual" class. The two treatments compared were defined as a "drill" treatment which involved manipulative language practice with generic meaning only, and a "contextual" treatment utilizing language practice with particularized referents of the concepts involved. The essential characteristic of the "contextual" treatment was that students were asked to tell the truth, i.e. to refer to the actual state of affairs in their environment, while students in the "drill" treatment were asked for cued responses. The experiment utilized a Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design with the MLAT (short form) administered as pretest, and researcher-constructed instruments for all language skills, as well as parts of the Pimsleur French Writing Test and the MLA Cooperative Speaking Test as posttest for the study. Results indicated highly significant findings (p < .01) favoring the "contextual" treatment in the productive skills.

Savignon (42) compared the effect of three treatments on tests of linguistic and communicative competence and attitude measures utilizing three beginning college French classes (N = 42) taught by two different instructors and the experimenter in a semester-long study. Of the three groups involved in the study, regular instruction for Experimental Group
One was supplemented by a fifty-minute session a week devoted to the training and performing of specific communicative acts (e.g. greetings, asking for directions, making a date, etc.). Instruction for Experimental Group Two was supplemented by a weekly period devoted to films or discussions of current political, social, and cultural topics about France. These activities were conducted in English. Instruction for the control group was supplemented by a weekly period in the language laboratory practicing basic course material.

Results of importance to this study indicate that the "communicative skills" group (E₁) performed significantly better (p < .001) on tests of communicative competence constructed by the experimenter. There were no significant differences on standardized tests of linguistic competence in the receptive skills nor on the course examination and final grades.

Of interest to this study is the test of oral communicative competence developed by Savignon as criterion measure for her study. The thirty-minute oral test consists of four parts:

Part I: Discussion. The student and a native speaker of French informally talk about one of three topics in French:

1. The advantages of a large university versus a small college
2. The validity of a foreign language requirement in a liberal arts education
3. The role of students in university administration.

Evaluation was based on how much information the two speakers could exchange within four minutes.
Part II: Information-Getting. Students were asked to interview the native speaker and find out as much as they could in four minutes allowed.

Part III: Reporting. Students were assigned one of three topics:

1. Your family
2. Your life on campus this semester
3. Your winter vacation

They were given one minute to talk about this topic in English to organize their ideas and then reported on the same topic in French for three minutes.

Part IV: Description of an on-going activity. The students observed a live actor perform several actions and orally described first the actor and then the activities within a two and one-half minute time allotment. A "warm-up" in English was again provided before the testing task was performed in French.

Although the following research does not properly fit under this heading, for lack of a better place it is reported here.

Brière (3) reports a study by Lee (23) which attempted to measure physiologically whether different language exercises bring about more or less learning. Lee, working on the assumption that structural and phonemic discrimination drills are not true language behavior and produce boredom, lack of motivation and little learning among students, measured the heart rate of ten women and eight men in an ESL course at seven different points in time during normal conversation and during pattern practice. He found the expected peaks of arousal in normal conversation, but measurement during pattern practice showed very little
arousal in heart rate. As it has been established that some physiological arousal is necessary for learning to occur, it was concluded that no learning was taking place during pattern drill activities.

Studies Examining the Relationship between Linguistic and Communicative Competence

Carroll (5) correlated scores of 127 participants of NDEA Institutes on the FSI interview as measure of communicative proficiency with scores on the four skill tests of the MLA Proficiency Test for Teachers and Advanced Students. He obtained correlations ranging from .58 to .86.

Clark (8) reports findings of an unpublished study where he correlated FSI scores of forty-four Peace Corps trainees with a series of discrete-point tests on vocabulary and grammar. Correlation coefficients ranged from .82 to .92.

Clark (7), however, warns that

the mere existence of reasonably high statistical correlations between communication-based tests and linguistically oriented tests should not be taken to indicate that the latter can be automatically substituted in the schools as criterion measures of the student's communicative skills. The motivational value of a direct communication test, as well as the obvious face validity it exhibits to teachers, students, administrators, and parents, are important additional considerations in its favor (p. 225).

Studies Examining the Relationship between Various Testing Techniques and Evaluation Criteria and Language Proficiency

The dictation as testing device for language proficiency has caused some controversy in the field. While Harris (15) and Lado (22) consider
dictations to be merely passive recording exercises and to be inefficient and invalid as testing procedures, recent research findings indicate a relatively high correlation between scores on dictation and general proficiency tests.

Oller (30) reports a study comparing scores on the English as a Second Language Placement Examination (ESLPE) with scores on dictations for one hundred randomly selected foreign students who took the ESLPE in the fall of 1968. He found that dictation scores correlated more highly with the other four parts (vocabulary, .67; composition, .69; phonological discrimination, .57; grammar, .64) than did any other part of the test. He concluded that "dictation is a useful device for measuring foreign language proficiency" (p. 259). Oller (31), however, added later, that the rate of speaking is the most important factor in administering the dictation test. "If the dictation is to be a test of skill in handling the spoken word, it must be spoken (or read, in this case) at a fairly fast clip. Reading dictation at a snail's pace is probably not much of a test of anything but spelling" (p. 195).

Valette (50) conducted a study involving 120 beginning college French students in two classes taught by two instructors. Group A was given daily dictations while Group B took only three or four dictations throughout the semester. The dictation score on the final examination was correlated with the combined score of the other parts of the examination (discrete-point oral comprehension and written grammar tests). The correlation coefficient computed for Group A was .78 while the correlation for Group B was .89.

Valette concluded that
for students drilled in dictation practice, the score on the dictée reflects only their skill in that area; for students possessing minimal experience with dictation, the dictée can validly be substituted for the traditional final examination in first-semester French, thus saving many hours of grading time (p. 432).

It appears that the evaluation instruments of "language proficiency" used as criterion measures in the above reported studies were predominantly tests of discrete-point language proficiency. It remains to be seen whether dictations fare as well when validated with more direct measures of communicative competence. In addition, further investigation is necessary to examine whether dictations in languages with a more consistent sound-symbol relationship (such as German or Spanish) are also valid indicators of proficiency in other skills.

Considered from the practical perspective of face validity, dictation, as Brann (2) points out, is not a very good "natural" language exercise as it is rarely used in everyday life. However, if instead of narrative passages we utilize dictations of letters, shopping lists, telephone messages, oral instructions, etc., the criterion of "situational realism" could be approached more closely.

Brodkey (4) has studied the dictator's voice as a variable in comprehension. Experimenting with dictations administered by native and non-native speakers of English, he found that familiarity with the speaker's voice is an important variable in comprehension. He suggests that we let students administer dictations to each other to make them aware of their incomprehensibility.

Several empirical investigations have compared cloze procedure testing methods with other proficiency measures. Darnell (9) reports a corre-
lation of .73 between a cloze test of English and the Test of English as a Foreign Language developed by the Educational Testing Service.

Oller and Conrad (32) report a multiple correlation coefficient of .88 between the ESLPE and a cloze test. The authors conclude that there is considerable validity in the cloze procedure as a test of ESL proficiency.

The cloze technique might be criticized for the lack of situational realism inherent in the testing task. However, it could be argued that we often use a "cloze procedure" in real-life language situations to fill in gaps in comprehension caused by noise interference, unclear enunciation, or illegibility (e.g., in telephone conversations, handwritten correspondence, etc.).

Spolsky, et al. (46) hypothesized that "there is such a factor as overall proficiency in a second language, and it may be measured by testing a subject's ability to send and receive messages under varying conditions of distortion of the conducting medium" (p. 81).

To test this hypothesis, several experiments were conducted exposing native English speakers and foreign students to a taped series of sentences with various degrees of noise distortion. The students had to write down all they understood from the recording. Results indicated that the degree of comprehension correlated with the degree of distortion, and that the scores of non-natives were much below those of native speakers. In a later experiment with refined procedures and instruments involving sixty-one foreign students, product-moment correlations between scores on the reduced redundancy tests and scores on an English proficiency test consisting of aural comprehension, objective grammar, and
essay parts ranged from .51 to .66. The authors conclude that such aural tests of reduced redundancy are a good measure of overall proficiency in a language.

Roy (1971) reports the unsurprising findings that "native speakers of French (when performing on an oral French test) emit in a given interval a much greater volume of predicates and vocoids than non-natives" and "non-native speakers of French hesitate much more than native speakers of French" (p. 91) when performing on an oral French test.

Studies Examining the Effect of Testing on Learning

Although the a priori assumption that testing influences learning repeatedly appears in the reviewed literature, this writer could not find any empirical research findings which relate to the effect of various testing procedures on the learning of a foreign language. However, several studies in other fields support the hypothesis that testing, by providing recitative reinforcement of the subject matter, can affect learning and help establish a learning set which facilitates certain kinds of problem solving.

Harlow (1959) defined "learning set" as the "learning how to learn efficiently in the situations the animal frequently encounters" (p. 51). His research, although predominantly conducted with laboratory animals, indicates that learning how to learn is indeed possible, and that one can learn not just specific abilities but entire "sets" or approaches to learning.

A systematic investigation of learning sets is beyond the scope of
this research. Let it suffice to list several studies in other fields which might have some bearing on the particular problem investigated by this study.

Concern with the efficacy of tests as an aid to learning dates back to the early 1920s when objective test items came into vogue. Ever since then, educators have debated the relative merits of essay versus objective-type examinations, and a considerable number of studies have concerned themselves with this question.

Jersild (19) listed two ways in which classroom tests benefit learning. First, they force the student to rehearse and recapitulate what has been learned, and secondly, they influence the learner's attitude by putting him under pressure and compelling him to participate more actively in the learning situation.

To investigate the latter premise, Jersild conducted several experiments utilizing two sections of a beginning college course in psychology. True-false, multiple-choice questions and essay questions were given as pretests on material which was to be presented after the test. When the identical tests were given as posttest, he found multiple-choice and essay questions superior to true-false statements as an aid to learning. Based on these findings, he calls true-false tests "of dubious value as a pedagogical instrument" (p. 608) because the intermingling of true and false propositions in a test may perpetuate error as well as strengthen correct associations. Further, Jersild believes that true-false tests are more tests of passive recognition than of active recall, and do not force the student to participate as intensely in the learning task as would multiple-choice or essay questions.
Jersild concluded from his study that the mental activity enforced during periods of examination by means of specific questions is conducive to more effective learning.

Terry (47) investigated the methods of study which students employ in reviewing for objective and essay-type tests. To compile a list of study methods, he asked students to take notes on their review strategies. From this data the author drew up a list of sixty-seven study methods of reviewing for tests. This list was given to 236 students in two sections of a course in tests and measurements. The students were asked to check each study method in one out of five columns as follows:

1. Study methods "you do not use or very seldom use."
2. Study methods "you consider best adapted to the essay test."
3. Study methods "best adapted to the objective test."
4. Study methods "equally well adapted to both essay and objective tests."
5. Study methods "poor for both types of tests" (p. 593).

Results indicated that 83% of the students made six or more discriminating judgments on 45.4 methods checked.

Terry found that the study methods favored in preparing for objective tests were more concerned with small units of subject matter and emphasized detail. The preferred methods for studying for an essay-type exam emphasized large units of subject matter and called for the application of principles to experience.

The author concluded that most students discriminate between study methods for objective and essay tests and that discriminating attitudes of this kind must be taken into account if the instructor is intelli-
gently interested in what his students learn, since the learning must inevitably be affected by the methods which they employ in reviewing for his /sic/ tests (p. 595).

The study recommended that teachers include both essay and objective tests in their evaluation procedures, as the student who solely uses the methods favored for objective test preparation "risks the possibility of acquiring the vice of shallowness or superficiality" (p. 597), while the student solely using the study methods preferred in preparing for essay tests might neglect facts and details necessary for mastery of the subject matter.

Douglas and Tallmadge (11) reported similar findings from a survey study involving 316 students in education courses. Their conclusions:

... it is obvious that the type of examination does influence methods of preparation for it and that the objective type focuses attention upon details and exact wording, while the subjective type apparently favors methods involving organization, perceiving relationships and trends and personal reactions (p. 320).

Further support favoring the essay-type examination comes from Meyer (24) who compared an "essay examination set" with an "objective examination set", and from Wiedemann and Newens (52).

Vallance (51) hypothesized that essay tests are superior to objective tests in helping students retain the tested subject matter over a period of time. He conducted several experimental studies involving a total of 327 high school social science students, comparing the effect of essay tests and objective tests on achievement and retention. Results of the studies indicated no conclusive differences between the two types of tests as learning experiences. However, research methods utilized in
the study were considerably less controlled than in studies reported previously.

Sax and Reade (44) investigated the effect of test item difficulty on achievement. Their study utilized 109 students in an educational measurement course. The subjects were randomly divided into two groups and pretested for initial differences on a test of prospective course content. One group was given a "hard" examination (defined by an item difficulty index) on two occasions during the quarter, while the second group was given "easy" examinations.

Results on the criterion instrument, a final exam of medium difficulty, indicated that those students who were initially in the upper half of the class obtained significantly higher scores when trained to take difficult examinations than did equally bright students who had been taking easier examinations. For students in the lower half of the class, as determined by the pretest, item difficulty on the treatment tests did not significantly affect scores on the criterion measure.

That test item difficulty might influence achievement is further supported in the results of a study by Hunkins (16) who found that elementary school pupils trained to take tests composed of items from the higher levels of Bloom's Taxonomy achieved higher scores on a criterion measure than did pupils who had previously taken tests composed of lower level (factual) items only (in Sax and Collet, 43, p. 373).

Sax and Collet (43) compared the effect of multiple-choice and recall tests on achievement on a multiple-choice and recall criterion test. The study involved two sections (N = 81 and N = 95, respectively) of an introductory course on testing and measurement. Students in one class
took three recall tests (short answer, essay, and completion items) and were told to expect the same type of final examination. Students in the second class took three multiple-choice tests and were told to expect a multiple-choice final exam. Test items were kept identical in content and differed only as far as the response modality was concerned. The criterion instrument, administered at the end of the quarter, consisted of a recall and multiple-choice final examination. These two forms were administered to approximately half the students who were randomly selected from each treatment. The findings indicated a significant difference on the multiple-choice criterion test in favor of the group previously exposed to multiple-choice tests. There was no significant difference between groups on the recall final exam.

The authors concluded that

MC/multiple-choice/ examinations are able to motivate students to perform as well as recall-type questions when items are relatively difficult and where the criterion task is a recall examination

and

... training on MC tests yields higher means on a MC criterion task than does training on recall examination (p. 377).

The authors explained the results by hypothesizing that

MC items requiring an application of knowledge to make close discrimination among novel elements is probably a more difficult examination than a corresponding test requiring application of recalled knowledge (p. 377).

In summary, the findings of the studies reported above are non-conclusive as to the superiority of one testing procedure over another as an aid to learning. There is, however, some indication that test
difficulty is a factor in learning.

It must be emphasized that all studies mentioned deal with subject matter other than foreign languages. Learning strategies might well differ among different disciplines, and language learning and production most likely involve different mental processes than learning and performance in a social science or education course.

Also, it needs pointing out that tests, be they objective or essay-type, can be of differing quality, testing different mental skills. None of the studies mentioned, with the exception of the Sax and Collet study, reported that specific care was taken in covering identical content in both types of examintion.

Other findings reported in the professional literature provide some empirical support that language practice which emphasizes meaning with situational referents is superior to purely discrete-point manipulative practice in fostering communicative competence. Furthermore, there appears to be general agreement that if there is to be congruency between our curricular goals and evaluation methods communicative proficiency should be formally tested by language production tests which make use of situational settings the student might encounter outside the classroom.

This writer would like to conclude this review of literature by listing the four persistent problems in foreign language testing which, according to Carroll (6), need concentrated attention from the profession:

1. The problem of validity -- that is, making sure that the measurements and assessments we obtain reflect what we want them to reflect.
2. The problem of scope -- that is, making sure that we measure or assess all the varied components of foreign language competence and skill.

3. The problem of efficiency -- that is, obtaining the best assessments we can obtain within the limits of time and resources available for the construction and administration of the assessments.

4. The problem of how tests relate to the wider context of instruction -- for example, the degree to which testing either enhances instruction or, contrariwise, distorts it through undesirable feedback effects from the tests (p. 4).

To some extent, this study has attempted to approach all of these problems. It deals with the problems of validity and scope by attempting to devise testing tasks which resemble true-life language situations and which assess a student's communicative proficiency in addition to discrete-point linguistic skills. It deals with the problem of efficiency, by studying the feasibility of constructing, administering and scoring free production language tests in a conventional classroom set-up. And, last but not least, it examines how tests relate to the wider context of instruction, by investigating the effect of different testing procedures on student achievement in the discrete-point and communicative skills.
Footnotes for Chapter II
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Population and Sample

This study was conducted during the Winter Quarter 1974 in the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures at The Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio. The population for this study consisted of the beginning French students enrolled in all sections of French 101 offered during the quarter.

Due to the nature of the study and the researcher's intent to use predominantly subjects with no prior French experience, it was not possible to randomly select subjects. All students enrolled in the four sections of French 101A offered during the Winter Quarter 1974 served as sample for this research project. (The French 101A courses at The Ohio State University are intended for students of elementary French who have not had prior instruction in the language. However, because of scheduling problems, the described sections did include students with previous French study in secondary or elementary school ranging from one to four years, and the students in 101A sections did not essentially differ from students in the other 101 sections.)

Of the ninety-seven students (forty-six in Experimental Group One, and fifty-one in Experimental Group Two*) enrolled in the four sections

*Experimental Group One (E₁) will be synonymous with Communication Group
Experimental Group Two (E₂) will be synonymous with Discrete-Point Group
of French 101A at the beginning of the quarter, eighty-five students (thirty-eight in \( E_1 \) and forty-seven in \( E_2 \)) remained in the sections until the final week of the quarter. Of these eighty-five, only eighty took the required final examination which served as posttest for this study. Of the five students who did not take the final examination, three were enrolled in \( E_1 \) and two in \( E_2 \). One of these students in each group received an "Incomplete" as final grade with the opportunity to complete course requirements at a later date. The other three students (two from \( E_1 \) and one from \( E_2 \) received failing grades for the course.

The profile of the eighty students for which posttest scores are available is summarized in Table 1.

The students' ages ranged from eighteen to thirty-one years with an average age of 21.06 years (median age: 21, mode: 20) for the Communication Group and 20.47 years (median age: 20, mode: 21) for the Discrete-Point Group.

The great majority of students involved in the study were enrolled in French 101A to fulfill a course requirement. None of the students listed French as intended major field of study.

To the researcher's knowledge, none of the students in either treatment group were aware of the experimental involvement of their respective sections. Any treatment differences were explained by the individual instructors as being their personal choice of procedures.

Design of the Study

The experimental design selected for this study was a Nonrandomized Control-Group Pretest-Posttest Design as defined by Campbell and Stanley
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Group (E₁)</th>
<th>Previous French Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher A:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher B:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N for E₁</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrete-Point Group (E₂)</th>
<th>Previous French Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher C:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher D:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N for E₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and described in Isaac, Handbook in Research and Evaluation (8, p. 43). This design is recommended for use with intact classes. It controls for extraneous variables affecting internal validity, such as history, pre- testing, maturation, instrumentation and mortality.

The Cooperating Instructors and Instructional Materials

The four experimental sections were taught by four different Teaching Associates, all native-born Americans with excellent fluency in French, and all working toward advanced degrees in the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures. All four teachers had prior experience in teaching elementary French courses.

The cooperating instructors were randomly assigned to one of the two treatments. In order to avoid creating a bias in favor of one treatment, the instructors were only superficially familiarized with the purposes of the experiment. However, during the course of the study, one instructor teaching a Communication Group repeatedly expressed a dislike for some of the testing procedures and the additional time needed for scoring them.

The cooperating instructors employed a modified audiolingual teaching approach, using as text Thomas H. Brown, French Listening Speaking Reading Writing, second edition (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971) with the accompanying workbook Cahier d'Exercices. The text gives equal stress to mastery of all four basic language skills.

All experimental classes had an identical number of forty-five instructional periods and followed an identical syllabus prescribing the course content to be covered, student assignments on a day by day
basis, as well as the dates for weekly chapter tests.

The Experimental Treatment

The experimental treatment was not intended to affect classroom instruction. Instructors were told to follow departmental guidelines for French 101 classes and to teach the courses as they had done in the past. The only intended treatment difference between the two groups was in the weekly chapter tests administered throughout the quarter, and in the chapter "Objectives" the students were given at the beginning of each unit in the textbook.

The treatment specified that at the beginning of each of the ten lessons which were to be covered during the quarter, all students were given a set of Learning Objectives developed by the researcher. These Learning Objectives (see sample in Appendix C) consisted of three parts: the first part specified the new vocabulary in the lesson to be learned; the second part listed the grammatical structures; and the third section outlined the "Communicative Objectives", suggestions for functional language use the student was to be able to make with the discrete vocabulary and structural elements presented in the textbook unit.

The Discrete-Point Group was given only the first two parts of the objectives, while the Communication Group was given all three parts as study and review guides for the tests.

Each week the students were tested on the content of a chapter in their textbook. These tests were to a large extent developed by the researcher and consisted of two different forms: a simulated communication test to be administered to the Communication Group, and a discrete-point
test to be given to the Discrete-Point Group. The tests will be de-
scribed in detail later in this chapter.

All ten tests consisted of a written part testing the listening
comprehension, reading and writing skills and the cultural information
presented in the chapter. Tests administered after chapters three,
five, seven and nine included a speaking section.

The decision to limit oral testing to four times during the quarter
was made for practical reasons to save time and manpower. While this pro-
cedure might have affected the findings of the study in that test ex-
posure and practice time in the speaking skill were limited, the re-
sults will be more easily generalizable to the average non-experimental
classroom situation as most foreign language classrooms are under simi-
lar time and facility constraints as was this researcher.

The speaking tests after lesson three and seven were administered
by the regular classroom instructors in individual interviews with the
students. Tests after lessons five and nine were group tests administered
by the instructors in the language laboratory and recorded on tape.

All tests, except for the two speaking tests administered in the
language laboratory, were evaluated by the instructors according to spe-
cific scoring instructions provided by the researcher.

To enable the instructors to answer student questions on test con-
tent, but to avoid extensive "teaching for the test", the instructors
were given their respective form of the test before the class meeting
on the day immediately preceding the testing date.

After each test the instructors were asked to complete a test eval-
uation from (see Appendix D). This feedback was considered by the researcher in constructing subsequent tests.

Description of Discrete-Point Item Tests

As outlined in "Definition of Treatment Techniques" in Chapter I of this dissertation, the discrete-point tests were basically "objective" tests intended to measure whether the student could recall and manipulate specified grammatical, vocabulary, or factual elements. Each test item was totally independent from other items on the test. There was no situational continuity which could have affected a response or which might have made a response predictable because of what happened in previous responses. The student was given precise instructions of what to do. He did not need to make reference to real phenomena in his surroundings in order to respond to an item. Responses were totally predictable and were either right or wrong. Similarity to real-life communicative acts was practically non existent in the test items.

In constructing the weekly discrete-point tests for the listening, reading, and writing skills the researcher used, almost exclusively, test items provided by the publisher and accompanying the textbook materials used by the two experimental groups. Only in cases of doubt, whether an item or a testing procedure suited the prescribed treatment, did the researcher substitute an item of her own. Because of copyright conventions the tests cannot be duplicated here. However, to clarify testing procedures used, they will be described in more detail.

Procedure Used to Test Listening Comprehension: Students heard twice a sentence accompanied by three spoken alternatives. The alter-
natives usually emphasized structural elements, forcing the students to discriminate between subject and object pronouns, verb forms, adjective agreements, etc. The student circled A, B, or C on his answer sheet to indicate his selected response.

**Procedure Used to Test Reading Comprehension:** The reading skill was tested in a manner similar to that of listening comprehension. The students were given a written stem with three or four written alternatives and had to circle the letter of the alternative which corresponded to the best completion, rejoinder, or answer to the stem. Again, structural elements were emphasized in the items.

**Procedures Used to Test Writing Skill:** To test the students' writing ability, they had to rewrite sentences inserting or substituting suggested words and making all necessary changes. Other written items consisted of asking students to write cued answers to written questions, directed dialogue, dehydrated sentences or multiple-choice vocabulary completion exercises.

**Procedures Used to Test Speaking Skill:** All four oral discrete-point tests were constructed by the researcher and consisted of reading aloud isolated sentences to check pronunciation of specific phonemes. In addition, students had to perform oral transformation drills or answer cued questions.

**Procedures Used to Test Cultural Knowledge:** Items intended to test knowledge of cultural information were developed by the researcher using predominantly English as vehicle. They consisted generally of multiple-choice completion items such as:
In a "pharmacie" one is unlikely to find ____

a. cosmetics
b. prescription drugs
c. a food counter
d. patent medicines

Description of Simulated Communication Tests

In approaching the task of constructing evaluation instruments which measure how well a student could use the target language in a simulated communication situation, an adequate model of the communication process had to be devised. For any language activity to be communication, certain ingredients must be present. The model presented in Figure 1 is an attempt to define these ingredients.

Essentially, all human communication takes place in some physical setting and is bound and influenced by some situational constraints. Within this defined communicative setting, and often motivated by it, we have a sender (or source of communication) with a specific purpose for wanting to communicate. This sender can be one or several individuals. The purpose can be to convey information, intentions, ideas, or a personal need to another individual or group of individuals. Next is the encoding process, the process used in transforming these non-material ideas and needs into some physically perceivable message. This message is relayed to the receiver or listener by some medium or carrier which can be either sound waves (oral speech), or light waves (written language, or some visual representation such as pictures or gestures).

The receiver, in his attempt to decode the message, will interpret the message and allot meaning to it using an interplay of various senses, e.g. his ears to listen, his eyes to read or watch gestures, as well as
Figure 1. Simplified Model of the Human Communication Process

personal impressions gained from the sender, his previous experience (cultural and linguistic), and the situational constraints. The meaning he will give the message is not necessarily identical to the meaning intended by the sender, but to the extent that the sender and receiver meaning overlap and are shared, communication takes place.

As a last element in this continuous process, the receiver responds to the message, and this response determines the fate of the process, either terminating the cycle or leading into another communication cycle.

Keeping the basic model of the communication process in mind, the main task in constructing simulated communication tests is to devise life-like communication situations in which the student can send or receive an extended message to fulfill a situational task requirement within his limited range of the target language vocabulary and structures. The student should be able to fulfill a given communicative task by integrating and synthesizing linguistic elements actually learned and practiced during the course of instruction, because obviously, we cannot ask the level-one student to give an oral report on a moonshot to a hypothetical audience of monolingual French speakers.

The major criterion used in developing simulated communication tests for this study was that the testing task to be performed by the student had to resemble a communicative situation the student might possibly encounter in real life.

Several techniques were used to test the four language skills. Depending on the skill tested, the student's response could be made in the target or the native language. For instance, in tests of listening and reading comprehension, students were asked to summarize in English
information they had heard or read about in French (as examples see tests for Lessons Two, Six, Seven and Ten in Appendix B). Sometimes a non-language response was accepted, such as in items where the student had to indicate comprehension of orally given French directions by drawing a line on a map leading from a point of departure to a given destination (e.g. see test for Lesson Three in Appendix B).

In the productive skills, of course, student responses had to be in the target language, though the cues were frequently given in English. For instance, students were required to ask questions which would elicit specific information from a hypothetical conversation partner. Or, they were to answer, orally or in writing, questions about themselves or their immediate environment.

Some reading/writing or listening/writing test items utilized a dialogue completion procedure where the student had to respond to the given (spoken or written) statements or questions of a hypothetical interlocutor in a given situation (e.g. see tests for Lessons Five and Eight in Appendix B).

Some items gave pictorial cues and asked the student to describe or answer questions about them (e.g. see tests for Lessons Two, Six, and Seven in Appendix B).

The cloze procedure, as suggested by Oller (11) was used twice to test reading/writing (e.g. see tests for Lessons Eight and Nine in Appendix B).

On the two oral tests administered in the language laboratory where a personalized question-answer exchange was not possible, the students were asked to give an oral summary in French of a passage they had read
in English (e.g. see test for Lesson Five in Appendix B), or they were asked to relate some information about themselves, using a given English narrative passage as example (e.g. see test for Lesson Seven in Appendix B).

Cultural information was tested by asking open-ended free-response questions on specific points of information.

In all of the testing procedures students were free to respond as they wished within the given context. The linguistic components (e.g. vocabulary or structures) the students employed in their responses were not specified or controlled by the test items, nor was the interpretation of a situation. The only limitations imposed on student responses were those inherent in the situational setting.

The simulated communication tests developed by this researcher are appended in Appendix B of this dissertation. Some items for these tests were taken from the French 101 testing files of the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures with the kind permission of Dr. Donald Corbin, Coordinator for the 101 sections.

Instrumentation and Collection of Data

The Pretest

As pretest for the study the long form of the Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT) Form A (3) was used. This objective test does not require previous knowledge of a foreign language. The test consists of five subtests: Number Learning, Phonetic Script, Spelling Clues, Words in Sentences, and Paired Associates. It was administered during several sittings outside of regular course hours during the first half of the quarter. The test takes between sixty to seventy minutes and all parts
were administered and timed by taped recording, assuring consistent administration procedures.

In order not to reveal the experimental use of this instrument, students were told that the purpose for requiring the MLAT was to provide departmental statistics helpful in planning and designing future elementary French courses.

All but four of the students involved in the study (one in the Communication Group and three in the Discrete-Point Group) took this pretest. For those students where test scores were not available, group means were inserted for the statistical tests involving the scores. Using a one-way test of Analysis of Variance, no significant difference was found to exist between the two experimental groups on total scores of the MLAT. The mean score for the Communication Group (N = 35) was 111.91 and for the Discrete-Point Group (N = 45) it was 115.55.

The Manual accompanying the MLAT (4, p. 17) reports odd-even reliability coefficients to be .94 for college males and .92 for college females. For this particular study a Spearman-Brown reliability coefficient of .96 was computed. It should be noted that on tests such as the MLAT, where speed is a factor, odd-even reliability tends to give an overestimate of reliability. Engelhart (8, p. 158) suggests the test-retest method for obtaining a more accurate computation of reliability. However, this suggested procedure was not feasible in this study.

Reported predictive validity coefficients using final grades and instructor evaluations as criterion measures range from .36 to .69 (4, p. 13). For this study, the Pearson correlation coefficient computed, using the final grade as criterion, was .42. When the posttest
scores were used as criterion, a predictive validity coefficient of .46 was computed.

The Posttest

At the end of the quarter, during the regular testing period scheduled during final examination week, the students involved in this study were given an identical "final examination" which served as criterion measure to test the null hypotheses established for this study. The instrument (see Appendix A) consisted of a written part, testing listening comprehension, reading, and writing, and a thirty-minute oral part. The written part was administered to the four classes in their regular classrooms by the regular instructors during a ninety-minute period. The oral exam was individually scheduled by each student and administered by the researcher in a small conference room especially scheduled for this purpose. The presence of the researcher as test administrator was explained by telling the students that because of the relatively subjective nature of oral tests, they would be tested by an independent member of the department who was not familiar with them personally.

The oral exams were scheduled during a seven-day period, beginning on the Thursday before final examination week to the last day, a Friday, of finals week. All student responses for the oral test were tape recorded for scoring purposes. The researcher exercised utmost care in keeping testing procedures constant throughout the eighty speaking tests administered.

The posttest consisted of eight subtests, each of the four skill areas being tested by a discrete-point and a simulated communication procedure. Table 2 summarizes the parts of the total instrument and gives
TABLE 2  
PARTS OF POSTTEST AND THEIR INTERNAL CONSISTENCY RELIABILITY ESTIMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Posttest</th>
<th>Type of Item</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Spearman-Brown Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening Comprehension</td>
<td>multiple-choice question-answer and rejoinder</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(discrete-point)</td>
<td>taking simulated telephone message</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>multiple-choice completion and question-answer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(discrete-point)</td>
<td>summary of information contained in written passage</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>completion, &quot;rewrite&quot; and dehydrated sentences</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(discrete-point)</td>
<td>writing letter giving personal information</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>structural transformation drills</td>
<td>10(^2)</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(discrete-point)</td>
<td>answering questions</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.95(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>asking questions</td>
<td>8+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(simulated communication)</td>
<td>describing picture series</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reporting personal information unspecified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Test</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(discrete-point)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Test (written parts only)</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(simulated communication)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 According to Bruning and Klintz (2, p. 188), a reliability value of .70 or higher shows that the test is accurately measuring the characteristics it was designed to measure.

2 This subtest actually consisted of 20 items in 10 statements. However, for purposes of establishing internal consistency reliability, each sentence was scored correct or incorrect without differentiating between errors.

3 As the simulated communication speaking subtest was scored using scales, a split-half reliability coefficient could not be computed. Instead, the Hoyt Analysis of Variance method for establishing reliability was utilized, giving a reliability coefficient on the 16 scores supplied by the scales.
internal consistency reliability coefficients for each subtest as well as for the total discrete-point test and the total simulated communication test.

The simulated communication listening comprehension and reading subtests might have violated the assumption of reliability formulas that test items are independent from each other. Theoretically a dependency existed in these subtests, although no definite pattern or relationship could be established in the responses.

As measures of internal consistency are at least in part a function of test length, the relatively low reliability on the discrete-point listening comprehension and speaking subtests as well as on the simulated communication writing subtest can partly be explained by the low number of items in these subtests. If the number of items on these subtests would be increased to fifty, the Spearman Brown Prophecy Formula would yield odd-even reliability coefficients given in Table 3.

It also should be mentioned that the low reliability on the simulated communication writing subtest might be partly due to the method of scoring used. For the purpose of computing a coefficient of internal consistency, the sole criterion of number of comprehensible bits of information was utilized. The task was arbitrarily assigned eleven points (ten for the ten separate points of information suggested in the test instructions, and one point for extra points of information, regardless of the number of extra points given). Each point was assigned the score of 1 if deemed comprehensible or 0 if considered incomprehensible. Many students, however, did not concentrate on giving the ten suggested bits of information, but gave instead a number of unsolicited points of infor-
TABLE 3

SPLIT-HALF RELIABILITIES COMPUTED BY SPEARMAN-BROWN PROPHECY FORMULA ON PROJECTED SUBTESTS OF FIFTY ITEMS EACH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Reliability Computed for this Administration</th>
<th>Reliability Computed by Spearman-Brown Prophecy Formula on Projected 50-Item Test of Similar Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening Comprehension (d.p.)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Comprehension (s.c.)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading (d.p.)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading (s.c.)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing (d.p.)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing (s.c.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking (d.p.)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In developing the speaking subtest for the simulated communication procedure, the researcher adapted testing techniques utilized by Savignon (13) for Parts II (Interview - Obtaining Information) and IV (Reporting of Personal Information) and by Roy (12) for Part III (Description of Picture Series).

Most of the items for the discrete-point subtests for listening
comprehension, reading, and writing were adapted from existing test items found in the test files for French 101 courses of the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures at The Ohio State University.

At the conclusion of the individual speaking tests the researcher asked each student to complete a Test Evaluation form (see Appendix A) to obtain some information on student preferences of testing procedures.

Scoring of the Posttest

All discrete-point parts of the test, except for the discrete-point speaking subtest, were scored by the researcher. The method of scoring was objective. The scores were converted to percentages correct for each subtest.

The discrete-point speaking subtest, which was administered and recorded by the researcher as part of the total oral test, was evaluated by two independent judges, using a right-wrong criterion for two structural elements in each of ten oral pattern-drill responses elicited from the students. Both of the judges are native-born American experienced teachers of French with an excellent command of the language. Both evaluators are presently candidates for the Ph.D. degree in Foreign Language Education at The Ohio State University. Interrater reliability for the two judges over eighty subjects was found to be .98.

In developing evaluative criteria for scoring the four parts of the simulated communication speaking subtest, the researcher examined several existing rating procedures. The Educational Testing Service in Princeton, New Jersey (7) developed a six-point rating scale for each of five language areas: pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. This rating procedure is used in evaluating language proficiency of U.S.
Peace Corps Volunteers.

The Foreign Service Interview (FSI) described in Clark (5, pp. 122-23) uses five "levels" ranging from "elementary proficiency" (able to satisfy routine travel needs and minimum courtesy requirements) to "native or bilingual proficiency" (speaking proficiency equivalent to that of an educated native speaker).

Savignon (13) uses different criteria to evaluate different parts of her oral communicative competence test. She employs six-point scales ranging from "None" to "Great" for such criteria as

- Effort to Communicate
- Amount of Communication
- Comprehensibility and Suitability of Introduction
- Naturalness and Poise
- Comprehension by Native
- Comprehensibility and Suitability of Conclusion
- Fluency
- Comprehensibility

Savignon also uses scales for linguistic criteria such as pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary.

The communicative criteria listed above are not clearly defined. For instance, it is left somewhat vague how "Effort to Communicate" differs from "Amount of Communication." (Doesn't the person who expends greater effort also usually say more?) Further, it is questionable, whether "Naturalness and Poise" are characteristics of communicative speech or personality characteristics.

The rating procedures used by the Experiment in International
Livin (EIL) for their Test of Communicative Competence (9) utilize a six-point scale for specifically stated communicative objectives (e.g. "Can he / the student/ ask and tell the time of day, day of week, date?") and equally specific grammar objectives (e.g. How well does the student have control over personal pronouns, indefinite articles, etc.).

Clark (5) suggests that communicative and linguistic criteria not be mixed in the evaluation of communicative competence, as he believes this mixture "serves only to obscure the distinction between the two types of measurement / linguistic and communicative/ and decrease /sic/ the validity of the test as a direct measure of communicative proficiency" (p. 126).

However, it is difficult to totally separate the two criteria, as the linguistic quality of an utterance can influence comprehensibility, the basic communicative criterion. Further, while a major goal of most college or secondary language programs is communicative ability in the target language, there is a justifiable concern with linguistic correctness because, as one of the cooperating instructors put it when questioning a scoring procedure suggested by this researcher, "We are not just attempting to teach survival communication. That can be effectively done by gesticulating, drawing pictures, etc. We are also trying to teach literacy in another language. And to become literate in another language one should be able to use it linguistically correctly."

To accommodate this view, the researcher used mixed linguistic and communicative criteria but gave greater emphasis to the communicative dimensions, leaving only one of four criteria to a general evaluation of linguistic correctness of utterances.
The evaluation criteria finally arrived at were the following for all four parts of the oral simulated communication test:

I. Fluency (adapted from FSI rating procedures)

General Definition: Fluency does not refer to absolute speed of delivery, since native speakers of any language often show wide variations 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.

Definition of each level on the scale:

1. Very many unnatural pauses, very halting and fragmentary delivery.
2. Quite a few unnatural pauses, frequently halting and fragmentary delivery.
3. Some unnatural pauses, occasionally halting and fragmentary delivery.
4. Hardly any unnatural pauses, fairly smooth and effortless delivery.
5. No unnatural pauses, almost effortless and smooth, but perceptibly still non-native.
6. As effortless and smooth as speech of native speaker.

II. Comprehensibility

General Definition: Comprehensibility refers to the ability of the student to make himself understood, to convey meaning.

Definition of each level on the scale:

1. No comprehension, couldn't understand a thing student said.
2. Comprehended small bits and pieces, isolated words.
3. Comprehended some phrases or word clusters.
5. Comprehended most of what the student said.
6. Comprehended all of what the student said.

III. Amount of Communication

General Definition: Amount of Communication refers to the quantity of information relevant to the communicative situation the student is able to convey.

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.
IV. Quality of Communication

General Definition: Quality of communication refers to the linguistic (grammatical) correctness of the student's utterances.

Definition of each level on the scale:

1. No utterances rendered correctly.
2. Very few utterances rendered structurally correct.
3. Some utterances rendered correctly but many structural problems remain.
4. Many correct utterances but some problems remain with structures.
5. Most utterances rendered correctly, only minor problems with structure.
6. All utterances rendered correctly.

A sample of a scoring sheet for the speaking test is appended in Appendix A.

The same two judges who evaluated the discrete-point speaking sub-test also scored the four parts of the recorded simulated communication speaking subtest. After several training sessions the evaluators were satisfied in having arrived at "the most objective scoring procedure for a subjective test."

While the Fluency dimension remained essentially subjective, the other three criteria (Comprehensibility, Amount of Communication and Quality of Communication) were independently evaluated by both judges using a dichotomous decision for each utterance made by the student. For the Comprehensibility criterion, an utterance was considered either comprehensible or incomprehensible; for the Amount of Communication criterion, an utterance either added relevant information to the situation or did not; for the Quality of Communication criterion, an utterance was considered either grammatically correct or incorrect.

For each criterion the evaluators then used a "conversion chart" to translate the number of acceptable utterances into levels on the
scale. This was done to obtain greater objectivity in assigning a value on the scales. For instance, the "conversion chart" for Part I of the simulated communication speaking subtest looked as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Acceptable Utterances</th>
<th>Rating on Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4 are given the interrater reliability coefficients for all parts and the total of the simulated communication speaking subtest, as well as for the four separate evaluative criteria.

Examining the reliability coefficients presented in Table 4, it appears that the more structured the test (e.g. the task requirement in both Interview settings was quite specific), the easier it is for two judges to agree on scoring.

Looking at the reliability coefficients for the scales, it will be noticed that those criteria where the judges agreed to use a dichotomous distinction in evaluating each utterance have a considerably higher interrater agreement than does the Fluency scale which depended on an impressionistic rather than an objective evaluation procedure.

Altogether, the relatively high interjudge reliability coefficients obtained on all parts of the speaking test has positive implications for practical application of similar evaluation procedures in actual classroom testing.
TABLE 4

INTERRATER RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS FOR SIMULATED COMMUNICATION SPEAKING SUBTEST: TEST PARTS AND SCALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Test</th>
<th>Interrater Reliability for 2 Judges over 80 Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part I (Interview: Giving Information)</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II (Interview: Obtaining Information)</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III (Monolog: Description of Picture Series)</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV (Monolog: Reporting of Personal Information)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Simulated Communication Speaking Test</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scales of Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Communication</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Communication</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The simulated communication listening comprehension and reading subtests were evaluated by the researcher and one other independent judge who is a native-born American experienced teacher of French with excellent command of the language. She is presently a candidate for the Ph.D. degree in Foreign Language Education at The Ohio State University.

The evaluation criterion for these two parts of the posttest was simply one of quantity of information relayed by the student. The points
of information contained in the French reading and listening passages were quantified, and the student's score on these tests was the percentage of points of information his English summary contained.

The interrater reliability coefficient for the two judges over eighty subjects was 1.00 for both the simulated communication listening comprehension and reading subtests.

Finding a relatively reliable evaluation procedure for the simulated communication writing subtest proved to be a rather difficult task. Clark (5, p. 117) suggests the use of similar scales in evaluating written free response tests as he does for communicative speaking.

The Educational Testing Service (6) offers a procedure using a four-point scale for five criteria:

1. How many of the given elements suggested as cues for a written dialog are included in the student's response?

2. How many of the words the student has written are spelled correctly and are properly used within the phrase in which the word appears?

3. How many of the sentences or phrases the student has been directed to write are correct and meaningful in themselves?

4. How many of the sentences or phrases the student has been directed to write contribute to the meaning of the paragraph as suggested by the given elements in the dialog cues?

5. General quality of dialog written (pp. 7-8).

After several unsuccessful efforts at devising and using scales for the evaluation of the simulated communication writing subtest, the researcher finally decided to use a Quantity and a Quality dimension for evaluating this part. Quantity of information was defined as the percentage of comprehensible bits of information contained in the student's written paragraph. A bit of information was taken to be any
written utterance which added new information. Quality of information was defined as the average percentage of correctly spelled words and syntactically correct bits of information.

The total writing score than was the average percentage of the Quantity and Quality dimensions. In summary, the following steps were involved in arriving at the total writing score:

1. Counting all attempted bits of information
2. Counting all comprehensible bits of information
3. Counting all words written
4. Counting all spelling errors (a spelling error was defined as any error within a word)
5. Counting all syntactical errors (a syntactical error was defined as any error in word order, including omission of words)

A mathematical formula for arriving at the total communicative writing score looked as follows:

\[
\text{Writing Score} = \frac{\% \text{ of comprehensible bits} + \left( \frac{\% \text{ of correct words}}{\% \text{ of syntactically correct information bits}} \right)}{2}
\]

The researcher attempted other means of evaluating the simulated communication writing subtest. She simply counted comprehensible bits of information. This score, when correlated with the writing score described above, yielded a rather low correlation coefficient of .19.

Another method experimented with was to arbitrarily deduct one point for each error (spelling, morphological and/or syntactical) from the total number of words written. While this scoring method was considerably less time consuming than the scoring method actually used, it was rejected because of the theoretical possibility of a minus-score (e.g. if a student
had several syntax errors in addition to misspelling all words). However, the Pearson correlation coefficient computed for the two writing scores was .67.

All simulated communication writing subtests were scored by the researcher. To compute interrater reliability, thirty tests were randomly selected from the total number of eighty tests. These were independently judged by the same judge who evaluated the simulated communication listening comprehension and reading subtests, using the same evaluation criteria as the researcher. The Interrater Reliability Coefficient for the two judges over thirty subjects was .76.

Statistical Analysis

Mean score comparisons on the long form of the MLAT by one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) showed no significant differences in language learning aptitude between the two treatment groups. Therefore, a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) design was used to compare the interactive effects of three factors (two levels each) of experimental treatment, sex, and prior experience on the following dependent variables:

1. discrete-point listening comprehension score
2. simulated communication listening comprehension score
3. discrete-point reading score
4. simulated communication reading score
5. discrete-point writing score
6. simulated communication writing score
7. number of comprehensible bits of information contained in written passage
8. discrete-point speaking score
9. simulated communication speaking score
10. discrete-point receptive skills score
11. simulated communication receptive skills score
12. discrete-point productive skills score
13. simulated communication productive skills score
14. discrete-point total test score
15. simulated communication total test score
16. total posttest score
17. simulated communication speaking test: Score on Part I
18. simulated communication speaking test: Score on Part II
19. simulated communication speaking test: Score on Part III
20. simulated communication speaking test: Score on Part IV

Because of the lack of significant differences found on all tests involving the sex factor, and in order to increase the power of the test by increasing cell size, sex was omitted as an independent variable and the MANOVA test was repeated using experimental treatment and prior French experience as independent variables and the eight subtests of the posttest as dependent variables. Marginal means were computed to determine the direction of significant differences.

A one-way ANOVA test was utilized to investigate the effect of the teacher variable on scores of the eight subtests of the criterion instrument. Marginal means and a Scheffé Compound Contrast Test were used to determine the direction of significant differences.

Pearson correlation coefficients intercorrelating all subtests of the criterion measure as well as the parts of the MLAT were computed.

All statistical computations were made by the Instruction and Research Computer Center of The Ohio State University on an IBM 370/165 Computer. The programs utilized were run by John Pluth, Computer Consultant for the College of Education, The Ohio State University, using existing packaged data analysis programs.
Footnotes for Chapter III


9. Experiment in International Living, "EIL Test of Communicative Competence: Individual Assessment Form," (Brattleboro, Vt.: The Experiment in International Living, date unknown) (Mimeographed).


CHAPTER IV
FINDINGS

This study was undertaken to investigate the effect of two testing methods on the development of linguistic and communicative competence in the four basic language skills in a beginning college French class. Further, this study was intended to explore the relationship between linguistic and communicative proficiency as defined by scores on the subtests of the criterion instrument. The findings will be discussed step by step for each hypothesis tested.

In order to facilitate reporting of results in tables and in the text of this dissertation, the following abbreviations will be used for the various dependent variables tested:

- discrete-point listening comprehension subtest: LCD
- simulated communication listening comprehension subtest: LCC
- discrete-point reading subtest: RD
- simulated communication reading subtest: RC
- discrete-point writing subtest: WD
- simulated communication writing subtest: WC
- number of comprehensible bits of information given on simulated communication writing subtest: WCBI
- discrete-point speaking subtest: SD
- simulated communication speaking subtest: SC
discrete-point receptive skills RSD
simulated communication receptive skills RSC
discrete-point productive skills PSD
simulated communication productive skills PSC
total discrete-point test TD
total simulated communication test TC
total test T
simulated communication speaking subtest: Part I SCI
simulated communication speaking subtest: Part II SCII
simulated communication speaking subtest: Part III SCIII
simulated communication speaking subtest: Part IV SCIV

As reported in Chapter III, a one-way test of Analysis of Variance showed no significant difference between groups on the MLAT administered as pretest for this study. Therefore, the two experimental groups were taken to be equal in language aptitude and straight ANOVA tests without covariate could be used to test the hypotheses established for this study.

Hypothesis I: At the end of one quarter of beginning college French instruction there will be no significant difference between the two experimental groups in student achievement on tests of linguistic and communicative competence testing the listening comprehension, reading, writing, and speaking skills.

As the subjects of the study had a mixed background of prior French study, prior experience in French was used as an independent variable
to eliminate that factor as a confounding variable. A second null hypothesis was established for this purpose:

**Hypothesis I**: There will be no significant difference in student achievement on linguistic and communicative competence tests between students with prior and without prior French experience.

A third hypothesis was established to test the effect of the interactive effect of experimental treatment and prior French study.

**Hypothesis I**: There will be no significant interaction between the experimental treatment and prior French experience on the eight dependent variables tested.

These three hypotheses were tested by a Multivariate Analysis of Variance test (MANOVA) using experimental treatment and prior French experience as independent variables and the eight subtests of the criterion instrument as dependent variables.

Results indicated that there was no significant interactive effect of treatment and prior experience (p < .302). Therefore, Hypothesis I was retained.

A second MANOVA was run testing the effect of prior French experience alone on the eight subtests. Results obtained on the Multivariate Test indicated that previous French study did have a significant effect on student scores (p < .023).

Table 5 gives the marginal means and significance levels for the test of the effect of prior French experience on group performance on the eight dependent variables tested.
TABLE 5
MARGINAL MEANS AND SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS OF TEST OF THE EFFECT
OF PRIOR EXPERIENCE ON EIGHT SUBTESTS OF THE CRITERION
INSTRUMENT REGARDLESS OF TREATMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>Students without prior French experience (N = 47)</th>
<th>Students with prior French experience (N = 33)</th>
<th>P less than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCD</td>
<td>48.08</td>
<td>54.85</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>65.32</td>
<td>76.21</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>76.06</td>
<td>78.42</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>80.76</td>
<td>81.31</td>
<td>.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td>67.45</td>
<td>64.14</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>78.84</td>
<td>84.98</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>52.68</td>
<td>61.70</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>64.36</td>
<td>73.20</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the table, the group with prior French experience did significantly better at the .01 level on the SC subtest (mean difference: 8.84). Significant differences were at the .05 level for the LCC (mean difference: 10.89), WD (mean difference: 16.69), and WC subtest (mean difference: 6.14), and at .051 for the SD subtest (mean difference: 9.02).

Prior French experience appeared not to have had any significant effect on the LCD, RD, and RC mean scores. However, all subtest marginal means favored the group with previous French study.

Due to the above findings, Hypothesis 1 of no significant difference
between groups due to the effect of prior French experience had to be rejected with the reservations that previous French study affected achievement on SC, SD, LCC, WD and WC, but had no significant effect on LCD, RD, and RC mean scores.

A third MANOVA was run testing Hypothesis I, the effect of the experimental treatment on the eight dependent variables. The experimental treatment, when tested by a Multivariate Test, did have a highly significant effect \((p < .001)\) on the overall achievement of the two experimental groups. Table 6 presents marginal means and significance levels on a test of the effect of the experimental treatment on the eight dependent variables tested.

### TABLE 6

MARGINAL MEANS AND SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS OF TEST OF THE EFFECT OF EXPERIMENTAL TREATMENT ON EIGHT SUBTESTS OF THE CRITERION INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtest</th>
<th>(\bar{E}_1) ((N = 35))</th>
<th>(\bar{E}_2) ((N = 45))</th>
<th>(P) less than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCD</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>57.11</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>72.29</td>
<td>67.89</td>
<td>.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>72.43</td>
<td>80.62</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>84.63</td>
<td>78.16</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td>65.62</td>
<td>81.11</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>82.79</td>
<td>80.27</td>
<td>.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>55.67</td>
<td>58.52</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>70.60</td>
<td>65.99</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 shows that differences in marginal means of the two experimental groups were significant at the .001 level for the LCD sub-test ($\bar{E}_1 = 42.86; \bar{E}_2 = 57.11$) and at the .05 level for the RD ($\bar{E}_1 = 72.43; \bar{E}_2 = 80.62$) and the WD subtests ($\bar{E}_1 = 65.62; \bar{E}_2 = 81.11$). All significant differences reported were in favor of the discrete-point group ($E_2$).

It can be concluded that discrete-point testing did have a significant effect on student achievement on the LCD, RD, and WD subtests of the criterion instrument. Mean differences on the SD subtest were nonsignificant. Because of these results, Hypothesis I of no significant difference between treatments was rejected.

The reader should note that the marginal means on all subtests favored the Communication Group on the simulated communication tests, while the means of the Discrete-Point Group were higher on the discrete-point tests. Although this difference was only significant on the subtests mentioned above, there seems to be a trend showing that testing procedures in general are a practice variable which can affect achievement on tests.

The three hypotheses listed above were also subjected to a MANOVA test to examine whether treatment, prior experience, or interaction of treatment and prior experience had any effect on TD and TC scores. Results were nonsignificant on the effect of the interaction of treatment and previous French study on the two major parts of the posttest ($p < .0675$), again supporting the retention of Hypothesis $I_2$.

When TD and TC were tested with prior experience as the sole independent variable, results on the Multivariate Test were nonsignificant ($p < .067$), contradicting the findings previously reported using prior
experience and the eight subtests of the criterion instrument as variables.

Table 7 shows marginal means and significance levels of univariate tests of the effect of prior experience on mean scores of the TD and TC parts of the posttest.

**TABLE 7**

MARGINAL MEANS AND SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS ON TEST OF THE EFFECT OF PRIOR EXPERIENCE ON ACHIEVEMENT ON THE TD AND TC PARTS OF THE CRITERION INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Students without prior French experience (N = 47)</th>
<th>Students with prior French experience (N = 33)</th>
<th>P less than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>61.14</td>
<td>67.75</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>72.39</td>
<td>78.74</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inspecting the figures in Table 7, it can be seen that in spite of the overall nonsignificance on the Multivariate Test ($p < .067$), mean scores on the TC test were significantly affected by prior experience ($p < .021$), supporting previous findings.

Hypothesis I was also tested using the TD and TC halves of the criterion instrument as dependent variables. Results on the Multivariate Test were highly significant ($p < .001$), supporting the previously reported findings that the experimental treatment did have a significant effect on mean student achievement. Significant differences on the uni-
variate tests were at the .01 level for the TD (mean difference: 9.27), favoring the discrete-point group. Mean differences on the TC were not statistically significant (p < .105).

Table 8 presents marginal means and significance levels of the test of the effect of the experimental treatment on mean scores on TD and TC parts of the criterion measure.

TABLE 8
MARGINAL MEANS AND SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS OF TEST OF THE EFFECT OF EXPERIMENTAL TREATMENT ON MEAN SCORES OF TD AND TC PARTS OF CRITERION INSTRUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>$\bar{E}_1$ (N = 35)</th>
<th>$\bar{E}_2$ (N = 45)</th>
<th>P less than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>58.68</td>
<td>67.91</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>77.62</td>
<td>72.97</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To get an overview of student achievement on all subtests as well as on the various combinations of subtests such as receptive skills score, productive skills score, total test score, number of points of information given on the WC subtest and on the four parts of the SC subtest, marginal means and significance levels were run on the effect of the experimental treatment on the twenty dependent variables presented in Table 9. Results supported previously reported findings. Table 9 shows significant differences favoring the discrete-point treatment on LCD (p < .002), RD (p < .033), WD (p < .018), RSD (p < .001), and TD (p < .011).
### TABLE 9
MARGINAL MEANS AND SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS OF TEST OF THE EFFECT OF EXPERIMENTAL TREATMENT ON MEAN SCORES OF 20 DEPENDENT VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>$\bar{E}_1$ (N = 35)</th>
<th>$\bar{E}_2$ (N = 45)</th>
<th>P less than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCD</td>
<td>42.86</td>
<td>57.11</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>72.29</td>
<td>67.89</td>
<td>.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>72.43</td>
<td>80.62</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>84.63</td>
<td>78.16</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td>65.62</td>
<td>81.11</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>82.79</td>
<td>80.27</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCBI</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>53.67</td>
<td>58.52</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>70.60</td>
<td>65.99</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSD</td>
<td>57.71</td>
<td>68.98</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSC</td>
<td>78.45</td>
<td>72.99</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD</td>
<td>59.64</td>
<td>66.84</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>76.71</td>
<td>73.14</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>58.68</td>
<td>67.91</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>77.62</td>
<td>72.97</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>68.13</td>
<td>70.46</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCII</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>13.24</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIII</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIV</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All other dependent variables tested were not significantly affected by either treatment. However, it should be noted again, that marginal means were consistently higher on communicative competence subtests and test combinations for the Communication Group and on discrete-point subtests and test combinations for the Discrete-Point Group, following the trend that testing in general influences achievement.

Chapter I of this dissertation listed a second major hypothesis to be tested by this study:

**Hypothesis II:** There will be no significant difference in the effectiveness of the two testing methods in developing discrete-point receptive skills, communicative receptive skills, discrete-point productive skills, and communicative productive skills.

When inspecting Table 9, it can be seen that the discrete-point treatment did have a highly significant effect on RSD ($\bar{E}_1 = 57.71; \bar{E}_2 = 68.98; p < .001$) while no significant differences were evident on the RSC, nor on either PSD or PSC subtest combinations. As has been mentioned previously, both discrete-point receptive skills subtests (LCD and RD) showed significant differences ($p < .001$ and .05 respectively) favoring the discrete-point treatment.

Because of the above results the hypothesis of no significant differences on receptive and productive skills was rejected. The discrete-point treatment did have a significant effect on achievement in the receptive skills while productive skills do not appear to have been significantly affected by either treatment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Number of Observations</th>
<th>LCD</th>
<th>LCC</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57.69</td>
<td>74.61</td>
<td>74.69</td>
<td>84.25</td>
<td>65.90</td>
<td>84.61</td>
<td>52.96</td>
<td>70.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.91</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td>15.32</td>
<td>22.16</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>15.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34.09</td>
<td>70.91</td>
<td>71.09</td>
<td>84.85</td>
<td>65.45</td>
<td>81.72</td>
<td>54.09</td>
<td>70.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53.04</td>
<td>59.35</td>
<td>80.52</td>
<td>76.81</td>
<td>85.95</td>
<td>83.32</td>
<td>61.41</td>
<td>71.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>30.01</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>44.58</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>16.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>61.63</td>
<td>76.82</td>
<td>80.73</td>
<td>79.57</td>
<td>76.06</td>
<td>77.07</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>60.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.54</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>17.31</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>20.41</td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P less than</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.554</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As there were four different teachers involved in this study, it
could be argued that the teachers present a confounding variable which
does not permit definitive interpretation of the results. To examine
the effect of the teacher variable on student achievement the following
hypothesis was tested by one-way ANOVA: There will be no significant
differences in mean scores on the eight subtests of the criterion instru-
ment due to the effect of four different teachers.

Table 10 presents marginal means, standard deviations and signifi-
cance levels of the test of the effect of four teachers on the eight
subtests. As can be seen in the Table, the only significant difference
between teachers appeared on means of the LCD subtest (p < .001). The
means of the four teachers on the LCD subtest were 57.69 for Teacher A
(E₁), 34.09 for Teacher B (E₂), 53.04 for Teacher C (E₃), and 61.36 for
Teacher D (E₄). A Scheffe Compound Contrast Test showed significance at
the .05 level for any mean difference greater than 11.15. Therefore, it
must be concluded that the mean of Teacher B differed significantly from
the means of the other three teachers and the above stated null hypothesis
was rejected.

However, it needs to be emphasized that this difference was signi-
ficant only on the LCD subtest, which subtest also showed statistically
significant findings on the treatment effect favoring the discrete-point
treatment (Teachers C and D). Also, Teacher B had a large percentage of
students with no prior experience in his class (68.18% versus 53.85 for
Teacher A; 43.48% for Teacher C; and 68.18% for Teacher D). Although
there was no significant interaction of treatment and prior experience
on mean scores, conceivably this interaction could have affected mean
scores for Teacher B.

Because of the above results, the highly significant findings on
the LCD variable should be interpreted with caution because of a
possible confounding teacher effect. However, it should again be
mentioned that mean scores did not significantly differ on any of the
other skill subtests.

The third major hypothesis to be tested by this study was:

Hypothesis III: There will be no significant relationship between indi-
dividual student scores on discrete-point and communicative tests on the following skills: listening com-
prehension, reading, writing, and speaking.

Table 11 presents correlation coefficients and significance levels
for the various subtests of the criterion instrument. The correlation
coefficient for the two parts of the listening comprehension test was
.31 (p < .05). It was the lowest coefficient computed between discrete-
point and simulated communication subtests among the four skills. The
two parts of the writing test correlated at .43 (p < .001). The two parts
of the reading test show a correlation of .50 (p < .001). The highest
coefficients were obtained for the two parts of the speaking test and
for the two parts of the total instrument at .68 and .74 respectively,
both significant at the .001 level.

Intercorrelations between all parts of the criterion test show that
all subtests of the criterion instrument correlated positively. Pearson
Correlation Coefficients range from .17 to .84, all significant at less
than .05, except for the coefficient computed between LCC and WD which
had a significance level of .058.
TABLE 11
INTERCORRELATIONS OF SUBTESTS OF CRITERION INSTRUMENT
N = 80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LCC</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TD</th>
<th>TC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LCD</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.002</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.030</td>
<td>p=.044</td>
<td>p=.002</td>
<td>p=.004</td>
<td>p=.009</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCC</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.058</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.009</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.004</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
<td>p=.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, the high significance levels on the correlation matrix presented in Table 11 need to be interpreted with caution. Hays (2, pp. 576-77) warns that intercorrelations are not statistically independent, and that in a large number of intercorrelations the probability of making a Type I error is very high.

Based on the above findings, this researcher believes it safe to conclude that Hypothesis III can be rejected. There is a significant moderate to high positive relationship between linguistic and communicative competence as defined by the subtests of the criterion measure.

Correlations: MLAT with Criterion Instrument

Correlations were also computed to explore the relationship of the MLAT and its five parts with the various subtests of the criterion instrument. Table 12 summarizes these findings.

Correlations were positive between all measures except for Part III of the MLAT (Spelling Clues) which yielded negative values when correlated with LCD, WD, WC, SD and TD. These negative relationships were, however, in no instance statistically significant. The positive correlations ranged from .03 to .49. The significance levels given in Table 12 again need to be interpreted with caution, because of the redundancy inherent in measures of intercorrelations.

In spite of the nonsignificance of the negative correlations reported for Part III of the MLAT, this writer is at a loss to adequately explain the lack of relationship between a subtest that purports to be a predictive measure of language aptitude and the language tests listed above. In Part III the student is given a "disguised word" (word spelled
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LCD</th>
<th>LCC</th>
<th>RD</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>WD</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>TD</th>
<th>TC</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLAT Total</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = 0.008</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.024</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part I</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = 0.007</td>
<td>p = 0.024</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.013</td>
<td>p = 0.010</td>
<td>p = 0.009</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.009</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.002</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = 0.003</td>
<td>p = 0.002</td>
<td>p = 0.002</td>
<td>p = 0.067</td>
<td>p = 0.007</td>
<td>p = 0.007</td>
<td>p = 0.003</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = 0.103</td>
<td>p = 0.054</td>
<td>p = 0.404</td>
<td>p = 0.137</td>
<td>p = 0.060</td>
<td>p = 0.330</td>
<td>p = 0.270</td>
<td>p = 0.351</td>
<td>p = 0.220</td>
<td>p = 0.127</td>
<td>p = 0.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = 0.018</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.052</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
<td>p = 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part V</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = 0.004</td>
<td>p = 0.077</td>
<td>p = 0.011</td>
<td>p = 0.097</td>
<td>p = 0.008</td>
<td>p = 0.005</td>
<td>p = 0.048</td>
<td>p = 0.032</td>
<td>p = 0.002</td>
<td>p = 0.016</td>
<td>p = 0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
phonetically or with missing vowels, etc.) and is asked to select a synonym from a list of alternatives. The test is highly speeded. According to the Manual accompanying the MLAT (1, p. 3), scores on this part depend to some extent on the student's English vocabulary knowledge and also measure sound-symbol association ability similarly to Part II (Phonetic Script) of the MLAT.

Several possible explanations come to mind for the lack of relationship between Part III of the MLAT and the listed subtests of the criterion instrument. One is that results are due to some characteristic in the sample which made the subjects of this study different from the population used to norm the test. Another possibility is that the criterion tests did not call on students to perform the particular ability tested by Part III, or that the ability tested does not play as important a part in learning certain language skills as original research might have indicated.

Of the five parts of the MLAT, Parts I (Number Learning), II (Phonetic Script) and IV (Words in Sentences) correlate highest with the total criterion instrument, all coefficients significant at the .01 level. Part III (Spelling Clues) does not correlate significantly with either the discrete-point or the simulated communication parts of the criterion instrument. Part V (Paired Associates) has the lowest significant correlation coefficients: .33 for TD, .24 for TC, and .31 for the total instrument.

The overall predictive validity of the MLAT with total posttest scores used as criterion was .46, significant at the .001 level.

Table 13 presents intercorrelations of the various parts of the
TABLE 13
INTERCORRELATIONS OF PARTS OF THE MLAT
N = 80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Part I</th>
<th>Part II</th>
<th>Part III</th>
<th>Part IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .001</td>
<td></td>
<td>p = .095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .363</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
<td>p = .005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .001</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
<td>p = .005</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part V</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .001</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
<td>p = .153</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 13, Part III of the test also correlated negatively (coefficient is nonsignificant) with Part V of the MLAT for this administration. On a table of intercorrelations of parts of the MLAT reported in the test Manual (1, p. 19) the authors of the test give a correlation coefficient of .17 (N = 136) and .19 (N = 101) for college males and females respectively.

Correlations: Final Course Grades with Criterion Instrument and MLAT

The final course grades were correlated with all parts of the criterion measure. As expected, all correlation coefficients were positive. They ranged from .35 (WD) to .82 (TD), all significant at the .001 level.
The final grade, when correlated with the various parts of the MLAT, showed a moderately positive correlation on all parts except Part III which yielded negative values. Again, the negative coefficient was statistically nonsignificant. Table 14 summarizes relationships between the parts of the MLAT and final course grades.

**TABLE 14**

**CORRELATIONS OF PARTS OF THE MLAT WITH FINAL COURSE GRADES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MLAT Part</th>
<th>Final Course Grade</th>
<th>P less than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part I</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part V</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Responses to Test Evaluation Questionnaire**

After the final individually administered oral test each student was asked to complete a short test evaluation soliciting reactions to the oral test and to testing procedures utilized during the quarter. The questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

One question asked the students to indicate which of the five parts on the oral test they liked best. The responses are summarized in
Table 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Oral Test</th>
<th>$E_1$</th>
<th>$E_2$</th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N = 35$</td>
<td>$N = 45$</td>
<td>$N = 80$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grammatical transformations</td>
<td>3  8.57</td>
<td>14  31.11</td>
<td>17  21.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answering questions</td>
<td>10  28.57</td>
<td>5   11.11</td>
<td>15  18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asking questions</td>
<td>11  31.43</td>
<td>13  28.89</td>
<td>24  30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>describing picture series</td>
<td>9   25.71</td>
<td>10  22.22</td>
<td>19  23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telling about self</td>
<td>9   25.71</td>
<td>7   15.55</td>
<td>16  20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>42*</td>
<td>49*</td>
<td>91*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The discrepancies in number of total responses and number of students in experimental groups is due to some students indicating more than one choice.

It is obvious that the large majority of responses (78.75%), regardless of experimental treatment, preferred communicative testing procedures to discrete-point procedures. Of the fourteen students in the discrete-point group ($E_2$) who preferred oral grammatical transformation exercises, the majority stated "previous practice with such items" as reason for this preference. The following are some other reasons given for preferring structural pattern drills to communicative use of the language:

I am lousy on vocabulary and I could do this part of oral grammatical transformations without knowing it.
I didn't have to make up an entire sentence by myself.

I did not need to recall a lot of words as most of them were given.

I can answer this part /oral grammatical transformations/ without knowing what it means.

I wasn't used to having to ask and answer questions and had a hard time trying to put disconnected pieces I have learned all together.

There is no practice for free dialog in or out of class.

The above are legitimate student reasons for preferring discrete-point items to communicative use of the language, but are they the kinds of reasons that should justify our use of these items for testing purposes?

It should be noted that the part which required students to ask questions of the test administrator received the highest number of favorable responses. However, the researcher gained the impression that this part presented most problems to many students because there were lengthy pauses between questions and other signs of discomfort.

Some reasons given for favoring "asking questions" are quoted below:

It is kind of gratifying to utter a few words and get a response.

... because I felt as though I were really communicating in French.

... because it is like a natural situation and less like a test.

I realized what it would be like to communicate with a person who didn't understand English.

... corresponded to real communicative situation.

... gave me a better chance to be active participant. I had more responsibility in interaction.
While "answering questions" was rated last in popularity by the total student sample, it appeared to the researcher to have been the easiest and quickest part, probably because of the high structure inherent in the task.

Another question on the Test Evaluation form asked the student which of the five parts on the oral test they liked least. Table 16 presents a summary of student responses.

**TABLE 16**

**STUDENT RESPONSES TO "WHICH PART OF THE ORAL TEST YOU HAVE JUST TAKEN DID YOU LIKE LEAST?"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of Oral Test</th>
<th>E₁ N = 35</th>
<th>E₂ N = 45</th>
<th>Total Sample N = 80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>grammatical transformations</td>
<td>9 25.71</td>
<td>9 20</td>
<td>18 22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answering questions</td>
<td>1 2.86</td>
<td>7 15.55</td>
<td>8 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asking questions</td>
<td>8 22.86</td>
<td>6 13.33</td>
<td>14 17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>describing picture series</td>
<td>12 34.28</td>
<td>6 13.33</td>
<td>18 22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telling about self</td>
<td>8 22.86</td>
<td>14 31.11</td>
<td>22 27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>42</strong>*</td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The discrepancy in number of responses and number of students in experimental groups is due to some students indicating no choice or more than one choice.

Contrary to the researcher's expectations, the part of the test which required the student to talk about himself was the least popular activity for the total sample. Some reasons stated for disliking this
I couldn't think of vocabulary to describe the things I wanted to. Have trouble creating expressions in French.

It is difficult to talk about oneself.

... have to do too much organizing.

I don't have much to say about myself.

The greatest agreement appeared in the students' dislike of being tested in the language laboratory. While several students commented on the value of the language lab for practice purposes, only 16% of the responding students liked to have oral tests administered in the laboratory, regardless of whether the procedure was discrete-point or communicative. Student agreement was very clear on the reasons for disliking lab tests. The general consensus was that oral tests in the laboratory are too artificial, too impersonal, and too inflexible as far as the time needs of individual students are concerned. Laboratory tests were further criticized for making students nervous, for permitting no reinforcement or feedback on whether student response was correct, and for being too distracting because of the noise made by other students.

The researcher realizes that some of the criticisms voiced against lab testing are due to test administration procedures rather than to shortcomings inherent in a language laboratory. While artificiality and impersonality in laboratory testing procedures will probably remain a problem for a long time to come, many sophisticated laboratories permit self-pacing, allowing the student to record responses at his own desired speed.

As the evaluation procedures for the simulated communication tests
throughout the quarter were based more on subjective teacher judgments than were the discrete-point tests, the researcher was interested in finding out student satisfaction with grading methods used. Forty-two students (93.33%) in the Discrete-Point Group considered grading to have been fair and objective, with only two students (4.44%) checking "sometimes unfair".

In the communicative treatment, twenty-nine students (82.86%) indicated satisfaction with scoring methods used, while six students (17.14%) checked "sometimes unfair". Two-thirds of the latter students came from one class alone.

Among comments pertaining to the testing procedures in general, several students complained about discrete-point listening comprehension tests as being too difficult and artificial and pleaded for more time on these items.

Many students expressed the need for more oral communication tests and especially for the opportunity of more communicative use of the target language in the classroom. Quoting two representative student comments, one stated: Pattern drills "are plastic exercises and I find it hard to relate this back into conversational French." Another student wrote: "I think they [discrete-point tests] limit the material too much and make it easy to concentrate on isolated points and forget the material in earlier lessons."

While this researcher expected some negative reactions to the frequency of tests administered during the quarter, more students (six versus four) expressed appreciation for the weekly tests than disliked the frequent testing. However, several students commented negatively on the intensity of the course, the amount of material covered, and teacher
expectations. Some comments are quoted below:

This should be a ten /quarter/ hour course. Much too much is expected.

Some people seem to forget that we are taking more courses than French which also require study. We are pressured to learn too much in too little time. Slow down and let us learn.

I really wanted to learn French when I first got into the course, but now I just want to get out of language for awhile. I think a language takes up too much time.

... too much too fast. No time to enjoy and use what you learn.

This writer has for some time suspected that the great attrition rate in beginning college language courses is at least in part due to the pressures and unrealistic expectations we have of our students. Few students have the motivation, energy and time to devote the necessary study and practice time to a foreign language which would enable them to live up to teacher expectations of producing faultless samples of the target language. While there was much grammatical inaccuracy in what the students were saying in the eighty oral interviews, this writer was repeatedly amazed by their ability to express themselves in the target language after just ten weeks (forty hours) of French instruction.

Chapter V of this dissertation will summarize and discuss the findings presented above and will attempt to draw some conclusions which might be of value to the classroom teacher.
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CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In Chapter I the objectives of this study were stated in the form of four questions. This writer will attempt to give tentative answers to these questions according to the findings reported in Chapter IV. The reader is reminded that the findings can only be generalized to beginning college French students with similar characteristics as those of the population involved in this study.

Question I: Does the type of classroom achievement test administered in a foreign language classroom foster the establishment of a learning set by the student which either facilitates or inhibits the development of communicative or linguistic proficiency in the target language?

To answer this question, an experimental study was conducted where the experimental treatment consisted of administering two differing types of weekly achievement tests to two separate groups of students in a beginning college French class. One experimental group was given ten weekly tests emphasizing discrete-point linguistic knowledge, while the other group took ten weekly tests focusing on situational communicative use of the language.

Mean scores on the criterion instrument indicated that students who had been consistently tested on discrete-point linguistic knowledge during
the quarter scored significantly higher on discrete-point tests measuring the listening comprehension skill \((p < .001)\), and the reading and writing skills \((p < .05)\) than did those students who had been consistently tested with simulated communication items. Mean differences were 14.25 on the discrete-point listening comprehension subtest, 8.19 on the discrete-point reading subtest, and 15.49 on the discrete-point writing subtest. The highly significant findings on the communicative listening comprehension subtest should, however, be interpreted with caution, as a test of ANOVA indicated that differences in mean scores on this subtest might have been due to instructor variation.

Although the Discrete-Point Group also achieved a higher mean on the discrete-point speaking test (mean difference: 4.85), this difference was not significant.

The Communication Group achieved higher mean scores on all simulated communication subtests, the mean differences being 4.40 on the simulated communication listening comprehension subtest, 6.47 on the simulated communication reading subtest, 2.52 on the simulated communication writing subtest, and 4.61 on the simulated communication speaking subtest. In no instance, however, was this difference statistically significant.

In summary, it can be said that the Discrete-Point Group performed consistently better on discrete-point tests and the Communication Group performed consistently better on simulated communication tests. However, these differences were only statistically significant on the listening comprehension, reading, and writing subtests, favoring the Discrete-Point Group.
Question I can therefore be answered in the affirmative: Classroom achievement tests as defined and administered in this study seemed to have promoted the establishment of a learning set which affected achievement. Discrete-point tests appeared to be superior to simulated communication tests in fostering in the student an awareness of discrete linguistic elements of the language in the listening comprehension, reading, and writing skills. The simulated communication test treatment did not significantly increase achievement on the simulated communication subtests of the criterion instrument. It appeared that the Discrete-Point Group's communicative ability, although somewhat lower in mean performance on all skill subtests, was not greatly affected by the fact that their test taking experience during the quarter consisted solely of discrete-point linguistic items.

The above findings are difficult to interpret. Several possible factors could have contributed to the direction of the significant findings in favor of the discrete-point group only, and a number of plausible explanations for the lack of significant findings in favor of the Communication Group on tests of simulated communication ability come to mind.

The reader is reminded that instruction in the four classes involved in the experiment was predominantly a modified audio-lingual approach, emphasizing discrete-point knowledge, without giving extensive specific training and practice to communicative use of the language. Therefore, to some extent at least, there was a lack of congruency between what was taught and what was tested for the Communication Group.

Furthermore, there was much more item variation in tests administered to the Communication Group than there was in the discrete-point tests
administered to the Discrete-Point Group. It was the researcher's intent to develop a variety of procedures and techniques to test communicative competence. This ambition might have negatively affected the results of the study, for while there was a definite predictability of testing procedures on discrete-point tests, students in the Communication Group were frequently subjected to new testing procedures. (In fact, there were some student complaints due to the frequently changing nature of the simulated communication testing procedures.) This variety of procedures might have influenced results in favor of the Discrete-Point Group by providing extensive practice on the type of items students had to perform on the discrete-point portion of the final test.

Another contributing factor might have been that communication per se cannot be easily reviewed or practiced alone by the student in preparation for a test, while discrete vocabulary or grammatical elements can be reviewed and memorized with ease.

In addition, situational settings (content) of simulated communication tests could not be predicted by the students as well as content on discrete-point tests.

Also, language use in a communicative situation (e.g., answering questions relating to "real" phenomena, comprehending situationally bound information, relating information on something experienced, obtaining information needed to complete a task, etc.) might conceivably be a more "natural" or familiar skill, a skill students make daily use of in their native language. Students probably need less systematic practice in order to understand the mechanics of such items, while discrete-point tasks (e.g., a dehydrated sentence or transformation exercise) often require
students to possess certain special test taking skills. The Communication Group did not have much opportunity to develop these test taking skills during the quarter.

In relating the findings of this study to other research on the effect of testing on learning, it should be remembered that the treatment did not strictly contrast selection (multiple-choice) tests with free response (essay) tests as did the studies reported in Chapter III. Discrete-point items testing the productive skills also required the student to respond without given multiple-choice cues, though the responses were more highly structured and totally controlled. However, if the research findings reported in Chapter II which suggest that items testing higher cognitive levels enhance achievement can be generalized to this study, a rather heretical possibility comes to mind in explaining the findings of this study which exclusively favored discrete-point testing. Could it be, that, in a testing situation, some discrete-point tasks require equal or more analytical and intellectual activity on the part of the student than do some items testing communicative ability? In other words, could certain discrete-point items be actually of equal or higher complexity than certain simulated communication items?

Valette and Disick (6), in their adaptation of Bloom's Taxonomy (1) to foreign language learning, generalize that discrete-point activities are simpler than communicative language use. According to their taxonomy, most discrete-point test items utilized by the researcher would fall into the "simpler" performance categories of Mechanical Skills, Knowledge, and Transfer, rather than into the more complex mental activity of Communication (Category 4) required by the simulated communication test items.
It might, however, be an oversimplification of mental processes to classify all discrete-point tasks as "lower" mental activities and all communicative tasks as "higher" ones. In principle, it seems logical to assume that communicative language use which requires the student to give a situationally appropriate response by selecting words and structures from his mental repertory is a more complex mental activity than is discrete-point language use, where the student simply manipulates given forms in isolated sentences. However, the conditions under which an activity is performed (e.g. practice versus testing) or the type of discrete-point or communicative activity performed might also make a difference as to what mental processes are involved in responding. An item, though communicative (e.g. routine greetings), could under certain conditions conceivably require less complex mental functions than a discrete-point item (e.g. a dehydrated sentence exercise).

The student performing in a communicative situation might be aided by having situational continuity and redundancy which help him establish a set of expectations. On the other hand, the student performing discrete-point linguistic tasks needs to change his frame of reference from one item to the next. Further, the student performing in a communicative situation has greater freedom in selecting those words and grammatical structures he is familiar with (at least in the productive skills), while the student performing a discrete-point activity has no choice as to linguistic elements in his response.

The above attempts at explaining the findings of this study are at this time merely speculations which will need verifying through further research.

What implications do the findings of this study hold for the class-
room teacher? It seems safe to conclude that discrete-point tests are superior to simulated communication tests in developing a learning set which makes students more aware of structural elements of the language. However, there appears to be a consistent trend throughout the findings of this study indicating that students do better on those skills which have been consistently tested, and that testing in general has an influence on learning.

If a major goal in foreign language instruction is control of grammatical structures and correct language use is an important consideration, it seems that discrete-point testing methods are superior in helping achieve this goal. If communicative ability (with major emphasis on meaning rather than grammatical accuracy) is the major aim of instruction, simulated communication tests tend to increase this kind of achievement. (The reader is reminded that in spite of all the factors mentioned above which could have negatively influenced student performance on simulated communication tests, students in the Communication Group achieved consistently higher mean scores on simulated communication tests than did students in the Discrete-Point Group.) If our aim in language instruction is one of enabling the student to communicate in the target language with a relative degree of correctness and a relative awareness of grammaticality, both abilities, linguistic and communicative, need to be tested.

A second objective of this study was to gain some insight into the relationship between linguistic and communicative competence. Question II in the "Objectives" section of this dissertation asked: What is the relationship between linguistic and communicative competence as measured by scores on tests of linguistic and communicative ability?

An answer to this question was attempted by correlating individual
student scores on the discrete-point and simulated communication sub-
tests of the criterion instrument in the listening comprehension,
reading, writing, and speaking skills. According to the results of this
study, the answer to the question is unambiguous. There is a clear
positive relationship between linguistic and communicative competence
as measured by the subtests of the final examination. Correlation coef-
ficients were .31 for the listening comprehension subtests, .50 for the
reading subtests, .43 for the writing subtests, and .68 for the speaking
subtests. All coefficients were significant beyond the .01 level.

The correlations computed for this study were somewhat lower than
those reported by Carroll (2) and Clark (3), mentioned in Chapter II.

What does this relationship mean for the classroom teacher? In the
researcher's opinion, although there is a significant positive relation-
ship between the two types of ability, the coefficients are not sufficient-
ly high to use a test score on one type of test as predictor for student
achievement on the other. According to Lado (4, pp. 327-28) a correlation
coefficient of .80 indicates an adequate relationship between two measures
to justify substituting one measure as predictor for another. None of the
correlations reported for this study were above .68. These relatively
moderate relationships support previous findings by Savignon (5) that
linguistic and communicative proficiency, although interrelated, are
separate constructs which need to be taught and tested separately. The
teacher will have to measure both linguistic and communicative compe-
tence of the individual student to get dependable indicators of student
ability.

A third objective of this study was formulated in Question III in the
"Objectives" section:

**Question III:** Are simulated communication tests feasible and practical in a foreign language classroom?

Administering tests of communicative competence, as defined by this researcher, does not pose any special problems in the receptive skills and in writing as far as instructional time and facilities are concerned. These tests can be given individually as well as to conventionally-sized classes during conventionally-scheduled periods.

Speaking presents a somewhat different case, in that communicative speaking tests often need to be administered individually or in small groups. Any realistic dialogue situation involving the speaking and listening skills simultaneously, necessitates, of course, a one-to-one interaction. However, the monologue procedures used in the simulated communication treatment tests after Lessons Five and Nine (see Appendix B) can easily be given to a group of students in the language laboratory. But, as has been mentioned previously, the great majority of students involved in this study appeared to dislike intensely oral language tests administered in the language laboratory.

Interrater reliability computed for two judges for each simulated communication subtest was adequately high (1.00 for listening comprehension; 1.00 for reading; .92 for speaking; and .76 for writing) to indicate that interjudge agreement on tests of communicative competence does not present a major problem. However, the scorers of a communication test need specific training and instructions to arrive at a highly consistent agreement in scoring.

Grading tests of communicative competence appeared to be more time
consuming than scoring discrete-point tests, especially in the productive skills. To investigate the possibility of decreasing scoring time on the simulated communication speaking test correlations were computed for the four criteria utilized in the evaluation process. Table 17 reports correlation coefficients for the scales used.

TABLE 17
INTERCORRELATIONS ON CRITERION SCALES USED TO EVALUATE SIMULATED COMMUNICATION SPEAKING SUBTEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Comprehensibility</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Communi-</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Communi-</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All values reported were significant at the .001 level.

Correlation coefficients were positive in all cases, the highest correlation occurring between the Quality of Communication and Comprehensibility scales, the lowest between the Quality of Communication and Amount of Communication scales.

These relatively high correlations could suggest that the criteria used for evaluating communicative speaking might be collapsed and that three scoring dimensions (Amount of Communication, Quality of Communication, and Fluency) might be sufficient as scoring criteria, thereby saving some time in the evaluation process.
The researcher also attempted to find more efficient procedures for scoring the communicative writing test. She simply counted the number of comprehensible bits of information given by a student on the writing test and correlated this score with the more comprehensive writing score described in Chapter III. While there was a significant positive correlation of .19 (p < .05) between the two measures, the low correlation coefficient computed does not justify the use of this simpler method of evaluation.

When the comprehensive writing score was correlated with the number of correct words written by the student, the correlation coefficient computed was .67. This coefficient appeared to be sufficiently high to warrant further investigation of this relationship for possible evaluation criteria for a communicative writing test.

Question IV in the "Objectives" section of this dissertation asked: Which type of test, discrete-point selection or simulated communication tests, do foreign language students prefer and why?

To get an indication of student preferences a questionnaire was administered to all students after completion of the final speaking test.

Student preferences were clearly for communicative procedures in oral testing (78.75). General comments implied this same preference for communicative procedures on written tests. Many students expressed the opinion that communicative tests were more realistic and more congruent with their personal objectives of what they felt they should be able to do in a foreign language class. In the researcher's opinion, this expressed preference alone is sufficient reason to include tests of communicative ability into a foreign language testing program.
Suggestions for Further Study

In summarizing the results of this research project, it should be remembered that the study was intended as an exploratory study dealing with all four skills. (Although it might have been possible to measure communicative ability in the receptive skills effectively by multiple-choice items, this researcher decided to use free response testing procedures on all skills, in order to hold testing procedures consistent throughout the experimental treatment.)

In spite of the large number of variables investigated by this study, the findings seem reasonably conclusive in suggesting that testing procedures can significantly affect achievement and that tests can be used as a learning as well as an evaluation device in the foreign language classroom. However, the findings should be considered tentative and need to be replicated under more controlled conditions, putting more stringent control on the teacher variable, the variables of instruction, and, preferably, testing one dependent variable at a time.

As the reported findings can only be generalized to beginning college French students of similar characteristics as the population involved in this study, the research should be replicated in other beginning foreign language classes to examine whether similar findings would occur with languages other than French.

In addition, the following areas are suggested for further investigation:

The experimental procedures used in this study should be replicated utilizing homogeneous groups of students at different levels of language learning. There might be an optimum time in the language learning process
when students respond more favorably to one testing procedure over another.

The study should be conducted over a longer period of time. The ten
weeks duration of this experiment might not have been sufficient to indi-
cate performance differences on all skills.

Further, it should be examined whether students of differing lang-
language aptitude and differing personality profiles respond better to one
testing method over the other.

Different communicative and discrete-point testing procedures should
be examined in detail for their relative effectiveness as teaching and
measuring devices for each of the four skills.

Another aspect of investigation could deal with finding an optimum
ratio in the use of discrete-point and communicative tests in order to
achieve optimum linguistic and communicative proficiency.

It would also be worthwhile to investigate whether students with
specific personal goals in learning a foreign language would achieve
higher with one testing procedure over the other. We assume that tests
reflect the teacher's pedagogical aims. Why not let them reflect student
aims in learning a language?

Students could be permitted to select testing procedures suiting
their own objectives in learning a foreign language. Those students
aspiring to become language teachers, or otherwise hoping to use the tar-
get language in professional dealings, might be advised to concentrate
on discrete-point testing procedures, or, ideally, be given a mixture of
discrete-point and communicative tests with an equal emphasis on meaning
and structure. Those students wanting to learn a language "for the fun of
it", for tourist purposes, or other purposes where linguistic correctness
is not of outstanding importance, might be allowed to take exclusively communicative tests focusing predominantly on meaning. Such procedures, if supported by research findings, would hold special implications for teachers who are moving toward individualizing instruction.

This researcher hopes that her study will stimulate other investigations into the use of testing as a teaching and learning device, and that it will rouse active discussions (be they challenging or supportive) among foreign language educators.
Footnotes to Chapter V


APPENDIX A

POSTTEST

1. Final Written Examination - Instructor's Copy
2. Scoring Instructions for Final Written Examination
3. Final Written Examination - Student Copy
4. Final Oral Examination - Administrator's Copy
5. Scoring Instructions for Final Oral Examination
6. Scales for Evaluating Final Oral Examination
7. Sample Copy of Evaluation Sheet for Final Oral Examination
8. Final Oral Examination - Student Copy Form A
9. Final Oral Examination - Student Copy Form B
10. Student Test Evaluation Form
I. Listening Comprehension (discrete-point item)

Read aloud instructions to Part I and clarify instructions, if necessary. Then read each item twice.

1. Est-ce que Roger aime son cours?
   a. Non, il ne les aime pas beaucoup.
   b. Non, il ne l'aime pas.
   c. Non, le professeur est formidable.

2. Quel temps a-t-il fait?
   a. Il pleut beaucoup en automne.
   b. Il fait très beau ici.
   c. Il a neigé toute la semaine.

3. Qui vous attend à la bibliothèque?
   a. C'est Paul qui m'attend.
   b. C'est Paul qui vous attend.
   c. J'attends Jacqueline.

4. Marc suit-il des cours intéressants ce trimestre?
   a. Non, ils ne suivent pas de cours intéressants.
   b. Oui, il a suivi des cours intéressants.
   c. Non, ses cours ne sont pas intéressants.

5. Dites à votre petit frère de dire la vérité.
   a. Ne mens pas.
   b. Ne monte pas.
   c. Ne mentez pas.

6. Avez-vous donné la cravate à Paul?
   a. Oui, je lui ai donné la cravate.
   b. Oui, Paul m'a donné la cravate.
   c. Oui, ils ont donné la cravate à Paul.

7. Quelle saison préférez-vous?
   a. En automne.
   b. Automne.
   c. L'automne.
8. Allez-vous me parler?
   a. Oui, je vous ai parlé.
   b. Oui, vous allez me parler.
   c. Non, je ne vais pas vous parler.

9. Quand êtes-vous venu?
   a. Pour dix minutes.
   b. Pendent dix minutes.
   c. Il y a dix minutes.

10. Avez-vous pris la chemise blanche?
    a. Oui, je les ai prises.
    b. Oui, je l'ai prise.
    c. Oui, je l'ai pris.

**KEY:** 1b; 2c; 3a; 4c; 5a; 6a; 7c; 8c; 9c; 10b; 11b; 12c; 13c; 14b; 15a; 16c; 17b; 18c; 19a; 20b;

II. Listening Comprehension (simulated communication)

Tell students to use blank space under Part II to take notes. Read aloud instructions to Part II and clarify instructions, if necessary. Read passage once, at moderate speed, leaving frequent pauses (as one would do when speaking to a foreigner). Leave a short pause for "digestion" and note-taking. Then re-read the passage, again at moderate speed with frequent natural pauses.

Je suis Jean Dupont, le frère de madame. Dites à madame que j'ai fini mes cours à la Sorbonne, et que je voudrais passer quelques jours chez les Brière. Je suis à la gare maintenant, et le train pour Grenoble va quitter Paris dans un quart d'heure. Je vais arriver à Grenoble ce soir à vingt heures.

III. Reading (discrete-point item)

**KEY:** 1a; 2b; 3b; 4c; 5a; 6a; 7b; 8c; 9c; 10c; 11b; 12c; 13c; 14b; 15a; 16c; 17b; 18c; 19a; 20b;

IV. Reading (discrete-point item)

**KEY:** 1a; 2c; 3b; 4a; 5c;
V. Reading (simulated communication)

Read aloud instructions and clarify, if necessary. Then hand out reading passage on attached sheet of paper. Give students four minutes to read the passage and then collect it again.

VI. Writing (discrete-point item)

**KEY:**

1. du
2. de
3. depuis
4. aux (des)
5. en (de l')
6. du (le)
7. Quelle
8. d'
9. moins
10. dites

VII. Writing (discrete-point item)

Make certain students understand instructions.

**KEY:**

1. (Hier) j'ai fini la leçon (hier).
2. Ils vont venir ce soir.
3. Avez-vous votre (vos) cahier(s)?
4. Quels livres avons-nous finis?
5. Il a acheté assez de stylos.

VIII. Writing (discrete-point item)

Make certain students understand instructions.

**KEY:**

1. Tu as été à Washington hier.
   Accept: Tu es à Washington depuis hier.
2. Je viens d'arriver.
3. Vous avez vendu votre (une) (l') (cette) auto hier.
4. Aime-t-elle la viande?
5. Ces hommes ont beaucoup d'argent.
IX. Writing (simulated communication)

Make certain students understand instructions. The students' résumé should include a minimum of ten points of information:

1. name or sex
2. place of birth (general or specific)
3. date of birth (general, e.g. "en 1950" or "il y a 20 ans", etc.)
4. present address (accept anything possible and comprehensible)
5. profession (for most: students)
6. university (universities) attended
7. how long student has studied French
8. how long student has been in Switzerland
9. how well student speaks French
10. what other languages student speaks
I. Listening Comprehension (discrete-point)

Key: 1b; 2c; 3a; 4c; 5a; 6a; 7c; 8c; 9c; 10b;

Give one point for each correct response. Convert into percentage.

II. Listening Comprehension (simulated communication)

The following points of information should be included in the students' summary of the telephone message. Give one point for each item of information, no matter in what order given or how it is stated. Do not count errors in information.

Information Items: Mrs. Brière's brother

Jean Dupont (Jean) (John)

finished courses

at Sorbonne (at the university)

wants to spend several days (some time) with

Brières (with the family) (in Grenoble)

is at (Paris) station (is waiting for the train)

(called from the station)

he (the train) will leave in 15 minutes (soon)

he will arrive (get to Grenoble)

tonight (this evening) (at 20:00 hours) (p.m.)

at 8 o'clock (p.m.) (20:00 hours)

Convert score into percentage
III. Reading (discrete-point item)

Key: 1a; 2b; 3b; 4c; 5a; 6a; 7b; 8c; 9c; 10c; 11b; 12c; 13c; 14b; 15a; 16c; 17b; 18c; 19a; 20b;

Give one point for each correct response.

IV. Reading (discrete-point item)

Key: 1a; 2c; 3b; 4a; 5c;

Give one point for each correct response. Add points of Parts III and IV and convert into percentage for total discrete-point reading score.

V. Reading (simulated communication)

Familiarize yourself with the attached reading passage. Then read students' summary of the passage giving one point for each of the following points of information contained in students' résumé, regardless of how the point is stated, or in what order it is stated (just as long as actions logically follow each other). Do not count errors in information.

Information Items: nice day (morning)

- springtime
- (old) man
- vacating
- in small French town (do not accept small village or city)
- takes walk
- sees sign (poster) (note)
- on small hotel (door)
- English, German and Spanish spoken here
- man is a language teacher
- likes to speak foreign languages (is happy)
- enters hotel
speaks to proprietor (owner) (hotel man) in English (do not count if either of the underlined concepts is missing)

no response
speaks German
no response
speaks Spanish
no response

man looses patience (gets mad)
asks who speaks foreign languages

proprietor responds: the tourists do

Convert score into percentage.

VI. Writing (discrete-point item)

Key: 1. du 6. du (le)
2. de 7. Quelle
3. depuis 8. d'
4. aux (des) 9. moins
5. en (de l') 10. dites

Give one point for each correct response.

VII. Writing (discrete-point item)

Key: 1. (Hier) j'ai fini la leçon (hier).
2. Ils vont venir ce soir.
3. Avez-vous votre (vos) cahier(s)?
4. Quels livres avons-nous finis?
6. Il a acheté assez de stylos.
Give one point per underlined structure. Disregard all other errors.

VIII. Writing (discrete-point item)

Key: 1. Tu as été à Washington hier. (Tu es à Washington depuis hier.)
   2. Je viens d'arriver.
   3. Vous avez vendu votre (une) (l') (cette) auto hier.
   4. Aime-t-elle la viande?
   5. Ces hommes ont beaucoup d'argent.

Give one point per underlined structure. Disregard all other errors.
Add scores for Parts VI, VII, and VIII and convert into percentage.

IX. Writing (simulated communication)

Count one point for each independent comprehensible utterance which adds new information, regardless of length or form of sentence. Disregard errors of spelling or syntax unless they interfere with meaning.
Do not count an utterance if it is ambivalent (e.g. this sometimes happens with tense use and use of pendant and depuis), inconsistent or contradicts something said previously.

Examples of points of information worth one point each:

- name or general identification (e.g. Je suis une étudiante américaine.)
- place of birth (general or specific)
- date of birth (general or specific) or age
- present address (accept anything possible and comprehensible)
- profession
- university (universities) attended
- how long student has been in Switzerland
- how long student has studied French
- how well student speaks French
- what other languages student speaks (count all other languages given as 1 point)
If student adds unsolicited information not listed above, add one point for each comprehensible relevant extra bit of information supplied.

A. Count all bits of information attempted by student.
Subtract incomprehensible bits of information given.
Convert score into percentage of comprehensible bits of information given.

B. For each student résumé count every word and number except English words, names of persons, cities, streets and universities (hyphenated or compound numbers count as one word).

C. For each student résumé count each spelling error. A spelling error is defined as any mistake within a word (including morphological errors). Do not count missing accent marks, missing hyphens or capitalization of words as mistake. Misspelled compound numbers count one point.
Subtract spelling errors from total number of words written.
Convert score into percentage of correctly written words.

D. Count the syntactic errors in student's passage. A syntactic error is defined as any mistake in word order, omission of a word, etc. Count only one syntactic error per point of information attempted by student.
Subtract the number of syntactical errors from the number of points of information attempted by the student. Convert the score into percentage of syntactically correct items of information given.

E. Add percentages arrived at in C. and D. and divide by two.

F. Add percentages arrived at in A. and E. and divide by two. This average percentage of points of comprehensible information and linguistic correctness is the final writing score.
French 101A
Final Examination

I. Listening Comprehension

You will hear a spoken statement followed by three possible responses. Choose the best response and circle the corresponding letter on this answer sheet. You will hear each item twice.

1. a  b  c
2. a  b  c
3. a  b  c
4. a  b  c
5. a  b  c

6. a  b  c
7. a  b  c
8. a  b  c
9. a  b  c
10. a  b  c

II. Listening Comprehension

Imagine you are spending the spring quarter in Grenoble, France, with a student exchange program. You are living with a French family, M. and Mme Brière. While the family is absent, you receive a telephone call. You try to convince the caller with: "Je ne parle pas bien le français et M. et Mme Brière ne sont pas là!", but the caller insists that you take an important message. Listen to the message. It will be repeated twice. You may take notes, if you wish. After the caller "hangs up", write out the message you will give to the Brières. Write in English. You will be evaluated on having understood the essential points of information. Be sure to include all important details.

Notes:
III. Reading

Circle the letter which corresponds to the best completion for each sentence.

1. Nous ____ fini de bonne heure.
   a. avons
   b. sommes
   c. allons

2. As-tu cherché ____?
   a. à Pauline
   b. tes chaussettes
   c. pour tes chaussettes

3. Ils sont allés ____ concert.
   a. à la
   b. au
   c. aux

4. Elle est ____
   a. une étudiante
   b. étudiant
   c. étudiante

5. ____ saison préfères-tu?
   a. Quelle
   b. Quels
   c. Quel

6. ____ école est très loin d'ici.
   a. Cette
   b. Cet
   c. Ce

7. Elles ne sont pas ____.
   a. rentrés
   b. venues
   c. parlé
8. Je n'ai pas mangé ____.
   a. des haricots
   b. haricots
   c. de haricots

9. Ils viennent ____.
   a. fini
   b. finir
   c. de finir

10. Je _____ ai donné des fleurs.
    a. les
    b. leurs
    c. leur

11. C'est un ____ homme.
    a. beau
    b. bel
    c. beaux

12. Qu'est-ce qu'elles ont ____?
    a. dit
    b. dites
    c. dit

13. Est-elle ____ Madrid?
    a. au
    b. en
    c. à

    a. ton
    b. ma
    c. de la

15. Merci, j'ai assez ____ eau.
    a. d'
    b. de l'
    c. l'

16. Tu ____ sorti en retard.
    a. as
    b. vas
    c. es

17. Je déteste ____.
    a. pommes frites
    b. les pommes frites
    c. des pommes frites
18. Voilà les robes qu'elle a _____.
   a. pris
   b. prise
   c. prises

19. Il neige ____ hiver.
   a. en
   b. au
   c. à l'

20. Demandez ____ de venir chez nous.
   a. Henri
   b. à Henri
   c. de Henri

IV. Reading

Circle the letter which corresponds to the best response to each question.

1. Vous avez vendu votre auto?
   a. Oui, je l'ai vendue.
   b. Oui, je la vends.
   c. Oui, je l'ai vendu.

2. Depuis quand voyez-vous Monique?
   a. Elle est étudiante depuis hier.
   b. Je les ai vus pendant quatre ans.
   c. Il y a trois jours que je la vois.

3. Avez-vous vu cet hôtel?
   a. Non, je ne les ai pas vus.
   b. Non, je ne l'ai pas vu.
   c. Non, je ne l'ai pas vue.

4. Parle-t-il souvent au professeur?
   a. Oui, il lui parle souvent.
   b. Oui, il leur parle souvent.
   c. Oui, il nous parle souvent.

5. Quel temps fait-il?
   a. Il est huit heures.
   b. Il étudie.
   c. Il pleut.
V. Reading

You will be given a reading passage. Read it twice and take notes on the content in the space provided below. You will not have time for a word-by-word translation of the passage. Just jot down the essential facts of the story. After four minutes your instructor will collect this reading passage. On this sheet below, summarize in English the content of the story.

Notes:

Summary: __________________________________________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
__________________________
C'est un beau matin de printemps. Un vieux monsieur qui passe ses vacances dans une petite ville française fait une promenade en ville. Sur la porte d'un petit hôtel il voit une affiche* qui dit:

ICI ON PARLE ANGLAIS, ALLEMAND ET ESPAGNOL.

Le vieil homme est très content. Il est professeur de langues et il aime bien parler les langues étrangères. Il entre dans l'hôtel et commence à parler au patron en anglais. Le patron ne le comprend pas. Ensuite il parle au patron en allemand. Le patron ne répond pas non plus. Maintenant le vieux professeur essaie de parler en espagnol, mais le patron ne lui donne pas de réponse.

Finalement le vieux professeur perd patience. Il dit: "Ecoutez, monsieur, qui parle anglais, allemand et espagnol ici?"

Le patron le regarde et lui répond sans hésitation: "Mais ce sont les voyageurs à l'hôtel."

* une affiche - a sign (poster)
VI. Writing

In each of the following sentences write a SINGLE French word which correctly completes the sentence.

1. La pharmacie est à côté _________ restaurant.
2. Ils changent _________ train ici.
3. Elle est malade _________ hier.
4. Elle ne veut pas parler _________ autres.
5. Mes amis sont _________ Angleterre.
6. Apportez-nous _________ vin.
7. _________ maison préférez-vous?
8. J'ai beaucoup _________ amis.
9. Il est sept heures _________ le quart.
10. Vous ne _________ pas la vérité.

VII. Writing

Rewrite the following sentences using the word or words in parentheses. Be sure to make all necessary changes.

e.g. Où travailles-tu? (vous) _________ Où travaillez-vous? _________
1. Je finis la leçon. (hier) __________________________
2. Je vais venir ce soir. (ils) __________________________
3. As-tu ton cahier? (vous) __________________________
4. Quelle leçon avons-nous finie? (livres) ______________
5. Il a acheté quelques stylos. (assez) ______________
VIII. Writing

With each of the following groups of words, you are to write a complete sentence. Be sure to make all necessary changes.

e.g. voilà/ photos/ tu/ prendre/ hier. Voilà les photos que tu as prises hier.

1. Tu/ être/ Washington/ hier. ______________________________

2. Je/ venir/ arriver. ______________________________

3. Vous/ vendre/ auto/ hier. ______________________________

4. Aimer/ elle/ viande? ______________________________

5. Ces/ homme/ avoir/ beaucoup/ argent. ______________________________
IX. Writing

After travelling in Europe for the summer, you end up in Genève, Switzerland, totally broke and forced to look for a job. You come across the following ad in the newspaper La Tribune de Genève:

Mesdemoiselles, Messieurs

désidez-vous une profession avec avancement rapide ?
Une Compagnie internationale américaine cherche des

Nous offrons :  
— une formation complète et messieurs
— une situation intéressante
— un portefeuille important

Nous demandons :
— le sens des responsabilités et des contacts humains
— nationalité suisse ou permis C
— âge idéal : 25-35 ans.

Arthur MURRAY Studio
2, cours de Rive (de étage)  
De 10 à 12 h. et de 14 h. à 18 h.  
2197 Te

Note: permis C refers to a Swiss working permit for foreign nationals.

You decide to apply for the advertised position.

In order to be considered for the job, you have to submit a short résumé in French 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:

who you are
when and where you were born
where you live at present (use your imagination)
profession
what university you attended
how long you have studied French
how long you have been in Switzerland
how well you speak French
what other languages you speak

continue on back, if necessary
FINAL ORAL EXAMINATION
ADMINISTRATOR'S COPY

Put the student at ease with some sympathetic comments. Read aloud general instructions on Student Copy and clarify, if necessary.

ROTATE THE TWO FORMS OF THE TEST AFTER USING EACH FORM TWICE IN A ROW.

WATCH THE TIME!

Do not use any English during a test.

Part I - Interview (Giving Information) 4 minutes

Read aloud the instructions to Part I on the Student Copy. Clarify instructions, if necessary.

Ask each of the following questions once. Repeat, or restate, only if student requests. Be careful to keep a logical sequence of questions. If a student's answer warrants, reword a question to preserve coherence in your dialog with the student.

FORM A

1. Depuis quand étudiez-vous le français?
2. Est-ce que vous aimez le français?
3. Pourquoi? (Pourquoi pas?)
4. Est-ce que vous étudiez beaucoup?
5. Combien de leçons avez-vous apprises?
6. Parlez-vous aussi espagnol?
7. Généralement, où prenez-vous le déjeuner?
8. Qu'est-ce que vous prenez comme déjeuner?
9. Quelle est votre boisson préférée?
10. Qu'allez-vous passer ce weekend?
FORM B

1. Depuis quand êtes-vous à l'université?
2. Est-ce que le français est difficile?
3. Pourquoi voulez-vous apprendre le français?
4. Comprenez-vous toujours votre professeur?
5. Est-ce que vous avez fini le livre de français?
6. Parlez-vous aussi allemand?
7. Généralement, où prenez-vous le dîner?
8. Qu'est-ce que vous prenez comme dîner?
9. Quelle est votre viande préférée?
10. Généralement, que faites-vous le soir, après les cours?

Part II - Interview (Obtaining Information) 8 minutes

Read aloud instructions to Part II on Student Copy and clarify, if necessary. Give student the prepared sheet to take notes on the information contained in your answers.

If student's question is unclear, ask him in French to repeat it. Answer each question naturally, elaborating whenever possible.

At the end of the test collect student's notes and check whether he got all essential information.

Part III - Description (Monolog) 6 minutes

Give student the appropriate form of the drawings:

Form A: La journée d'un étudiant
Form B: La journée d'une mère de famille

Read aloud instructions to Part III on Student Copy and clarify, if necessary. Give student about one minute to study drawings and organize thoughts. Do not interrupt after he starts speaking.
Part IV - Reporting (Monolog) 4 minutes

Make sure that student has appropriate form of test:

Form A: Tell about your family
Form B: Tell about your life as a student

Read aloud instructions to Part IV on Student Copy and clarify, if necessary. Give student about half a minute to organize thoughts. Do not interrupt after student begins speaking.

Part V - Grammatical Transformations 4 minutes

A. Present tense → passé composé

Instructions to student: I will give you a short sentence in the present tense. Restate it orally in the conversational past.

e.g. If I say: Je parle français.
You will say: J'ai parlé français.

FORM A
1. Il finit la leçon
3. Je ne cherche pas mon livre.
4. Habites-tu ici?

FORM B
1. Il remplit le verre.
2. Vous allez à Genève.
3. Je ne trouve pas mon livre.
4. Prépares-tu le déjeuner?

B. Noun Objects → Pronoun Objects

Instructions to student: I will give you a short sentence containing a direct or an indirect noun object. Restate the sentence by replacing the noun object by an object pronoun.

e.g. If I say: Je parle au professeur.
You will say: Je lui parle.
**FORM A**

5. Tu vois le professeur.
6. Il parle à ses parents.
7. Nous ne regardons pas nos livres.
8. Avez-vous la robe?

**FORM B**

5. Tu prends le livre.
6. Il parle à ses amis.
7. Nous ne quittons pas nos parents.
8. A-t-il la carte?

**C. Command Form**

Instructions to student: I will tell you to tell someone to do something. Give the appropriate command.

*e.g.* If I say: Dites au professeur de venir.

You will say: Venez (s'il vous plaît)!

**FORM A**

9. Dites à votre mère de prendre votre sweater.
10. Dites à la vendeuse de chercher vos photos.

**FORM B**

9. Dites à votre frère de faire son travail.
10. Dites au professeur d'apporter vos livres.

AT THE END OF THE ORAL TEST GIVE STUDENT THE TEST EVALUATION FORM TO BE COMPLETED AND LEFT ON THE TABLE PROVIDED FOR THIS PURPOSE IN 165 RAMSEYER HALL.
SCORING INSTRUCTIONS FOR FINAL ORAL EXAMINATION

Evaluate Parts I, II, III, and IV of the speaking test using the attached scales and evaluation sheet.

Add the 16 values you circled on the evaluation sheet. Convert this number into a percentage score by using 90 as the total number of points possible on the simulated communication oral test.

For Part V allot one point for each structure underlined:

FORM A

1. Il a fini la leçon.
3. Je n'ai pas cherché mon livre.
4. As-tu habité ici?
5. Tu le vois.
6. Il leur parle.
7. Nous ne les regardons pas.
8. L'avez-vous?
9. Prends mon vêtement !
10. Cherchez mes photos !

FORM B

1. Il a rempli le verre.
2. Vous êtes allé à Genève.
3. Je n'ai pas trouvé mon livre.
4. As-tu préparé le déjeuner?
5. Tu le prends.
6. Il leur parle.
7. Nous ne les quittons pas.
8. L'a-t-il?
9. Fais ton travail!
10. Apportez mes livres!

(Count 1 point for correct pronoun and 1 point for correct word order.)

(Count 1 point for correct verb form and 1 point for correct possessive adjective.)

Convert score into percentage. (Possible number of points: 20)
DEFINITION OF SCALES FOR EVALUATING
FINAL ORAL EXAMINATION

I. Fluency (adapted from FSI rating procedures)

General Definition: Fluency does not refer to absolute speed of delivery, since native speakers of any language often show wide variations 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.

Definition of each level on the scale:

1. Very many unnatural pauses, very halting and fragmentary delivery.
2. Quite a few unnatural pauses, frequently halting and fragmentary delivery.
3. Some unnatural pauses, occasionally halting and fragmentary delivery.
4. Hardly any unnatural pauses, fairly smooth and effortless delivery.
5. No unnatural pauses, almost effortless and smooth, but perceptibly still non-native.
6. As effortless and smooth as speech of native speaker.

II. Comprehensibility

General Definition: Comprehensibility refers to the ability of the student to make himself understood, to convey meaning.

Definition of each level on the scale:

1. No comprehension, couldn't understand a thing student said.
2. Comprehended small bits and pieces, isolated words.
3. Comprehended some phrases or word clusters.
5. Comprehended most of what the student said.
6. Comprehended all of what the student said.

III. Amount of Communication

General Definition: Amount of Communication refers to the quantity of information relevant to the communicative situation the student is able to convey.

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.

IV. Quality of Communication

General Definition: Quality of communication refers to the linguistic (grammatical) correctness of the student's utterances.

Definition of each level on the scale:

1. No utterances rendered correctly.
2. Very few utterances rendered structurally correct.
3. Some utterances rendered correctly but many structural problems remain.
4. Many correct utterances but some problems remain with structures.
5. Most utterances rendered correctly, only minor problems with structure.
6. All utterances rendered correctly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Comprehensibility</th>
<th>Amount of Communication</th>
<th>Quality of Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Interview (Giving Information)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Interview (Obtaining Information)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Description (Monolog)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Reporting (Monolog)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part V Grammatical Transformations

Form A

1. Il a fini la leçon
3. Je n'ai pas cherché mon livre.
4. As-tu habité ici?
5. Tu le vois.
6. Il leur parle.
7. Nous ne les regardons pas.
8. L'avez-vous?
9. Prends mon sweater!
10. Cherchez mes photos!

Score:

Form B

1. Il a rempli le verre.
2. Vous êtes allé à Genève.
3. Je n'ai pas trouvé mon livre.
4. As-tu préparé le déjeuner?
5. Tu le prends.
6. Il leur parle
7. Nous ne les quittons pas.
8. L'a-t-il?
9. Fais ton travail!
10. Apportez mes livres!
The test you are about to take is a test of how well you can communicate in French in a variety of situations. While correctness in pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary is, of course, important, in this test you will be judged on how well you make yourself understood, as well as the effort you make to express yourself. You should concentrate, therefore, not so much on speaking perfect French as on using every means at your disposal, including gestures, to express your ideas and to get your meaning across. Say as much as you possibly can in the various communicative situations of this test. Don't worry about minor mistakes. Even an occasional English word will be forgiven....

This test has five parts and will last about 25 minutes. Your answers will be recorded.

**Part I - Interview (Giving Information) 4 minutes**

The test administrator will ask you several questions about yourself. Try to give as much information as you can to each question. The more the better. If you do not understand a question you may ask in French to have it repeated.

**Part II - Interview (Obtaining Information) 8 minutes**

Ask the test administrator appropriate questions to obtain the information requested below. Take short notes on the test administrator's answers, as you will be evaluated partly on how well you make yourself understood and partly on how well you understand the reply. (Use the sheet you will be given for taking notes.)

Find out: where the test administrator comes from
how long she has been in Columbus
what she is doing in Columbus
where she learned to speak English
where she is living in Columbus
whether she has any brothers or sisters
whether she likes the U.S.
anything else you'd like to know
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Part III - Description (Monolog) 6 minutes

You will see a series of drawings which tell a little story about

A DAY IN THE LIFE OF PAUL, A COLLEGE STUDENT.

Take a minute to look over the drawings and to organize your thoughts. Then tell the story in French. Say as much as you can. Use your imagination to add whatever details you wish, even though they might not be pictured. You will not be interrupted.

Part IV - Reporting (Monolog) 4 minutes

Imagine you are spending your summer vacation in France and are living with a French family. Your hosts would like to know a little about your family background. Take a moment to organize your thoughts. Then talk about your family in as much detail as you can, e.g. include how many family members there are, what they do, where they live, who you like best, etc. You will not be interrupted.

Part V - Grammatical Transformations 4 minutes

The test administrator will say several short sentences and ask you to restate these sentences making some grammatical change.

  e.g. You might be asked to change a sentence in the present tense to the conversational past, or to replace a noun object by a pronoun object, etc.

Say what your instructor tells you to say.
La Journée d'un Étudiant

1. \[ \text{Lum} \]
2. \[ \text{La mère, le père, 2 enfants} \]
3. \[ \text{LUMS} \]
4. \[ \text{Bain de soleil} \]
5. \[ \alpha = [a + b] \]

6. \[ \text{Bibliothèque} \]
7. \[ \text{Le fleuriste} \]
8. \[ \text{Miroir} \]
9. \[ \text{Restauration} \]
10. \[ \text{Censored} \]
11. \[ \text{Étudiant} \]

drawn by Jay Kealey
Sheet for Taking Notes on Part II of Oral Examination
FORM A
Notes for Part II (Interview - Obtaining Information)

where the test administrator comes from

how long she has been in Columbus

what she is doing in Columbus

where she learned to speak English

where she is living in Columbus

whether she has any brothers or sisters

whether she likes the U.S.

anything else you'd like to know
The test you are about to take is a test of how well you can communicate in French in a variety of situations. While correctness in pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary is, of course, important, in this test you will be judged on how well you make yourself understood, as well as the effort you make to express yourself. You should concentrate, therefore, not so much on speaking perfect French as on using every means at your disposal, including gestures, to express your ideas and to get your meaning across. Say as much as you possibly can in the various communicative situations of this test. Don't worry about minor mistakes. Even an occasional English word will be forgiven....

This test has five parts and will last about 25 minutes. Your answers will be recorded.

Part I - Interview (Giving Information) 4 minutes

The test administrator will ask you several questions about yourself. Try to give as much information as you can to each question. The more the better. If you do not understand a question you may ask in French to have it repeated.

Part II - Interview (Obtaining Information) 8 minutes

Ask the test administrator appropriate questions to obtain the information requested below. Take short notes on the test administrator's answers, as you will be evaluated partly on how well you make yourself understood and partly on how well you understand the reply. (Use the sheet you will be given for taking notes.)

Find out: where the test administrator was born how long she has lived in the U.S. what she is doing at the university where she learned to speak English whether she lives far from the university whether her parents also live in the U.S. whether she is going to stay in the U.S. anything else you'd like to know
Part III - Description (Monolog) 6 minutes

You will see a series of drawings which tell a little story about

A DAY IN THE LIFE OF MME DUPONT, A HOUSEWIFE.

Take a minute to look over the drawings and to organize your thoughts. Then tell the story in French. Say as much as you can. Use your imagination to add whatever details you wish, even though they might not be pictured. You will not be interrupted.

Part IV - Reporting (Monolog) 4 minutes

Imagine you are spending your summer vacation in France and are living with a French family. Your hosts would like to know a little about life at a U.S. university. Take a moment to organize your thoughts. Then talk about your life as a student in as much detail as you can, e.g. include how many courses you take, what courses you take, where you live, what you do for entertainment, etc. You will not be interrupted.

Part V - Grammatical Transformations 4 minutes

The test administrator will say several short sentences and ask you to restate these sentences making some grammatical change.

   e.g. You might be asked to change a sentence in the present tense to the conversational past, or to replace a noun object by a pronoun object, etc.

Say what your instructor tells you to say.
where the test administrator was born

how long she has lived in the U.S.

what she is doing at the university

where she learned to speak English

whether she lives far from the university

whether her parents also live in the U.S.

whether she is going to stay in the U.S.

anything else you'd like to know
La journée d'une mère de famille

1. Enfant dormant
2. Famille à table
3. Child on bus
4. Woman driving car
5. Lazarkus building
6. Clothing and accessories
7. Woman with bonnet
8. Woman offering money
9. Restaurant
10. Woman in car

drawn by Jay Kealey
STUDENT TEST EVALUATION FORM

Have you studied French before this quarter?  yes  no
If yes, where did you study French previously?  High School  college
other (explain) _______
How long have you studied French before this quarter? ____________
Is French spoken in your home?  yes  no  By whom? ______________
Have you travelled or lived in a French-speaking country?  yes  no
If yes, for how long? ________________

We are trying to improve the testing program for beginning French classes
and would very much appreciate your answers to the questions below.
Please be frank. Your comments will in no way affect your grade.

1. Which part of the oral test you have just taken did you like best?
   (Check appropriate category.)
   ____ grammatical transformations (last part of test, where test adminis­
trator gave a sentence and asked you to restate it in past tense, etc.)
   ____ answering questions asked by the test administrator
   ____ asking questions and getting information from the test administra­
tor
   ____ describing the picture series
   ____ telling about some aspect of your life

Why did you like the checked part best?
2. Which part of the oral test you have just taken did you like least? (Check appropriate category.)

____ grammatical transformations
____ answering questions asked by the test administrator
____ asking questions and getting information from the test administrator
____ describing the picture series
____ telling about some aspect of your life

Why did you like the checked part least?

The following questions pertain to the chapter and oral tests you took during the quarter.

1. Of the 4 oral tests administered during the quarter, which test did you prefer? (Check appropriate category.)

____ the oral tests taken individually with instructor
____ the oral tests taken in the language laboratory

2. Why did you prefer the checked testing procedure over the other?

3. Check your reaction to the weekly chapter tests you took during the quarter.

____ tests were generally too easy
____ tests were generally of the right difficulty
____ tests were generally too difficult

____ tests were predictable (you usually knew what to expect)
____ tests were unpredictable (you usually did not know what to expect)
grading was usually fair and objective
grading was sometimes unfair
grading was often unfair and too subjective

4. Please make any other comments (positive or negative) on the testing procedures used. (Comment on specific parts of the tests, e.g. Listening Comprehension, Reading, Writing, and Cultural Information, if you wish.)

5. Do you have any suggestions for improving the French 101 testing program?
APPENDIX B

WEEKLY TESTS ADMINISTERED AS
SIMULATED COMMUNICATION TREATMENT
I. Listening Comprehension

To clarify student task for this item, have a "dry-run" with an English example.

\( e.g. \) Fred: Hi, John, do you want to go to the movies tonight?

John: No, I can't, I have to study for a final.

Fred: Too bad, I had a date lined up for you.

John: Maybe I can take the time after all.

Student summary could look somewhat like this:

Fred greets John and asks him to go to the movies tonight.
John can't go because of exams.
Fred promises a date for John and John reconsider.

(The numbers in parentheses are the points of information to be counted for grading.)

After instructions are clear, play the listening comprehension exercise on tape twice. (The text is recorded twice. No rewinding of tape is necessary.)

Text: Voice I: Ah, bonjour monsieur, comment allez-vous?

Voice II: Je vais très bien madame, et vous?

Voice I: Ça va, merci. Vous allez à Madrid demain, n'est-ce pas?

Voice II: Oui, madame.

Voice I: Est-ce que vous parlez espagnol?

Voice II: Non, je ne parle pas espagnol, mais je parle italien.

Suggested scoring: Give 3 points each for the following points of information, regardless of length and form of presentation.
1. she greets him;
2. they ask each other "how are you";
3. they are both fine;
4. she asks whether he is going to Spain (tomorrow);
5. he replies "yes";
6. she asks whether he speaks Spanish;
7. he doesn't;
8. but he speaks Italian;

Total possible: 24 points

II. Writing

Have a "dry-run" in English so students are sure to understand task.

e.g. students could say: Hi, how are you? (or, Good morning, how is life? etc.)
Where are you going?
Are you working?
I am going to a café. (I am on my way to a café, etc.)
See you later. (So long. Good bye. etc.)

Suggested scoring: Give 4 points for each correct situationally meaningful utterance regardless of length or form. Allot one point for situational applicability, one point for syntax and two points for morphological (spelling) mistakes.

E.g. If, instead of "Où allez-vous?" the student writes: Ou vous allez? he would receive
2½ points (4 minus 1 point for syntax and ½ point for missing accent in "ou").

Total possible: 24 points

III. Reading/Writing

Suggested scoring: same as in II.

Total possible: 24 points

IV. Writing numbers

Suggested scoring: 1 point for each correct number

Total possible: 8 points
V. Reading

Key:  1. yes
     2. at the "Café de Paris" in Chicago
     3. no
     4. no

Suggested scoring:  2 points for each correct item of information, regardless of length or form.

Total possible:  8 points

VI. Cultural Information

a) expected response: Shake hands and say: "Bonjour madame, comment allez-vous?"

b) expected response: Shake hands and say: "Bonjour Marie, ça va? (Comment vas-tu? Tout va bien? or anything else appropriate.)

Suggested scoring:  2 points for shaking hands and 2 points for appropriate greeting formula. (Do not count spelling mistakes.)

VII. Cultural Information

Expected response: Alcoholic beverages are served; social institution (meeting place for neighborhood, place for discussion, card playing, etc.)

Suggested scoring:  2 points each for two points of information regardless of how they are stated.

Total possible for VI and VII: 12 points

Total possible score: 100
Test — Lesson One (I)  Name: __________________________

Date: _____  Section: ______

I. You will hear twice a short conversation between two Frenchmen. Shortly summarize in written English what they are saying to each other. (3 points for each point of information correct. Total possible score: 24 points.)

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

II. Pretend you are walking across campus and are meeting a young Frenchman, Robert Dupont, whom you know from a course you are taking together. Write down what you would say to him (in French, of course!) in order to

greet him;
find out how he is, where he is going, and if he is working;
tell him that you are going to a "café";
say farewell.

(4 points for each complete utterance. Total possible score: 24 points.)

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

III. The following questions or comments are addressed to you personally. Write an appropriate (true) response in French.  (4 points per reply: 24 points.)

1. Comment ça va? __________________________________________

2. Est-ce que vous parlez russe? ________________________________

3. Est-ce que le professeur parle bien? __________________________

4. Où travaillez-vous? ________________________________________
5. Demain vous allez à Paris, n'est-ce pas?

6. À tout à l'heure.

IV. You are attending a French satellite launching (they have them, you know?) Help with the countdown.
(1 point each: 8 points.)

dix, neuf, ____________, ____________, ____________, ____________, ____________, ____________, zéro.... BOUM!

V. Read the passage below and answer in writing the following questions.
Your answers may be in English or French. You will be graded solely on providing correct information.
(2 points per answer: 8 points.)


Questions:

1. Est-ce que Mme Dubois va à Chicago?
2. Où travaille Mme Dubois?
3. M. Dubois parle italien, n'est-ce pas?
4. M. Dubois travaille avec Mme Dubois?

VI. You are living in France as a student. On a shopping trip you meet a French friend, Marie Leclerc, and her mother.
(4 points for each item. Spelling mistakes will not count: 8 points.)

a) What would you do and say to properly (à la mode française!) greet the mother of Marie? (You have just met her once before.)

b) What would you do and say to greet your friend?
(Note: In the U.S. you could say to both: "Hello, how are you?"
Use an "equivalent" French form.)
VII. Briefly outline the difference between a French "café" and an American café.
(4 points)

Score (possible total 100) ____________
I. Listening Comprehension

Let students hear conversation twice.

Text: Official: Bonjour mademoiselle, vous êtes américaine?
Woman: Non, monsieur, je suis espagnole.
Official: Où habitez-vous en France?
Woman: J'habite à Bordeaux.
Official: Quand allez-vous à Bordeaux?
Woman: Je vais à Bordeaux demain après midi.
Official: Qu'est-ce que vous apportez?
Woman: J'apporte une serviette et des livres.
Official: Ah, vous êtes professeur?
Woman: Non, monsieur, je suis étudiante.
Woman: Au revoir, monsieur.

Expected answers: the woman's nationality: Spanish
her place of residence: Bordeaux
when will she go there: tomorrow afternoon
what is she carrying: a briefcase and books
her occupation: student

Suggested scoring: Give 3 points for each correct item of information
regardless of length or form of answer.
(Total: 15 points)

II. Listening/Writing

Read each question twice, giving students sufficient time to answer
in writing.
Questions:

1. Qu'est-ce que c'est?
2. Qu'est-ce que le garçon apporte?
3. Habite-t-elle en France?
4. Sont-ils catholiques?
5. Où va le garçon?
6. Elle est espagnole, n'est-ce pas?
7. Où vont les deux étudiants?
8. Qu'est-ce que c'est?

Expected Answers:

1. C'est un livre.
2. Le garçon (il) apporte deux tasses (de café).
3. Non, elle (Mme Nixon) n'habite pas en France. (Elle habite aux E.U., en Amerique, à Washington, etc.)
4. Oui, ils sont catholiques.
5. Le garçon (il) va en France.
6. Non, elle n'est pas espagnole. (Elle est américaine.)
7. Les deux étudiants (ils) vont au Canada.
8. C'est une lampe.

Note: If at any time a student should not know a point of information (e.g. nationality of Liz Taylor, or religion of Kennedys), please provide it in English. Let students know that they may ask for factual information (non-linguistic) anytime they need to, except on the items testing cultural information.

Suggested scoring: Give 4 points for each correct situationally meaningful response regardless of length or form. Again, like suggested for other written items, you may allot 1 point for situational applicability (indication of comprehension), 1 point for syntax and 2 points for spelling mistakes. (Total: 32 points)

III. Writing Numbers

Suggested scoring: 2 points per item. (Total: 10 points)

IV. Reading/Writing

Suggested scoring - same as in II. If an answer is blatantly untrue, do not give any points. If a student does not know the factual information required by a question you may give it to him (e.g. the "Rolling Stones" are British.) (Total: 28 points)

V. Reading

Expected answers: 1. in Paris
2. George's friend (a student)
3. at a café
4. no (she is a student at the Institut Politechnique)
5. to the movies
Suggested scoring: Give 2 points for each correct item of information regardless of length or form. (Total: 10 points)

VI. Cultural information

Expected answers: bread (rolls, croissants)
                 butter
                 jam
                 coffee

Suggested scoring: 5 points

Total possible score: 100
Test -- Lesson Two (I)  Name:________________________

Date:________ Section:______________

I. Listening Comprehension (3 points per item; total 15 points)

While you are listening to the following conversation, pretend you are at the custom's office at Orly airport near Paris and you overhear a conversation between a custom's official and a woman. You will hear the conversation twice. While listening, jot down in English the following information:

the woman's nationality ____________________________________________

her place of residence ___________________________________________

when she will go there (to her place of residence) ____________________

what she is carrying ______________________________________________

her occupation __________________________________________________

II. Listening - Writing (4 points each; total 32 points)

Familiarize yourself with the "drawings" below. You will hear a question about each of the numbered frames. Answer each question in written French, using the drawing as a referent for the question.

1. _______________________________________________________

2. _______________________________________________________

3. _______________________________________________________

4. _______________________________________________________

5. _______________________________________________________

6. _______________________________________________________

7. _______________________________________________________

8. _______________________________________________________

Edward Kennedy
Ethel Kennedy
Rose Kennedy
III. Numbers (2 points each; total 10 points)

Write out in French answers to the following arithmetic problems:

e.g. deux et deux = __________

1. dix et sept = __________  4. huit et huit = __________
2. neuf et dix = __________  5. trois et dix = __________
3. cinq et neuf = __________

IV. Reading - Writing (4 points each; total 28 points)

The following questions are addressed to you personally. Write an appropriate (true) response in French. Write complete sentences, please!

1. Etes-vous canadien (canadienne)? _____________________________________________
2. Où habitez-vous? ________________________________________________________________
3. Etes-vous professeur? ____________________________________________________________
4. Nous sommes aux Etats Unis, n'est-ce pas? ________________________________________

5. Le professeur arrive-t-il en retard? ______________________________________________

6. Est-ce que Brigitte Bardot est française? __________________________________________

7. Est-ce que les "Rolling Stones" sont allemands? ___________________________________

V. Reading (2 points per answer; total 10 points)

Read the passage below and answer in writing the following questions. Your answers may be in English or French. You will be graded solely on providing correct information.


Cet après midi, Georges et Mary vont au cinéma avec une autre étudiante.

* amie (friend)
** depuis (since)
1. Où habite Georges Aucoin?

2. Qui est Mary Smith?

3. Où arrive-t-elle?

4. Est-elle étudiante à la Sorbonne?

5. Mary et Georges, où vont-ils cet après midi?

VI. Cultural information (5 points)

An "American breakfast" typically might consist of juice, eggs, bacon, buttered toast and coffee. What does a "petit déjeuner" generally consist of?

Total possible score: 100
Test — Lesson Three (I)

Instructor's Copy

I. Listening Comprehension

Read the directions once, making adequate pauses between sentences so that students can follow directions on their map. Then re-read directions without pauses for a double check.

1. Vous traversez la place.
2. Vous allez tout droit.
3. Traversez l'avenue de Genève et continuez tout droit.
4. Au café, vous tournez à gauche.
5. Vous continuez tout droit jusqu'au coin.
6. Tournez à droite et Maurice est à côté du café.

Suggested scoring: Give 3 points for each direction correctly followed (up to where student gets lost).
(Total: 18 points)

II. Writing

Suggested scoring: Give 4 points for each correct direction. Allot 1 point for situational applicability, 1 point for syntax and 2 points for spelling.
(Total: 16 points)

III. Writing

Suggested scoring: Give 4 points for each correct situationally meaningful question which would elicit the requested information, regardless of length or form. Allot 1 point for situational applicability, 1 point for syntax, and 2 points for spelling mistakes.
(Total: 24 points)

IV. Reading

Expected answers: 1. with a policeman
2. in Lyon (France) (at the corner of Boulevard Raspeil and the rue Vaugirard)
3. the post-office
4. at the place de la gare (at the station)
5. no (he is American)
6. near the drugstore (pharmacie)

Suggested scoring: Give 3 points for each correct item of information, regardless of length or form.
(Total: 18 points)
V. Written Numbers

Expected answers: 1. cinquante-trois; 2. soixante et un;
3. quarante-cinq (francs);
4. soixante-cinq centimes.

Suggested scoring: 3 points per item. (Total: 12 points)

VI. Cultural Information

Expected answers: 1. (la) librairie
2. no food counter, no magazines, newspapers,
toys, clothing, etc.
3. French novelist (writer, literary figure, etc.)
of 19th century.
4. Gendarme is similar to a highway patrolman;
agent de police has duties of city policeman.

Suggested scoring: 3 points per correct information. (Total: 12 points)

Total possible score: 100
I. You and a group of students are visiting Lausanne. You are now waiting at the train station for Maurice, a Belgian student. You ask your Swiss guide, "Où est Maurice?" and he gives you directions in order to go and find him. On the attached map, follow the oral instructions with a line and mark an X at the building or store where you expect to find Maurice. The directions will be given twice. (18 points)

II. You are still in Lausanne at the train station. A Tunisian member of your group would like to go to the Restaurant Nord-Africain for lunch. Find it on your map and give your "fellow traveller" written directions to the place. (Not less than four sentences, please!) (16 points)

III. (24 points) Pretend you are meeting a young French speaking woman who has just arrived in the U.S. and you want to obtain the information asked for below. Prepare in writing the questions you will ask her to get this information:

Find out: 1. her nationality;
2. where she lives;
3. if she lives far from here;
4. if she is a student;
5. where she is going;
6. if she has a map of the city.

1. ____________________________________________
2. ____________________________________________
3. ____________________________________________
4. ____________________________________________
IV. Read the dialog between a policeman and a tourist and answer the questions which follow. You may answer in French or English. You will not be penalized for linguistic errors. Score will be based solely on correct information to the questions. (18 points)

Touriste: Pardon, monsieur l'agent, je cherche le bureau de poste.
Agent de police: Ah, vous n'êtes pas de Lyon, monsieur?
Touriste: Non, monsieur, je suis américain.
Agent de police: Le bureau de poste est loin d'ici. Voici un guide de la ville. Vous êtes ici au coin du boulevard Raspail et de la rue Vaugirard. Traversez le boulevard et allez tout droit dans la rue Vaugirard jusqu'à la place de la gare. Tournez à gauche. Le bureau de poste est à côté de la pharmacie.
Touriste: Merci, monsieur l'agent.

Questions:
1. Avec qui parle le touriste? ___________________________
2. Où sont le touriste et l'agent de police? ___________________________
3. Que cherche le touriste? ___________________________
4. Où tourne-t-il à gauche? ___________________________
5. Est-ce que le touriste est suisse? ___________________________
6. Près d'où se trouve le bureau de poste? ___________________________

V. Solve the following arithmetic problems. Write out the missing numbers in French, please. (12 points)

1. Marie a trente francs et j'ai vingt-trois francs. Nous avons ensemble* ____________ francs. 2. Le professeur a quarante-neuf francs

* = together
et vous avez douze francs. Vous avez ensemble ______ francs.
La monnaie est ______ centimes.

VI. Cultural Information (12 points)
1. What is the French name of the store where one can buy all kinds of books, maps, calendars and writing materials? ______
2. The French dictionary equivalent of "drug-store" is usually given as la pharmacie. Are the two concepts identical? If not, briefly list some differences.

______________________________

3. In one sentence identify Honore de Balzac.

______________________________

4. What is the difference between a gendarme and an agent de police?

______________________________
Plan de Lausanne

Boulevard de Zurich

- Hôtel
- Bureau de Tabac
- École
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Place de la Gare

Vous êtes ici.
First Speaking Test (I)
Instructor's Copy

Part I. Give student a minute or so to go silently over the reading passage. Then ask him to read the passage aloud. While student reads evaluate the pronunciation of the underlined phonemes and intonation patterns.

Reading Passage:

Marie est à Paris. Elle habite dans un hôtel près de la Sorbonne. Elle cherche la rue des Ecoles.
Elle parle à un agent de police: "Pardon, monsieur, où est la rue des Ecoles?"
L'agent explique que la rue n'est pas loin d'ici. Elle est là-bas à l'autre côté de la cathédrale.
Mais Marie ne trouve pas la rue. Elle décide d'acheter un guide de la ville. Elle entre dans une librairie.
Elle parle à la vendeuse: "Est-ce que vous avez un guide de Paris?" Le guide coûte trois francs cinquante. Ensuite Marie va trouver la rue.

Suggested scoring: Give 1 point for each underlined sound or intonation pattern correctly pronounced. Total possible points: 20. At the end of the loud reading use the following scale for an overall evaluation of the reading:

Pronunciation:
Phonemically accurate pronunciation throughout 5 points
Occasional phonemic error, but generally comprehensible. 4 points
Many phonemic errors; difficult to perceive meaning. 3 points
Generally incomprehensible except for isolated fragments. 2 points
Totally incomprehensible or no response. 1 point
Fluency:

Speech is natural and continuous. Any pauses correspond to those which might be made by a native speaker.  5 points
Speech is generally natural and continuous. Occasional slight stumblings or pauses at unnatural points in utterance. 4 points
Some definite stumbling, but manages to rephrase and continue.  3 points
Long pauses, unfinished utterances.  2 points
No response.  1 point

Total possible score for Part I:  30 points

Part II. A. Giving Information

Put the student at ease and create as much of a natural conversation atmosphere as possible. Tell the student you will ask him 7 questions and he is to answer in complete sentences in his best French. If a student hesitates unnaturally long with an answer, repeat the question or try to restate it. Do not repeat or restate a question more than once.

Ask each student 7 of the questions below:

1. Comment ça va ce matin? (cet après-midi) (Comment allez-vous aujourd'hui?, etc.)
2. Vous n'êtes pas français(e) (russe, canadien-ne, italien-ne, etc.), n'est-ce pas?
3. Où habitez-vous à Columbus?
4. Est-ce que vous travaillez ce trimestre? Où travaillez-vous?
5. Est-ce que vous étudiez à la maison ou à la bibliothèque?
6. Est-ce que la bibliothèque est loin d'ici? (en face de Marshon, de High Street, de l'hôtel Hilton)
7. Allez-vous au cinéma ce soir?
8. Avez-vous 50 dollars?
9. Où est la librairie?
10. Combien coûte ce livre (cahier, stylo, etc.)? Have article available which has a marked price on it, or use something in student's possession.
11. Qui est James Joyce (John Steinbeck, Hemmingway, Balzac, etc.)? Est-il français (anglais, russe, etc.)?

Part II. B. Getting Information

Refer student to "student copy" of the oral test. Let him familiarize himself with the instructions for Part II. B. Clarify directions, if necessary. Tell student to ask you in French for the information listed and to take short notes on your answers on his test sheet.
Give an appropriate answer to every question the student asks you. You are not necessarily limited to the vocabulary of the first three lessons in the book (let "common sense" guide you). Use a natural conversational tone, gestures, restatements and any other means of communication at your disposal. Try to avoid simple yes-no answers.

e.g. to question #3, "Habitez-vous près de l'université?" you could reply: "Ah, non, J'habite loin d'ici. J'habite à côté du Northland Shopping Center." or something similar.

to question #4, "Parlez-vous russe?" you could reply: "Non, malheureusement je ne parle pas russe, mais je parle français et allemand." etc.

Suggested scoring for Part II:
Use the scale below to evaluate each response in both sections of Part II. (There are 7 responses in Part II A, and 7 responses in Part II B.) Each response is worth from 1-4 points according to the scale, giving you a possible total of 28 points for each section of Part II.

4 points - appropriate, grammatically correct response delivered with good pronunciation and natural fluency.

3 points - appropriate comprehensible response with small grammatical error or shortcomings in pronunciation. Only slight hesitation in delivery.

2 points - attempt at response, faulty grammar and poor pronunciation; hesitant delivery, barely comprehensible.

1 point - attempt at response, but response incomprehensible or inappropriate.

At end of Part IIB go over the notes the student has taken on your answers to his questions. Allot

2 points - for each item containing complete essential information.

1 point - for each item containing partial information

0 points - for each item with totally incorrect information or no response.

(Possible score: 14 points)

Total score for Part II:

\[
\text{Part II. A} \quad + \quad \frac{28}{28} \quad + \quad \text{Part II. B List, Comp.} \quad + \quad \frac{14}{14}
\]
First Speaking Test (I)
Student Copy

Part I. Take about one minute to silently prepare the following passage. Then read the passage aloud naturally and in your best French. You will be evaluated on correct pronunciation of specific sounds and intonation patterns as well as on the overall fluency and pronunciation of the passage. (30 points)


Part II. A. Your instructor will ask you several questions. Answer in your best French, using complete sentences. Don't hesitate to use gestures to help you get your point across. Your instructor will ask each question only once. You may ask for a restatement of the question, but try to get by without it.
You will be evaluated on the correctness and appropriateness of each response. (28 points)

Part II. B. Now it's your turn to ask questions. In French, ask your instructor appropriate questions to obtain the following information.
Take short notes (in English or French) on the instructor's answers, as you will be evaluated partly on how well you get the questions across, and partly on how well you understand the reply. (42 points)

Find out from your instructor: 1. how he or she is feeling today;
2. whether he or she works much;
3. whether he or she lives near the university;
4. whether he or she is French;
5. whether he or she speaks Russian;
6. who Guy de Maupassant is;
7. whether he or she has change for $5.00.
Test -- Lesson Four (I)

Instructor's Copy

I. Listening Comprehension (2 points per item: 20 points)
Read each statement once only.

1. Ici il fait du soleil à minuit. Key: -
2. Le camembert est un fromage français. +
3. En été, il fait beau ici. +
4. Hélène déteste la neige et le froid. Elle aime bien l'hiver. -
5. Le film commence à 8h45. Nous sommes au cinéma, et il est 8h30. Nous sommes en retard. -
6. Il est maintenant cinq heures du matin. -
7. On prend le petit déjeuner le matin. +
8. Ici, il fait très chaud en hiver. -
9. Si vous aimez le soleil, vous aimez l'été. +
10. On fait un pique-nique quand il neige. -

II. Listening/Writing
Repeat each question twice, giving sufficient time for the students to write an answer.

1. Êtes-vous de Columbus?
2. Aimez-vous Columbus?
3. Quelle est votre adresse ici?
4. Êtes-vous étudiant?
5. À quelle université allez-vous?
6. Est-ce une bonne université?
7. À quelle heure allez-vous en classe le matin?
8. À quelle heure commence votre cours de français?
9. Qu'est-ce que vous faites cet après-midi?
10. Allez au restaurant avec moi! Quel restaurant préférez-vous?

Suggested scoring: 4 points per situationally meaningful response, regardless of length or form; allot 1 point for situational applicability, 1 point for syntax, 2 points for spelling. Possible total: 40 points)
III. Reading, 24-hour time system (2 points per item: 10 points)

Answers: 1. 6:35 p.m.
       2. 11:59 a.m.
       3. 8:49 a.m.
       4. 12:08 a.m.
       5. 3:05 a.m.

IV. Reading

Answers: 1. à Bruxelles (en Belgique)
       2. (C'est) le printemps
       3. très beau (bien chaud)
       4. une excursion (à Waterloo)
       5. Anne et Suzanne (deux jeunes filles)
       6. des sandwiches et du café
       7. Ils achètent une carte et préparent la Renault (l'auto).
       8. près de Bruxelles (en Belgique)
       9. à midi
       10. non (il préfère les petites autos économiques)

Suggested scoring: 2 points per item of comprehensible information in French, regardless of length or form. Correct spelling errors but do not count. Possible total: 20 points.

V. Cultural Information (2 points per item of information, regardless of length or form. Possible total: 10 points.)

Answers: 1. A town near Paris (with a famous castle)
       2. avoids confusion between day and night-time hours
       3. a) vingt-quatre heures; (zero heure)
          b) treize heures trente;
          c) une heure trente;
French 101A

Test -- Lesson Four (I)

I. You will hear a statement twice. Indicate whether the statement is true (+) or false (-). (2 points each: 20 points)

1. ________  6. ________
2. ________  7. ________
3. ________  8. ________
4. ________  9. ________
5. ________

II. A French student visiting Columbus asks you the following questions about your life here. Answer appropriately (truthfully) in complete French sentences. (4 points each response: 40 points).

1. __________________________________________________________________________
2. __________________________________________________________________________
3. __________________________________________________________________________
4. __________________________________________________________________________
5. __________________________________________________________________________
6. __________________________________________________________________________
7. __________________________________________________________________________
8. __________________________________________________________________________
9. __________________________________________________________________________
10. __________________________________________________________________________

III. Look at the abbreviated train schedule below. Answer each of the following questions by giving the requested times in English (indicating a.m. and p.m.) (2 points each: 10 points)
### GARE DE MARSEILLE

**HORAIRE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrivée des trains</th>
<th>Depart des trains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08h49 Lyon</td>
<td>11h59 Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12h27 Bordeaux</td>
<td>14h30 Lyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18h35 Paris</td>
<td>20h12 Cannes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22h18 Grenoble</td>
<td>23h34 Nice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24h08 Genève</td>
<td>03h05 Strasbourg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions:

1. À quelle heure arrive le train de Paris? _________________

2. À quelle heure part le train pour Paris? _________________

3. À quelle heure arrive le train de Lyon? _________________

4. À quelle heure arrive le train de Genève? _________________

5. À quelle heure part le train pour Strasbourg? _________________

*part = leaves, is leaving;

---

IV. Read the passage below and answer the questions which follow. **Answer in French.** You do not need to write complete sentences, but be sure your answer is comprehensible. You will be graded on providing correct information to the question. (2 points each response: 20 points)

Charles et Paul sont étudiants à l'université de Bruxelles (en Belgique). Nous sommes au printemps et il fait très beau. Le ciel n'est pas couvert, et il fait bien chaud.

Charles et Paul décident de faire une excursion à Waterloo (près de Bruxelles) cet après-midi. Ils invitent deux camarades, Anne et Suzanne. Les deux jeunes filles sont étudiantes aussi.


Les deux garçons cherchent les jeunes filles à midi et l'excursion commence.

*Renault = French-made car.
Questions:

1. Paul et Charles, où habitent-ils? ______________________________________

2. Quelle saison est-ce? ________________________________________________

3. Quel temps fait-il? ___________________________________________________

4. Les garçons, que vont-ils faire cet après-midi? ________________________

5. Qui va avec les garçons? _____________________________________________

6. Les deux jeunes filles qu'est-ce qu'elles préparent pour le pique-nique? __________________________________________________________________

7. Les garçons, que font-ils pour préparer l'excursion? _________________

8. Où est Waterloo? ____________________________________________________

9. À quelle heure commence l'excursion? ________________________________

10. Paul, préfère-t-il les grandes autos? _________________________________

V. Briefly answer the following questions in French or English (only information counts!) (2 points per item: 10 points)

1. What is Chantilly? _____________________________________________________

2. The French sometimes use a 24-hour system rather than the U.S. 12-hour system. Why?

   ________________________________________________________________

3. Based on the 24-hour system, how would the French say (write out the answers)

   a. midnight ______________________________

   b. 1:30 p.m. ______________________________

   c. 1:30 a.m. ______________________________
Test — Lesson Five (I)

Instructor's Copy

I. Listening/Writing

Repeat each question twice, giving sufficient time for the student to write an answer.

1. Où habitez-vous parents?
2. Quel jour est-ce aujourd'hui?
3. À quelle heure avez-vous votre cours de français?
4. Apprenez-vous le russe ce trimestre?
5. Où prenez-vous le déjeuner?

Suggested scoring: 4 points per situationally meaningful response, regardless of length or form; allot 1 point for situational applicability, 1 point for syntax and 2 points for spelling. Possible total: 20 points.

II. Reading/Writing

Suggested scoring: Same as in I.

III. Reading

Expected answers: 1. en octobre (au mois d'octobre)
2. à l'université de Strasbourg
3. non
4. un cours de littérature (française), un cours de philosophie, un cours d'histoire
   (la littérature, la philosophie et l'histoire)
5. (en) autobus
6. non
7. non
8. non
9. à la maison
10. non

Suggested scoring: 2 points per item of comprehensible information in French, regardless of length or form. Correct mistakes but do not count. Possible total: 20 points.
IV. Oral Examination

Part A - Pronunciation: Students should not spend more than 5 minutes on this part. Give about 1 minute preparation time. Then let students record themselves, or, if you wish, record whole class simultaneously. REMIND STUDENTS TO SAY THEIR NAMES TWICE WHEN THEY BEGIN RECORDING.

Marc est un étudiant français qui commence ses études à Bordeaux. Sa mère et son père sont à Lyon. Marc habite chez un cousin parisien dans un petit appartement près de la bibliothèque. Le matin il vient à l'amphithéâtre de bonne heure pour trouver une place près d'une jolie Américaine.

Suggested scoring: Give 1 point for each phoneme correctly pronounced. (10 points) At the end of the reading use the following scale for an overall evaluation of the reading: (10 points)

Pronunciation:
- Phonetically accurate pronunciation throughout. 5 points
- Occasional phonemic error, but generally comprehensible. 4 points
- Many phonemic errors; difficult to perceive meaning. 3 points
- Generally incomprehensible except for isolated fragments. 2 points
- Totally incomprehensible. 1 point

Fluency:
- Speech is natural and continuous. Any pauses correspond to those which might be made by a native speaker. 5 points
- Speech is generally natural and continuous. Occasional slight stumblings or pauses at unnatural points in utterances. 4 points
- Some definite stumbling, but manages to rephrase and continue. 3 points
- Long pauses, unfinished utterances. 2 points
- No response 1 point

Now add points received for discrete phonemes and points received for overall evaluation (Possible total: 20 points) and divide in half to get student's score for Part A.

Part B: After students have had a chance to read instructions to Part B and to familiarize themselves with the English paragraph, COLLECT THE ORAL EXAM SHEET (to discourage direct translation) page 3 of the test. Refer students to the bottom of page 2 for a list of
pertinent facts of the paragraph which they are to use in their French narrative.
Let students look over this list for about a minute and ask them to record their little stories when they are ready (or, if you wish, you can record the whole class simultaneously).

Suggested scoring: Give 1 point for each of the following points of information conveyed in a comprehensible manner, regardless of length or form. (Total possible: 15 points)

1 2 3 4
Today - Friday; spring - nice weather; Robert + girlfriend →
5 6 7 8
picnic - after classes; friends (André + Nicole) come too;
9 10 11
girls - sandwiches; boys - beer; take Robert's car; leave
12 13 14 15
university at 4:00 p.m.; soon arrive at park.

To this score for amount of information conveyed add an overall evaluation using the following scales.

Structure:
No errors of morphology or syntax. 5 points
Generally accurate structure, occasional slight error. 4 points
Some errors of basic structure, but some phrases rendered correctly. 3 points
Many errors in structure, but passage still comprehensible. 2 points
Incomprehensible because of structural mistakes. 1 point

Pronunciation:
Phonemically accurate pronunciation throughout. 5 points
Occasional phonemic error, but generally comprehensible. 4 points
Many phonemic errors; difficult to perceive meaning. 3 points
Generally incomprehensible except for isolated fragments. 2 points
Totally incomprehensible 1 point

Fluency:
Speech natural and continuous. Pauses correspond to those of a native speaker. 5 points
Speech generally continuous; occasional slight stumbling. 4 points
Some definite stumbling, but manages to rephrase and continue 3 points
Long pauses, unfinished utterances. 2 points
No response 1 point
I. Your instructor will ask you five questions. Write an appropriate answer in French. Complete sentences, please!
(4 points each response: 20 points)

1. _________________________________________________________________________
2. _________________________________________________________________________
3. _________________________________________________________________________
4. _________________________________________________________________________
5. _________________________________________________________________________

II. Pretend you are engaged in a conversation with your instructor. Write an appropriate response to whatever your instructor says. Complete sentences, please! When you have finished, this should read like a coherent dialog.
(4 points per response: 20 points)

Le professeur: Ah, je ne vais pas très bien aujourd'hui. Et vous, ça va?
Vous répondez: ______________________________________________________________

Le professeur: Quels cours suivez-vous ce trimestre?
Vous répondez: ______________________________________________________________

Le professeur: Alors, vous travaillez beaucoup?
Vous répondez: ______________________________________________________________

Le professeur: Est-ce que vous aimez le français?
Vous répondez: ______________________________________________________________

Le professeur: Vous comprenez toujours mes conférences, n'est-ce pas?
Vous répondez: ______________________________________________________________
En France, les cours universitaires commencent au mois d'octobre. Madeleine Lefèvre va suivre des cours à l'université de Strasbourg. Elle va étudier la littérature française, la philosophie et l'histoire.

Le petit frère de Madeleine ne fait pas encore d'études supérieures. Il est élève (un élève c'est un étudiant à l'école secondaire) au lycée*. Ses cours commencent aussi en octobre. Il apprend l'anglais, les mathématiques, la chimie et la physique. Il est très intelligent. Il prépare son baccalauréat**.

Le matin Madeleine et son frère prennent l'autobus pour aller en classe. Quelquefois ils arrivent en retard.

Madeleine prend le déjeuner au restaurant universitaire, mais son frère va à la maison pour déjeuner avec la famille.

*lycée = l'école secondaire

**baccalauréat = final official examination administered at the end of secondary school studies. One needs to pass it to enter university.

Questions:

1. Quand commencent les études secondaires et les études supérieures en France?

2. Madeleine où fait-elle ses études?

3. Est-ce que le frère de Madeleine suit des cours supérieures?

4. Madeleine quels cours va-t-elle suivre?

5. Madeleine et son frère comment vont-ils à l'école?

6. Est-ce qu'ils arrivent toujours de bonne heure?

7. Madeleine est-ce qu'elle quitte l'université avant le déjeuner?
8. Elle prend le déjeuner avec sa famille, n'est-ce pas? _____________

9. Et le frère de Madeleine, où va-t-il à midi? _________________

10. Est-ce que le frère de Madeleine est stupide? _________________

* avant = before

IV. Oral Examination

Part B

Wait for instructions from your teacher before doing this part of the test.

Today - Friday; spring - nice weather; Robert + girlfriend →
picnic - after classes; friends (André + Nicole) come too;
girls - sandwiches; boys - beer (la bière);
take Robert's car; leave university 4:00 p.m.; soon arrive at
park (au parc).
IV. ORAL EXAMINATION (15 minutes)

A. Take about one minute to silently prepare the following passage. Then read the passage aloud naturally and in your best French. You will be evaluated on correct pronunciation of specific sounds and intonation patterns as well as on the overall fluency and pronunciation of the passage. (10 points)

RECORD YOUR READING ON TAPE. When you begin recording, please say your name twice.

Marc est un étudiant français qui commence ses études supérieures à Bordeaux. Sa mère et son père sont à Lyon.

Marc habite chez un cousin parisien dans un petit appartement près de la bibliothèque. Le matin il vient à l'amphithéâtre de bonne heure pour trouver une place près d'une jolie Américaine.

*jolie - pretty

B. In this part of the oral test you will be asked to relate in French something you have read in English. Familiarize yourself with the following paragraph. After your initial reading, it's a good idea to mentally restate the paragraph in your own words to organize what you are going to say. After about 3 minutes, your instructor will collect this sheet, but he will give you a list of the essential facts stated in the paragraph to help you remember.

Using this fact summary sheet, tell in French a similar story as you have just read in English. Make as many sentences as you can, adding any additional information you wish, even though it might not have been in the English paragraph. Please do not make any written notes.

Record your story on tape. Please state your name twice when you begin recording. (Try not to spend more than 10 minutes on this part of the test.) 30 points.

Today is Friday. It's springtime and the weather is nice. Robert and his girlfriend are going on a picnic after classes at the university. Their friends, André and Nicole, are coming along also. The girls prepare the sandwiches and the guys buy the beer (la bière). They take Robert's car. They leave the university at 4:00 p.m. and soon arrive at the park (au parc).
Test - Lesson Five (I) Oral Examination Evaluation Sheet

Name of Student: ____________________________________

Part A

Marc est un étudiant français qui commence ses études supérieures à Bordeaux. Sa mère et son père sont à Lyon. Marc habite chez un cousin parisien dans un petit appartement près de la bibliothèque. Le matin il vient à l'amphithéâtre de bonne heure pour trouver une place près d'une jolie Américaine.

Evaluation:

(Discrete phonemes: ___ + Pronunciation: ___ + Fluency: ___)

10 divided by 2 = Score for Part A __________

10

Part B

Today - Friday; spring - nice weather; Robert + girlfriend —> picnic - after classes; friends (André + Nicole) come too; girls - sandwiches; boys - beer; take Robert's car; leave university 4:00 p.m.; soon arrive at park.

Evaluation:

Amount of information conveyed: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

Structure: 1 2 3 4 5

Pronunciation: 1 2 3 4 5

Fluency: 1 2 3 4 5

Score for Part B __________

30

Total score for Oral Exam = Part A ___ + Part B ___ = ___
I. Listening/Writing (20 points)

If you think it will be helpful, have a short "dry-run" in English to clarify instructions.

e.g. Read the following passage and ask students to jot down only what you actually order.

This restaurant here is famous for lobster. But lobster is rather expensive, so I'll settle for perch. With it, maybe some Spanish rice - or better yet, I'll have parsley potatoes and a cucumber salad. I'd love to have a cocktail, but they do not serve alcoholic drinks here. So I'll take a glass of milk.

Students should only have written the underlined words.

Instructions for administration: Read the following passage twice. Read it as "authentically" and "dramatically" as possible, with frequent pauses, "hemming and hawing..." Recommend to your students to simply listen to you during the first reading, without writing anything.

Tell students to be sure to include "quantities" ordered, such as un litre de, beaucoup de, de la, du, etc.

J'ai très faim aujourd'hui. Où est la carte? Ah, voici la carte. (Pretend you pick up the menu and are looking at it.) Il y a du bifteck, du jambon, et du rosbif. - Eh bien, je prends du rosbif.

Et qu'est-ce que vous avez comme légumes? (Pretend you are studying la carte.) - Apportez-moi des frites et des haricots verts. - Ah, j'aime bien la salade de tomates, mais je n'ai pas assez d'argent pour acheter une salade. - Comme boisson je voudrais un verre de bière, s'il vous plaît. Je n'aime pas le vin. - C'est tout.
Suggested scoring: The underlined words in the paragraph are the expected answers. Score the answers as you would a dictation, giving 1 point per correctly spelled word (count haricots verts as one word only). (Total possible score for spelling: 10 points)
In addition, give 1 point for comprehension, regardless of spelling. (Total possible for comprehension: 10 points)
If a student writes an "unsolicited" order, subtract 1 point, regardless of number of words or spelling mistakes in this unsolicited order.

II. Vocabulary/Writing

Expected answers: 2. C'est une assiette.
3. Ce sont des fourchettes.
4. C'est un couteau.
5. C'est une cuillère.
6. Ce sont des verres.
7. C'est du sel.
8. C'est du poivre.
9. C'est un litre de vin. (C'est du vin.)

Suggested scoring: Each written answer is worth 2 points (Total: 16 points). Allot 1 point for production and spelling of requested vocabulary item (e.g. assiette, fourchette), and 1 point for C'est/ Ce sont + correct article/partitif.

III. Writing

Suggested scoring: 4 points per situationally meaningful response, regardless of length or form; allot 1 point for situational applicability, 1 point for syntax and 2 points for spelling. Possible total: 28 points.

IV. Writing

Suggested scoring: Give 2 points for the verb (or verbs) in the order and 2 points for each of the four items to be ordered (you may wish to allot 1 point to partitif and 1 point to food item). Total possible: 10 points.
V. Reading

Expected answers: 1. chez M. et Mme Durrand (chez les Durrand)
                    (chez leurs amis)
  2. non (ils arrivent à 19h30 et le dîner commence à 20h)
  3. du jambon
  4. des pommes de terre, des carottes (une salade de tomates)
  5. non
  6. accept 3 or 4: du vin blanc; du vin rose; du vin; du café; de l'apéritif
  7. non
  8. oui
  9. de la politique (de l'affaire Watergate, etc.)

Suggested scoring: 2 points per item of comprehensible information in French, regardless of length or form. Correct mistakes but do not count. Possible total: 18 points.

VI. Cultural Information (3 points)

Expected answers: 1. le petit déjeuner
                    2. le déjeuner
                    3. le dîner

VII. Cultural Information (5 points)

Expected Answers: 1. l'entrée
                    2. la viande et les légumes
                    3. la salade
                    4. le camembert
                    5. le café
I. -- You are the waiter/waitress in a French restaurant. Your instructor has come for lunch and you are taking the order. Listen carefully! Write down in French only the items he/she wishes to eat or drink. You will hear the order twice. (20 points) Watch your spelling!

II. -- Identify the items in French with a complete sentence. (2 points each: 16 points)

Qu'est-ce que c'est?

1. C'est une tasse.
2. __________________________
3. __________________________
4. __________________________
5. __________________________
6. __________________________
7. __________________________
8. __________________________
9. __________________________

numbered
III. The following questions are addressed to you personally. Write an appropriate (true) response in French. Complete sentences, please! (4 points per response: 28 points)

1. Avez-vous soif? __________________________________________________
2. Qu'est-ce que vous préférez comme boisson? _________________________
3. Voulez-vous de la soupe maintenant? ______________________________
4. Votre mère aime-t-elle le thé? _________________________________
5. Avez-vous beaucoup d'argent? _________________________________
6. Prenez-vous de l'eau minérale avec vos repas? ____________________
7. Combien d'oncles avez-vous? ____________________________________

IV. Pretend you are in a French restaurant for lunch. Le garçon has greeted you and asked you "Que désirez-vous?"
Order a meal, including at least 1 meat, 1 vegetable, a salad and something to drink.
Write out everything you would say to the waiter to order your meal. (10 points)

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

V. Read the passage below and answer the questions which follow in French.
You do not need to write complete sentences, but make certain your answers are comprehensible. You will be graded on providing correct information to the questions. Spelling mistakes will not count.
(2 points each response: 18 points)

Ce soir, M. et Mme. Durrand invitent leurs amis, les Poirier. Madame est en train de préparer le dîner. Elle va préparer un repas formidable.
Il y a des hors d'œuvre variés avec du vin blanc, une soupe excellente, du jambon, des pommes de terre et des carottes avec du vin rosé, une salade de tomates, des fromages et des fruits. Plus tard, après le repas, il y a du café.
Mme et M. Poirier arrivent chez les Durrand vers sept heures et demie. Ils apportent des fleurs* pour Mme Durrand. Mme Durrand est très contente.
Avant** le dîner les hommes prennent un verre d'apéritif*** et ils parlent de la politique (de l'affaire Watergate, etc.).
Le dîner commence à huit heures. C'est une soirée splendide.

* les fleurs = flowers
** avant = before
*** L'apéritif = a sweet wine with herbal additives, taken as appetizer before dinner. (Cocktails are not as popular as in the U.S.)

Questions:
1. Où vont M. et Mme Poirier ce soir? ______________________________
2. Est-ce que les Poirier arrivent en retard? ____________________________
3. Mme Durrand, qu'est-ce qu'elle prépare comme viande? ________________
4. Qu'est-ce qu'il y a comme légumes? _________________________________
5. Est-ce qu'ils prennent du vin rouge avec le repas? _____________________
6. Combien de boissons y a-t-il? ______________________________________
7. Est-ce que les Durrand et leurs amis prennent le dîner à sept heures et demie? __________________________________________________________
8. Est-ce que Mme Durrand aime les fleurs? _____________________________
9. De quel sujet parlent les hommes? ________________________________

VI. List the principal meals of the day by their French names. (3 points)
1. Le matin on prend ________________________________________________
2. A midi on prend _________________________________________________
3. Le soir on prend ________________________________________________
VII. Put the following foods in the order most Frenchmen would eat them in during a formal meal. (5 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>la salade</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l'entrée</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le camembert</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>le café</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la viande et les légumes</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Listening Comprehension
Let students hear conversation twice.

La femme: Bonjour monsieur. Y a-t-il un train pour Strasbourg ce soir?

L'employé: Oui, madame. Le dernier train pour Strasbourg part à 19h40.

La femme: Ah bon! Je voudrais un billet de deuxième classe pour moi, et un billet pour mon petit garçon, s'il vous plaît.

L'employé: Voulez-vous des billets aller et retour, madame?


L'employé: Les voici, madame. 45 francs s'il vous plaît.

La femme: De quel quai part le train pour Strasbourg?

L'employé: Du quai douze, madame.

La femme: Est-ce que le train est à l'heure?

L'employé: Oui, madame. Le train est en gare maintenant. Il va partir dans 3 minutes.

Expected Answers: 1. to Strasbourg
2. evening
3. no (with her son)
4. one-way
5. second class
6. 45 francs
7. (platform number) 12
8. no

Suggested scoring: Give 2 points for each correct item of information, regardless of length or form of answer. (Total: 16 points)
II. Hold up each of the numbered magazine cut-outs (or put them on the board with magnets) and ask the questions below. Say each question twice.*

e.g. 1. De quelle couleur est cette auto? (show picture of VW)

2. Regardez cette vedette. Comment est-elle? (show picture of Brigitte Bardot)

Questions:

1. Comment est ce repas? (Show picture #3 of meal)

2. De quelle couleur est cette voiture? (Show picture #2 of red Simca)

3. Comment trouvez-vous ces deux hommes? (Show picture #3 of two athletes)

4. Comment sont ces fleurs? (Show picture #4 of bouquet)

5. Comment est cette ville? (Show picture #5 of New York City)

Some possible student responses:

1. C'est un (bon) (grand) repas (délicieux) (formidable).

2. C'est une voiture rouge.

3. Ce sont de(s) beaux (jeunes) hommes (sympathiques) (intéressants).

4. Ce sont de belles (jolies) fleurs.

5. C'est une (grande) (jolie) ville (intéressante). etc.

Suggested scoring: Give 4 points per response, counting at least 1 point for correct form of the adjective and 1 point for correct position of adjective.

*Note to reader: Because of reproduction difficulties the visuals utilized in Part II of the test are not included. They consisted of large pictures taken from magazines and portrayed the objects or people referred to in the questions.

III. Writing

Suggested scoring: 4 points per situationally meaningful response, regardless of length or form. Allot 1 point for situational applicability, 1 point for syntax and 2 points for spelling. Possible total: 20 points.
IV. Writing (Direct Object Pronouns)

**Suggested scoring:** 4 points per response, counting 2 points for correct form of direct object pronoun and 2 points for correct position of pronoun.

Note: Answer to question #5 should be negative.

V. Reading

**Expected answers:**
1. à Orleans
2. au guichet (à la gare)
3. en hiver
4. oui
5. elle est jolie
6. au café de la gare
7. le café
8. à 19h30
9. ?

**Suggested scoring:** 2 points per item of comprehensible information in French. Allot 1½ points for general comprehensibility and appropriateness, and ½ point for linguistic correctness.
Possible total: 18 points.

VI. Cultural Information

**Expected answers:**
1. *un billet de quai* is a platform ticket; you need it if you bring someone to a train (or similar response).

2. *un billet de première classe* is a first class ticket; you want one if you wish to have more space and comfort in the compartment. They are more expensive than a *billet de deuxième classe*.

3. *Un aller et retour* is a return ticket; you get one if you wish to return to the city of departure within a reasonable time.

**Suggested scoring:** Give 2 points for each appropriate answer, no matter how stated. Total possible: 6 points.
I. You are at the Gare de l’Est in Paris, standing in line at the guichet to buy a train ticket. You overhear the following conversation between a woman and the ticket agent. You will hear the conversation twice. Familiarize yourself with the questions below and during the second reading jot down short answers to the questions. You may write in English or French. Only information will count. (2 points each response: 16 points)

1. Where does the woman want to go? ________________________________
2. What time of day is it? (morning, afternoon, etc.) ____________
3. Is the woman travelling alone? ________________________________
4. What kind of ticket does she buy? (one-way or return) ____________
5. What class does she travel? ________________________________
6. How much does she have to pay? ________________________________
7. From what platform is the train leaving? _______________________
8. Does she have to wait a long time for the train? ________________

II. Your instructor will show you some pictures and ask you a question about each one. Answer the questions appropriately, using descriptive adjectives. Do not use the same adjective more than once. (4 points per response: 20 points)

Example: Look at picture #1 and listen to the question.

You would write: 1. C’est une auto brute.

Look at picture #2 and listen to the question.

You could write: 2. C’est une femme épatante. (or something similar)

1. ____________________________________
2. ____________________________________
3. ____________________________________
III. The following questions are addressed to you personally. Write an appropriate response in French. Complete sentences, please! (4 points per response: 20 points)

1. Où passez-vous le weekend cette semaine? ________________

2. Sortez-vous avec des amis ce soir? ________________

3. Marlon Brando, est-ce que vous le trouvez sympathique? ________

4. Mme Golda Meir, est-elle jeune? ________________

5. Quel est le neuvième mois de l'année? ________________

IV. Answer the following questions again truthfully in writing, with complete French sentences. Answer as naturally as possible, substituting object pronouns for the nouns. (4 points each: 20 points)

   e.g. To the question: Aimez-vous Marlon Brando?
       You could respond: Yes I like **him**, or No, I don't like **him**.
       (in French, of course)

1. Aimez-vous les haricots verts? ________________

2. Détendez-vous le vin? ________________

3. Invitez-vous votre ami (amie) pour le weekend? ________________

4. Comprenez-vous cette leçon? ________________

5. Commencez-vous la cinquième leçon demain? ________________

V. Read the passage below and answer the questions which follow. Answer in French. You do not need to write complete sentences, but make certain your answer is meaningful and comprehensible. Spelling mistakes will count. (2 points per response: 18 points)

Henri est étudiant à l'École de Beaux Arts. Pendant la semaine il habite à Paris dans un petit appartement, mais le vendredi il va à Orléans pour
passer le weekend chez sa famille.
Le vendredi soir, après les cours, Henri quitte son appartement avec sa petite valise. Il prend le métro pour aller à la gare. A la gare il va au guichet et achète un aller et retour de deuxième classe.
Généralement, quand Henri arrive sur le quai le train est déjà en gare. Mais aujourd'hui il est en retard parce qu'il fait très mauvais et il neige.
Le train pour Orléans part à 19h30 - sans Henri et sans la jeune fille.

*pendant la semaine = during the week
** le métro = Paris subway
*** déjà = already
**** attend = waits, is waiting

Questions:
1. Où habitent les parents d'Henri? 
2. Henri, où achète-t-il son billet? 
3. En quelle saison sommes-nous? 
4. Généralement le train est à l'heure, n'est-ce pas? 
5. Pourquoi Henri regarde-t-il la jeune fille? 
6. Les jeunes gens où vont-ils ensemble? 
7. La jeune fille préfère-t-elle la bière ou le café? 
8. Quand part le train pour Orléans? 
9. Et Henri et la jeune fille, que font-ils? (This is a conjecture question. Watch your dirty minds....)

*gens = people
VI. Briefly answer the following questions in English or French.
(2 points each item: 6 points)

1. un billet de quai, what is it and when do you need it?

2. un billet de première classe, what is it and when do you want one?

3. un aller et retour, what is it and when do you get one?
Second Speaking Test (I)

Instructor's Copy

I. Give the student a minute or so to prepare the reading passage. Then ask him to read the passage aloud.

Françoise va passer le weekend chez son oncle. /wa/, /o/

Elle va à la gare avec son amie Hélène pour acheter un billet. /a/, mute /h/

Françoise: A quelle heure part le train pour Paris?

Employé: A trois heures cinquante, mademoiselle. liaison, /ât/ no /æ/

Françoise: Est-ce qu'il est en retard?

Employé: Non, mademoiselle. Aujourd'hui il part à l'heure.

Les deux jeunes filles vont au café de la gare pour prendre une tasse de thé. Elles ont soif. liaison

Elles veulent prendre des sandwiches, mais il n'y a pas assez de temps. Le train arrive. /ɛ/

Suggested scoring: Give 1 point for each underlined sound or intonation pattern correctly pronounced (20 points). At the end of the reading use the following scale for an overall evaluation of the reading. (10 points)

Pronunciation:
Phonemically accurate pronunciation throughout. 5 points
Occasional phonemic error, but generally comprehensible. 4 points
Many phonemic errors, difficult to perceive meaning. 3 points
Generally incomprehensible except for isolated fragments. 2 points
Totally incomprehensible. 1 point

Fluency:
Speech is natural and continuous. Any pauses correspond to those which might be made by a native speaker. 5 points
Speech is generally natural and continuous. Occasional slight stumblings or pauses at unnatural points in the utterances. 4 points
Some definite stumblings, but manages to rephrase and continue. 3 points
Long pauses, unfinished utterances. 2 points
No response. 1 point
II. Giving Information

Put the student at ease and create as much of a natural conversation atmosphere as possible. Tell the student you will ask him 7 questions and he is to answer in complete sentences in his best French. If a student hesitates unnaturally long with an answer, repeat the question or try to restate it. Do not repeat or restate a question more than once.

Ask the student 7 of the questions below, preferably choosing at least 1 "conversation grouping":

1. Quels cours suivez-vous ce trimestre?
2. Quand avez-vous votre cours de ______ (name of subject)?
3. Préférez-vous votre cours de français ou votre cours de ______?
4. Avez-vous faim maintenant?
5. À quelle heure prenez-vous le déjeuner (dîner, petit déjeuner)?
6. Où prenez-vous le déjeuner (dîner, petit déjeuner)?
7. Est-ce que vous aimez préparer les repas?
8. Quelle boisson préférez-vous?
9. Combien de frères (soeurs) avez-vous?
10. Où habitent vos frères (soeurs)? ou Où habitez-vous?
11. Est-ce que votre frère est étudiant aussi? (soeur est étudiante)
12. Est-ce que vous sortez ce soir?
13. Avec qui sortez-vous?
14. Où passez-vous le weekend?
15. Est-ce que vous dormez en classe?
16. Quel temps fait-il aujourd'hui?
17. Quel temps fait-il ici en été?
18. Quel jour est-ce aujourd'hui?

III. Getting Information

Refer student to "student copy" of the oral test. Let him familiarize himself with the instructions for Part III. Clarify directions, if necessary. Tell student to ask you in French for the information listed and to take short notes (in English or French) on your answers on his test sheet.

Give an appropriate answer to every question the student asks you. You are not necessarily limited to the vocabulary of the first seven lessons in the book. (Let "common sense" guide you!) Use a natural conversational tone, gestures, restatement and any other means of communication at your disposal. Try to avoid simple yes-no answers.
Part II - Suggested scoring: Use the scale below to evaluate each response in part II. Each response is worth from 0-4 points according to the scale, giving you a possible total of 28 points.

4 pts. - appropriate, grammatically correct response delivered with phonemically correct pronunciation and natural fluency.

3 pts. - appropriate comprehensible response with small grammatical mistake or phonemic error in pronunciation, only slight hesitation in delivery.

2 pts. - attempt at response; faulty grammar and poor pronunciation; hesitant delivery, barely comprehensible.

1 pt. - attempt at response, but response incomprehensible or inappropriate.

0 pts. - no response.

Part III - Suggested scoring: Use same scale above to evaluate each question the student asks you. Each question is worth from 0-4 points, giving you a possible total of 28 points using the above scale. In addition, at the end of part III, go over the notes the student has taken on your answers and evaluate them as follows: (14 points)

2 pts. - for each item containing complete essential information.

1 pt. - for each item containing partial information.

0 pts. - for each item with totally incorrect information or no response.

You may use this sheet to help you keep track of Parts II and III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part II</th>
<th>No. of points</th>
<th>Part IIIA</th>
<th>No. of points</th>
<th>Part IIIIB</th>
<th>No. of point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response #1.</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Question #1.</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>List.Comp. #1.</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS =</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student's name: _________________</th>
<th>Student's score: _______</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parts I + II + IIIA + IIIB</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. Take about one minute to prepare the following passage. Then read the passage aloud naturally and in your best French. You will be evaluated on correct pronunciation of specific sounds and intonation patterns as well as on the overall fluency and pronunciation of the passage. (30 points)

Françoise va passer le weekend chez son oncle. Elle va à la gare avec son amie Hélène pour acheter un billet.

Françoise: A quelle heure part le train pour Paris?

Employé: A trois heures cinquante, mademoiselle.

Françoise: Est-ce qu'il est en retard?

Employé: Non, mademoiselle. Aujourd'hui il part à l'heure.

Les deux jeunes filles vont au café de la gare pour prendre une tasse de thé. Elles ont soif. Elles veulent prendre des sandwiches mais il n'y a pas assez de temps. Le train arrive.

II. Your instructor will ask you several questions. Answer in your best French, using complete sentences. Don't hesitate to use gestures to help you get your point across. Your instructor will ask each question only once. You may ask for a restatement of the question, but try to get by without it.

You will be evaluated on the correctness and appropriateness of each response. (28 points)

III. Ask your instructor appropriate questions to obtain the following information. Take short notes (in English or French) on your instructor's answers, as you will be evaluated partly on how well you get the question across, and partly on how well you understand the reply. Use the space next to the questions for taking notes. (42 points)

Find out the following:

1. whether your instructor has a car. ________________________________

2. what color is the car. ________________________________

3. whether your instructor is thirsty. ________________________________

4. where your instructor eats lunch. ________________________________

5. whether your instructor prefers wine or beer. ________________________________

6. at what time your instructor comes to school. ________________________________

7. whether your instructor has a lot of money. ________________________________
I. Listening Comprehension (2 points each: 10 points)

Read each of the following passages once. After each passage make a short pause and then read the "statement".


   **Statement:** Jacques va prendre l'autobus pour aller chez sa tante.


   **Statement:** Versailles n'est pas très loin de Paris.

3. La tante de Jacques l'attend à la gare. Ils prennent un taxi pour aller à la maison. L'oncle de Jacques et ses cousins l'attendent.

   **Statement:** La tante de Jacques vient le chercher dans son auto.


   **Statement:** Paul donne un pourboire à sa tante.

5. Après le dîner la famille prend du café et on parle de Jacques et de ses études à l'université. Plus tard on regarde la télévision.

   **Statement:** Jacques est étudiant.

II. Listening/Writing

Read each question twice and allow sufficient time for the students to write a response.

Chauffeur: Depuis quand attendez vous?
Student:

Chauffeur: Où voulez-vous aller?
Student:
Chauffeur: Etes-vous très pressés?
Student:

Chauffeur: Vous êtes américains vous deux?
Student:

Chauffeur: Mais vous parlez bien le français!

Suggested scoring: 4 points per situationally meaningful response, regardless of length or form; allot 1 point for situational applicability; 1 point for syntax, 2 points for spelling. Possible total: 16 points.

III. Writing
  Suggested scoring: Same as in Part II. Possible total: 24 points.

IV. Writing (Pronouns)
  Suggested scoring: 4 points per response, counting 2 points for correct pronoun and 2 points for correct position of pronoun.

Note: Answers to questions #2 and #3 should be negative.

V. Writing (Imperative)

Expected answers: Attendez une minute!
Ne perdez pas de patience, monsieur!
Ne sois pas fâché!
Partons (Allons)!
Sois sage! Finis (fais) ton travail!
Va dormir à 9h!

Suggested scoring: 2 points per meaningful command (you can allot 1 point for each meaningful verb, no matter what its form, and 1 point for each grammatically correct imperative). 14 points.

VI. Reading

Expected answers: 1. (Il fait) mauvais. (Il pleut.)
2. à 2 kilomètres de l'appartement de Jacques et de Nanette. (à 2 kilomètres de leur appartement)
3. Saint-Michel
4. il n'y a plus (pas) de places
5. près du cinéma

Suggested scoring: 2 points per item of comprehensible information in French. Possible total: 10 points.

VII. Cultural Information (2 points per answer: 4 points)
1. Hernani est un drame romantique de Victor Hugo.
2. le souper est le repas qu'on prend tard le soir après le théâtre, le concert, etc.

VIII. Cultural Information (2 points)
In the U.S. one usually does not tip the usher in a theater or cinema.
French 101A

Test -- Lesson Eight (I)

I. You will hear five short passages. After each passage your instructor will make a statement referring back to what he has just read. If the statement coincides with what was described in the passage write true (+), if the statement does not fit the content of the passage, write false (-). (2 points each: 10 points)

1. ___  2. ___  3. ___  4. ___  5. ___

II. You and a friend are going to la Comédie Française, a famous theater in Paris. You are in a hurry and have just flagged down a taxi. Your instructor will be le chauffeur. Respond appropriately to his or her questions. You will hear each question twice. Write complete sentences, please. (4 points each response: 16 points)

Le Chauffeur: -----
Votre réponse: __________________________________________________________

Le Chauffeur: -----
Votre réponse: __________________________________________________________

Le Chauffeur: -----
Votre réponse: __________________________________________________________

Le Chauffeur: -----
Votre réponse: __________________________________________________________

Le Chauffeur: -----

III. The following questions are addressed to you personally. Write an appropriate response in French. Complete sentences, please! (4 points per response: 24 points)

1. Depuis quand étudiez-vous le français? ________________

2. Vous voulez acheter une auto. Choisissez-vous une Pinto ou une Cadillac? ________________

3. Est-ce que vous finissez la huitième leçon aujourd'hui? ________
4. Vendez-vous votre livre de français à la fin du trimestre?

5. En quel mois finit votre cours de français 101?

6. Le professeur pose beaucoup de questions, n'est-ce pas?

* à la fin = at the end

IV. Answer the following questions again truthfully in writing with complete French sentences. Be sure to answer as naturally as possible (replacing noun objects by pronoun objects). (4 points each: 20 points)

e.g. To the question: Parlez-vous au professeur?
You could respond: "No, I don't talk to him."
(In French, of course!)

1. Ce soir vous allez parler à vos amis, n'est-ce pas? 

2. Est-ce que le professeur parle aux étudiants maintenant?

3. Regardez-vous la télévision maintenant?

4. Est-ce que vous répondez toujours au professeur?

5. Aimez-vous l'opéra?

V. Georges Bardot has a rendez-vous (date) with his girlfriend, Suzanne. The following conversation takes place as he arrives at Suzanne's house to pick her up.
Several words are missing from the conversation. Fill in words which would logically complete the conversation in meaning and form. (2 points each word: 14 points)
Georges arrive. Monique, la petite soeur de Suzanne est à la porte.
Elle dit: "Bonjour, monsieur. Vous venez chercher Suzanne, n'est-ce pas? __________ une minute, je vais la chercher."
Georges répond: "Merci, ma petite. J'attends ici."
Monique va chercher Suzanne. Elle revient*: "Ne __________ pas de patience, monsieur! Elle va venir tout de suite."
Suzanne arrive: "Je suis désolée, Georges. Je suis en retard. Ne __________ pas fâché!"
Georges: "___________! Le spectacle va commencer dans un quart d'heure."
Suzanne parle à Monique: "Au revoir, Monique. __________ sage! __________ ton travail et __________ dormir à neuf heures!"
* revenir = to come back, to return

VI. Read the passage below and answer the questions which follow. Answer in French. You do not need to write complete sentences, but make certain your answer is comprehensible. (2 points per response: 10 points)

Jacques et Nanette veulent aller au cinéma ce soir.
Il y a un vieux "western" et Jacques aime beaucoup les films américains.
Le cinéma est à deux kilomètres de leur appartement et ils décident de prendre un taxi. Ils attendent un taxi au coin de la rue.
Nanette lui répond: "Il n'y a pas de taxis ce soir. Prenez le métro. Le cinéma n'est pas trop loin."

A ce moment un taxi arrive, Jacques dit au chauffeur: "Le cinéma Saint-Michel s'il vous plaît. Nous sommes très pressés."
Quand ils arrivent au cinéma il est huit heures trente-cinq. Jacques va au guichet pour acheter des billets. La femme au guichet dit: "Je suis désolée, monsieur, mais il n'y a plus de places."

Jacques est en colère. Il demande à Nanette: "Qu'est-ce que nous allons faire maintenant?"

Nanette lui répond: "Ne sois pas fâché! Il y a une jolie petite discothèque près d'ici. Allons-y!"

Les deux amis vont à la discothèque. Ils prennent un verre de vin, écoutent la musique et regardent les gens. C'est très agréable.

* y = there
** les gens = the people

Questions:

1. Quel temps fait-il ce soir? ________________________________
2. Où est le cinéma? ________________________________
3. Quel est le nom du cinéma? ________________________________
4. Pourquoi Jacques est-il fâché? ________________________________
5. Où y a-t-il une discothèque? ________________________________

VII. Briefly define the following terms. You may use English or French. Only information counts. (2 points per response: 4 points)

1. Hernani ________________________________

2. le souper ________________________________

VIII. Give one instance where a tip is expected in France but not in the U.S. (2 points)

______________________________
I. Listening/Writing
Repeat each question twice and give sufficient time for the students to write a response.

L'ami: Ah, te voilà! Je t'attends depuis une heure. Où as-tu été?
Student response: -------
L'ami: Qu'est-ce que tu as fait hier soir?
Student response: -------
L'ami: As-tu déjà déjeuné aujourd'hui?
Student response: -------
L'ami: J'ai faim. Veux-tu venir avec moi au restaurant universitaire?
Student response: -------
L'ami: Il fait très beau aujourd'hui. Veux-tu faire une promenade plus tard?
Student response: -------

Suggested scoring: 5 points per situationally meaningful response, regardless of length or form. (25 points)

II. Dictation
Read once in its entirety. Then dictate each sentence twice.

Cher Monsieur,

Hier, quand j'ai déjeuné dans votre restaurant, j'ai perdu mon porte-feuille.
C'est un petit porte-feuille noir avec plusieurs photos et à peu près 50 francs. Est-ce que vous l'avez trouvé? J'ai été à la table près de la porte.

J'attends votre réponse.

Suggested scoring: Count each misspelled word ½ point and subtract from 25. (Total possible: 25 points)

III. Reading/Writing
Suggested scoring: 5 points per situationally meaningful response, regardless of length or form. (25 points)
IV. Reading/Writing

Clarify instructions to cloze procedure, if necessary.

Suggested scoring: 2 points per word, allotting 1 point to meaning and 1 point to correct grammatical form and spelling. Accept any completion which is meaningful in the context of the passage.

e.g. blank #2 could be belle, jolie, grande etc. (if wrong form of adjective is used, give only 1 point)

Subtract "wrong score" from 25 to get score out of 25.

V. Oral Examination

A. Clarify instructions, if necessary. Give about 2 minutes preparation time. Record students. REMIND STUDENTS TO GIVE THEIR NAMES TWICE BEFORE STARTING TO READ ALOUD.

Suzette va passer un mois en Allemagne et Paul /wa/, /n/ l'a invitée à dîner avant son départ. Ils vont /Ê/, /r/ au restaurant "Chez Jean". /S/, /3/

Paul est très élégant ce soir. Il porte un complet liaison, /έ/ rouge foncé, une chemise grise et une belle cravate. /d/, /s/, /l/

Suzette est très jolie aussi ce soir. /έ/

Pour le dîner les deux amis prennent du bifteck, des liaison, /n/ pommes frites, une salade de tomates et un litre de /a/, no liaison vin. C'est un repas excellent. liaison, /a/

Après le dîner Paul veut payer le garçon, mais il a /φ/ perdu son porte-feuille. /y/

Suggested scoring: Give 2 points for each underlined phoneme. (40 points)
B. Clarify instructions, if necessary. Make certain students understand that the information is to be relayed in the "I" form (e.g. Je suis étudiant et j’habite à Quebec, etc.). Also emphasize that students can use any linguistic means at their disposal to get the message across, just as long as the meaning of what they say comes close to the meaning of the guide sheet.

   e.g. "you are a student" could be stated as: I am a student
          I go to the university
          I go to school
          I am taking courses etc.

   "you don't have much money" could be stated as:
          I don't have much money
          I am poor
          I am not rich
          I don't earn much, etc.

After instructions are clear, give students approximately 2 minutes preparation time. Remind students not to take any written notes.

Suggested scoring: Give 1 point for each of the following points of information conveyed in a comprehensible manner, regardless of length or form: (14 points)

1       2       3       4
Student - Quebec - little money - young -
5       6       7       8
attractive - intelligent - unhappy - no friends

9       10      11
- looking for a friend - for years - parents don't
12      13
understand - selected partner - you don't like -

14
is crazy.

To this score for amount of information conveyed add an overall evaluation score using the scales below. (16 points)

Pronunciation:
Phonemically accurate pronunciation throughout. 4 points
Occasional phonemic error, but generally comprehensible. 3 points
Many phonemic errors; very difficult to perceive meaning. 2 points
Incomprehensible. 1 point

Vocabulary:
Consistent use of appropriate words throughout. 4 points
Minor lexical problems, but vocabulary generally appropriate. 3 points
Vocabulary usually inaccurate, except for occasional correct word. 2 points
Vocabulary inaccurate throughout. 1 point
Structure:
No errors of morphology or syntax. 4 points
Generally accurate structure, occasional slight error. 3 points
Errors of basic structure, but some phrases rendered correctly. 2 points
Virtually no correct structures. 1 point

Fluency:
Speech is natural and continuous. Pauses correspond to those a native speaker might make. 4 points
Speech is generally natural and continuous. Occasional slight stumbling. 3 points
Some definite stumbling, but manages to rephrase and continue. 2 points
Long pauses. Utterances left unfinished. 1 point

Double this score (points of information + overall evaluation x 2) to get score out of 60.

Use the form below to keep track of the score:

Overall evaluation:
Pronunciation 4 3 2 1
Vocabulary 4 3 2 1
Structure 4 3 2 1
Fluency 4 3 2 1

Total for overall evaluation 16
+ score for points of information 14
x 2 = total score for Part B 60
+ score for Part A 40
= TOTAL SCORE FOR ORAL TEST 100
I. Imagine the following conversation taking place between yourself and a friend just as you arrive at home after classes. Your instructor will read the part of your friend. Respond appropriately to the questions, writing complete sentences, please. You will hear each question twice.
(5 points each response: 25 points)

Votre ami: ----
Votre réponse: ___________________________________________________________

Votre ami: ----
Votre réponse: ___________________________________________________________

Votre ami: ----
Votre réponse: ___________________________________________________________

Votre ami: ----
Votre réponse: ___________________________________________________________

Votre ami: ----
Votre réponse: ___________________________________________________________

II. You are spending your junior year in Genève and are doing part-time clerical work for a Swiss company. Your boss (instructor?) asks you to take a letter. Write exactly what he or she dictates. (25 points)

Cher Monsieur,

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
III. The following questions are addressed to you personally. Write an appropriate response in French. Complete sentences, please!
Answer as naturally as possible, replacing noun objects by pronouns whenever possible.
(5 points per response: 25 points)

1. Avez-vous déjà commencé la dixième leçon? ____________________

2. Votre professeur, a-t-il été malade hier? ________________

3. Est-ce que vos parents vous donnent de l’argent? __________

4. Est-ce que les étudiants portent souvent des cravates? _______

5. Maria Callas vient à Columbus en mars. Allez-vous l’écouter?


IV. Imagine you are looking through a level I French text your grandmother used. The book is old and badly used (your grandmother was a hardworking student...) and some words in the text are illegible. The blank spaces in the text below represent the illegible words. Fill in the blanks with words which would be meaningful and grammatically correct in the context of the passage.
(2 points per word + 1 bonus point: 25 points)

Une amie française ______ a donné un guide de Paris et j'ai fait ______ longues promenades dans la ville.
J'ai ______ de belles photos; j'ai ______ beaucoup de souvenirs; j'ai mangé ______ repas excellents et j'ai parlé avec beaucoup de parisiens.
Un jour, mon amie et moi nous avons fait une excursion à Versailles. Il ______ a un château magnifique et un parc formidable avec beaucoup de fleurs.
Le matin nous avons regardé les salles du château.
Le guide ______ a bien expliqué l'histoire de Versailles."

J'ai deux cents photos de Versailles. Voulez-vous _______ regarder?"

*retrouver = to find again

V. Oral Examination

Part A - Pronunciation: Read the following passage aloud naturally and in your best French. Your reading will be recorded on tape. PLEASE RECORD YOUR NAME AT THE BEGINNING AND AT THE END OF THE ORAL TEST. (40 points)

Suzette va passer un mois en Allemagne et Paul l'a invitée à dîner avant son départ.
Ils vont au restaurant "Chez Jean".
Paul est très élégant ce soir. Il porte un complet rouge foncé, une chemise grise et une belle cravate. Suzette est très jolie aussi ce soir.
Pour le dîner les deux amis prennent du bifteck, des pommes frites, une salade de tomates et un litre de vin. C'est un repas excellent.
Après le dîner Paul veut payer le garçon, mais il a perdu son porte-feuille.

Part B: Pretend you are the unfortunate soul described below and you are calling a radio station's advice program (Ann Landers type program). Relate your story in French. You will be recorded. Do not make any written notes. Make as many sentences as possible. You may add whatever you wish to the information suggested below. (60 points)

You are a student / living in Quebec/ you don't have much money, but you are young, good looking and intelligent/ you are not happy/ you don't have any friends/ you have been looking for a boyfriend (girlfriend) for years/ your parents don't understand you/ they have selected a partner for you but you don't like him (her)/ he (she) is crazy.
I. Listening Comprehension

Read the following passage twice.

Hier, le père de Jacqueline lui a donné 100 dollars. 
Alors elle est allée en ville et elle a fait des 
achats chez Lazarus.
D'abord elle a regardé les pantalons. Elle a vu des 
pantalons longs, des pantalons courts, des pantalons 
de toutes couleurs. Elle a décidé de prendre un 
pantalon noir.
Jacqueline a aussi essayé une robe, mais elle ne l'a 
pas achetée. Elle n'aime pas les nouveaux modèles.
Ensuite elle est allée chercher des souliers. Elle 
a trouvé une jolie paire de chaussures et l'a achetée.
Pour sa mère Jacqueline a pris un livre et pour son 
père elle a acheté six mouchoirs.
Elle a vu aussi un très jolie chapeau. Les chapeaux 
lui vont bien, mais comme elle n'a pas assez d'argent 
elle ne l'a pas acheté.

Suggested scoring: Give 4 points for each of the underlined items. 
(16 points)

II. Listening/Writing

Show students the picture of the woman wearing long skirt and 
white blouse (or put it on board with magnets) and ask each of 
the following questions twice, giving sufficient time for the 
student to write an answer.*

1. Regardez cette femme. Qu'est-ce qu'elle porte?
2. Est-ce qu'elle porte des gants?
3. De quelle couleur est sa blouse?
4. Est-ce que la blouse lui va bien?

Suggested scoring: 4 points per situationally meaningful response, 
regardless of length or form; allot 1 point for situational 
applicability, 1 point for syntax and 2 points for spelling. 
(16 points)

*Note to reader: Because of reproduction difficulties the visual 
utilized in Part II of this test is not included. 
It consisted of a large picture taken from a maga­ 
zine portraying a model in evening attire.
III. Writing

Suggested scoring: Same as in Part II. (20 points)

IV. Writing

Suggested scoring: Same as in Part II. (16 points)

V. Reading

Expected answers: 1. sur la côte atlantique de l'Afrique (en Afrique)
2. le Sénégal (pays) a été une colonie française (pendant 250 années)
3. depuis 1960 (depuis 14 ans)
4. étudier (continuer ses études) (suivre des cours à l'université)
5. depuis hier (il vient d'arriver)
6. pour voir ses deux frères (il a deux frères à Grenoble), etc.
7. non (il est resté pendant 2 semaines)
8. il y a un mois
9. il a visité Londres et la ville natale d'un poète anglais (il a passé quelques jours à Londres, etc.)
10. en Ohio (à Columbus)
11. des cours de chimie (accept any other logical answer)

Suggested scoring: 2 points per item of comprehensible information in French. (22 points)

VI. Cultural Information

Expected answers: 1.a) (la) Belgique  
b) (le) Luxembourg  
c) (l') Allemagne  
d) (la) Suisse  
e) (l') Italie  
f) (l') Espagne  
2. check location of les Pyrénées and Marseille on map.  
3. accept any two: wheat, perfum, wine, locomotives, cheese, precision instruments, fruits, planes, heavy machinery, etc.
4. accept any two: climate, varied landscape, museums, castles, la cuisine, etc.

Suggested scoring: For question #1 give ½ point for correctly placing country and ½ point for correct spelling of country. (6 points)
For question #2 give 1 point for each place correctly located on map. (2 points)
For questions #3 and #4 give ½ point for each correct response. (2 points)
I. You will hear twice a short passage about a girl's shopping trip. During the first reading try to just listen for overall comprehension of the passage; during the second reading list everything Jacqueline actually purchased on the shopping trip. You may list the items in English or French. (16 points)

II. Your instructor will show you a picture and ask you some questions about it. Answer the questions appropriately in French. Complete sentences, please! (4 points each response: 16 points)

1. __________________________________________________________
2. _______________________________________________________________________
3. _______________________________________________________________________
4. __________________________________________________________

III. The following questions are addressed to you personally. Write an appropriate response in French. Complete sentences, please! (4 points per response: 20 points)

1. Etes-vous allé(e) au cinéma hier soir? ____________________________

2. A quelle heure êtes-vous rentré(e) hier soir? ____________________________

3. Avez-vous déjà vu le film "Le dernier tango"? ____________________________

4. Est-ce que vous dites "bonjour" ou "au revoir" quand vous partez? ____________________________
5. Quelle leçon venez-vous de finir? __________________________

IV. A friend introduces you to a young French woman who has just recently arrived in the U.S. Write, in French, the questions you would ask her to get the following information.
(4 points each question: 16 points)

1. when she arrived ____________________________________________

2. where she was born _________________________________________

3. whether she has already seen Columbus _______________________

4. whether she is taking courses at the university __________________

V. Read the passage below and answer the questions which follow. Answer in French. You do not need to write complete sentences, but make certain your answers are meaningful and comprehensible.
(2 points per response: 22 points)

François Diop est sénégalais. (Le Sénégal est un pays sur la côte atlantique de l'Afrique. On parle français au Sénégal parce que le pays a été une colonie française pendant à peu près 250 années. Depuis l'année 1960 le pays est indépendant de la France.) Il est étudiant. Il a fini trois années d'études à l'université de Dakar, et maintenant il vient d'arriver aux États-Unis pour continuer ses études ici. Plus tard il veut rentrer au Sénégal et devenir professeur de chimie dans une école secondaire.

Avant d'arriver à New York, François a fait un long voyage. Il a quitté sa famille il y a un mois et est allé en France. Deux de ses frères font leurs études à Grenoble et François est allé les voir pendant deux semaines.

Après la France il est allé en Angleterre. Il a passé plusieurs jours à Londres et a visité aussi la ville natale* d'un poète anglais très célèbre. Depuis hier il est à New York. Il va continuer son voyage demain pour aller en Ohio où il veut suivre des cours à l'université de cet état.

*ville natale = city of birth
Questions:

1. Où se trouve le Sénégal? ________________________________

2. Pourquoi est-ce qu'on parle français au Sénégal? ________________

3. Depuis quand le Sénégal n'est-il plus une colonie française?

4. François Diop, que veut-il faire aux États Unis? ________________

5. Depuis quand est-il aux États Unis? _________________________

6. Pourquoi est-il allé à Grenoble? _____________________________

7. Il est resté en France pendant un mois, n'est-ce pas? ____________

8. Quand a-t-il quitté l'Afrique? _________________________________

9. Qu'est-ce qu'il a fait en Angleterre? __________________________

10. Où va-t-il habiter aux États Unis? ____________________________

11. Probablement, quels cours va-t-il suivre à l'université? _______

VI. 1. On the outline map of France attached, write in the French names of the countries which border France. (6 points)

2. Put the following places into their approximate location on the outline map attached. (2 points)

   a) les Pyrénées
   b) Marseille

3. List two French exports. (1 point)

4. List two reasons "pourquoi la France attire les touristes". (1 point)
APPENDIX C

SAMPLE SET OF LEARNING OBJECTIVES

BASED ON

Thomas H. Brown,
*French Listening Speaking Reading Writing*
Second Edition

Deuxième Leçon
French 101A

LESSON TWO - OBJECTIVES: VOCABULARY

Students should be able to understand, speak, read and write the following vocabulary:

**Verbs:**
- arriver
- habiter
- apporter
- être

**Nouns:**
- le petit déjeuner
- le garçon
- le panier
- le croissant
- le livre
- le crayon
- le stylo
- le tableau
- le cahier
- le bureau
- le mur
- le professeur
- le soir (ce soir)
- cet après midi
- l'homme

- la minute
- la tasse
- la carte
- la serviette
- la lampe
- la gomme
- la table
- la chaise
- la fenêtre
- la porte
- la jeune fille
- la femme

- le Mexique
- le Canada
- le Japon
- la Suisse
- la Russie
- la France
- la Belgique
- l'Allemagne
- l'Italie
- l'Espagne
- l'Angleterre
- les États Unis

**Adjectives:**
- deuxième
- enchanté
- heureux
- parisien
- belge
- américain
- canadien
- catholique
- protestant
- autre

**Adverbs:**
- en retard
- aujourd'hui
- demain
- ici

**Indefinite Articles:**
- un
- une

**Numbers:**
- 11 - 20

**Other:**
- de
- qui?
- en
- quand?
- aux
- qu'est-ce que c'est?

REVIEW VOCABULARY FROM CHAPTER ONE!
French 101A

LESSON TWO - OBJECTIVES: STRUCTURES

Student should be able to

1. conjugate the verb être in the present tense in negative and positive statements and questions.

2. conjugate the "-er" verbs habiter, arriver, apporter in the present tense.

3. use the indefinite article un and une. e.g. un étudiant une étudiante

4. differentiate gender and number of nouns of nationality.
   e.g. une Canadienne — un Canadien

5. omit the indefinite article when appropriate before predicate adjectives or unmodified predicate nouns indicating nationality, religion, profession.
   e.g. Il est français. but C'est un Français.

6. use correct prepositions with geographical names.
   e.g. à Paris
       en Allemagne
       au Mexique
       aux États Unis

7. make proper agreement of adjectives.
   e.g. Il est français. Elle est française.
       Il est enchanté. Elle est enchantée.

CULTURAL NOTES:

French breakfast
qu'est-ce que c'est qu'un croissant?
What language is spoken in southwestern Switzerland?

REVIEW OBJECTIVES FROM CHAPTER ONE!
French 101A

LESSON TWO - COMMUNICATIVE OBJECTIVES

Students should be able to

1. identify (name) objects;
2. state people's nationality, religion and occupation;
3. tell or inquire where someone is living;
4. count from 1-20;
5. introduce someone and behave correctly (à la mode française) when introduced;
6. find out: when someone is arriving;
   when someone is leaving;
   where someone is;
   where someone is going.

REVIEW OBJECTIVES FROM CHAPTER ONE!
APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTOR'S TEST EVALUATION

devised by
Department of Romance Languages and Literatures
The Ohio State University
TEST EVALUATION

Test:
Instructor's name:
Section:

Number of students present: ______
Number who missed the test: ______
Average grade for the class: ______ Median: ______

Was the length of the test satisfactory? _____
How long did it take your class? ______________

Was the test as a whole at the right difficulty level? _____
If not, which items or sections were not?

Did the test provide a fair sample of the materials covered during the unit and of the knowledge expected from students? ______
If not, indicate which items were possibly "too tricky" or too marginal, and which aspect of the unit should have received more emphasis.

Where there any items that were not clear:

a) because the instructions were not clear?
   (Indicate which items and why.)

b) because some other answer than the one expected was also possible? (Indicate which items.)

c) because -- on Vrai ou Faux items -- the statement was actually debatable.
   (Indicate which items.)

Which section of the test did your students tend to do best?

On which section did they tend to do worst?

Which items, if any, did most students miss?
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