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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Introduction

At all stages and levels of foreign language instruction, teachers, and students rely heavily on the core textbook. The objectives and philosophy selected by authors and editors guide instructors in the presentation of language and cultural concepts to students. Content and format provide the organizational base for the syllabus. Daily lesson plans are based on exercises, drills, and vocabulary contained within each chapter. Foreign language students depend upon the textbook for examples, assignments, and clarification of problematic areas. Ariew (1982) states that the textbook "is the main source of guidance for both teachers and students" (pp. 16-17).

The importance of the textbook in foreign language classrooms is a crucial issue. Research has, however, neglected the systematic evaluation and description of these texts. Those studies that have been conducted often use instruments that focus upon general course goals and objectives, content, methodology, implementation requirements, and general preferences of the evaluator. These instruments do not adequately consider the needs of the
foreign language learner. They do not have the potential or flexibility to aid researchers or teachers in the evaluation or selection of appropriate materials for the varying ability levels, learning styles, and personal interests of students. The instruments used for the evaluation of foreign language textbooks have not changed, even though the focus of language teaching has.

The foreign language teaching profession is now aware of the fact that the language learner is, and should be the central figure in language teaching theory. Student-centered approaches have, in some cases, replaced traditional teacher-centered methods (i.e., the direct method, the audio-lingual method, the grammar-translation method). The learning styles, needs, and interests of individuals that were neither acknowledged nor honored by teacher-centered approaches have been emphasized in student-centered instruction. Educators have devised methods that attempt to meet the varying language needs of each student. These methods sensitize teachers to human values and human relations in the language class and create an awareness of the social and affective climate caused by the interaction among students and between students and teachers in the classroom (e.g., individualized instruction, Curran's Community Language Learning, Gattegno's Silent Way, Lozanov's Suggestopedia, and Asher's Total Physical Response) (Stern, 1983). The focal point of all of these new approaches to language curricula is the interaction between
the student, teacher, and learning environment (Yoshikawa, 1982) (Figure 1).

\[ \text{Student} \quad \text{Teacher} \]
\[ \text{Learning Environment} \]

Figure 1

Student - Teacher - Learning Environment

The research efforts of the past 25 years in the fields of psycholinguistics, psychology, and learning theory have supported this more interpersonal approach to language learning. However, both theoreticians and practitioners agree that language teaching should no longer be conceptualized in terms of a "single undifferentiated methodological prescription," (Stern, 1983 p. 494) but in terms of student "learner factors" (Jakobovits, 1970; Rivers, 1972; Stern, 1973).

Ausubel (1968) groups these "intrapersonal factors" into two main categories: cognitive and affective-social. The cognitive domain includes objective, intellectual factors (intelligence, language aptitude, first language proficiency, and learning style). Subjective and interpersonal determinants of learning (attitudes, motivation, and personality) are included in the affective domain. In their
reviews of crucial learner factors, Stern (1980, 1983) and Brown (1980) add a third category to include the variable of age. Frymier (1977) has expanded these groups to include other dimensions of human existence that he describes as particularly relevant in relation to learning. He states that "these dimensions, or factors, are not the only personal attributes that affect learning, but it is assumed that they are important, discernible human qualities, and it is also assumed that they relate directly to learning" (p. 55). These factors are: interest in subject matter area, age, previous experience, intelligence, motivation, emotional and personality qualities, creative abilities, social beliefs and skills, verbal facility, auditory, visual, and motor perception skills.

In spite of the prolonged contact between psychology and language teaching theory, the treatment of learner factors has not been easy to accommodate in language pedagogy. In his text, Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching, Stern (1983) offers the following observation:

...By and large, language teachers have looked upon language learners with fixed assumptions about how a learner should react to a given curriculum or a given teaching approach, only to be suprised again and again, and often to be quite shocked, by the variety of reactions on the part of the learners. These differences were somehow not allowed in the language teaching methods and textbooks, in spite of the fact that educational psychology had for decades recognized, emphasized, and investigated the concept of individual learner differences. (p. 360)
In order to develop a curriculum that considers student "learner factors," the instructor must be cognizant of not only the interaction between the student, teacher, and learning environment, but also the interaction that occurs between these three variables and materials used in the classroom. Three different theoretical models of the language learning/teaching process developed within the past decade (Mackey, 1970; Strevens, 1976; and Stern, 1983) include the variables of method and materials within their paradigm. These models "(1) serve as a conceptual framework for theory development; (2) provide categories and criteria for the interpretation and evaluation of existing theories; (3) provide essential conceptualizations for planning and practice; and (4) give directions for research" (Stern, 1983, p. 115). While these models serve as a practitioner's guide and a research map, they do not provide an actual instrument that could serve as a linking mechanism between learner, teacher, materials, and the learning environment. Frymier (1977) has proposed a theoretical model and instrument that links these four variables.

The Annehurst Curriculum Classification System (ACCS) incorporates the four variables (learner, teacher, materials, and environment) considered in the student-centered classroom theories. It also provides an instrument that assesses the student's learner characteristics
and offers a linking mechanism between the learner, teacher, materials, and learning environment (Figure 2).
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Figure 2

Frymier (1977) explains the schooling paradigm as follows:

Learners are different and curriculum materials materials are different. Further, learners can be characterized in particular ways, and curriculum materials can be characterized in particular ways. Within the schooling paradigm, the basic purpose of ACCS is to help teachers create a match between a particular learner and particular curriculum materials that will enable the student to learn effectively and enjoyably. Conceptually, ACCS is a linking mechanism. It helps teachers bring learners and curriculum materials together in ways that will maximize learning. (p. 4)

For the foreign language educator, this "linking mechanism" is of utmost importance. Joiner (1974) has described the role of the teacher in the new student centered classroom as that of a tailor, who must use "craftsmanship, knowledge, and ingenuity to adapt material to a particular client or clientele" (p. 154).

This analogy implies at least two important responsibilities of language teachers: determining the
individual needs and characteristics of the student and
designing learning experiences to meet those needs. These
"learning experiences" include two important factors,
methodology and curriculum materials. This study focuses
upon the second factor, curriculum materials, in an attempt
(1) to use ACCS as an instrument to aid foreign language
teachers, researchers, and ultimately, foreign language
learners in the selection, analysis, and use of curriculum
materials; and (2) to describe and analyze the curriculum
characteristics of 14 Spanish textbooks used in first-
and third-year high school classes.
Statement of the Problem

Curriculum materials are a prominent feature of classroom instruction. Frymier et. al., (1984) states that "heavy reliance upon the textbook as the tool for learning has been documented by a number of different studies (p. 99). Reports of actual student time in school spent interacting with materials in mathematics, language arts, science, and social studies range from 50% (Medley, 1977) to 80% (Davis, Frymier, and Clinefelter, 1977). Barclay (1983) reports that curriculum materials play an extremely important role. "More than anything else in school, the student deals with curriculum materials" (p. 20). While investigations of student-materials interaction time in foreign language education is not as extensive, Cimerhanzel-Nestlerode (1980) reported that students spent approximately 95 hours within a 14 week period interacting with instructional materials and media outside of the classroom. In an analysis of foreign language teacher effectiveness Nerenz and Knop (1982) noted that three teachers spent from 10% to 41% of a classroom period interacting with some type of printed curriculum material. In an investigation of time-on-task and instructional activities, Long (1983) reported that most of the instructional activities used in the observed university classroom came from the core textbook. These studies indicate that the importance of materials in the foreign language classroom cannot be overlooked.
Investigations in other subject matter areas have also revealed that due to the role of the material as teacher by proxy, teacher intent and pupil behavior are frequently dictated by the material. Denton (1978) states that "curriculum materials are dictating to the teacher his/her instructional interactions, limiting the instructors' effectiveness with the result...that materials have a greater or equal impact on student knowledge than the teacher does" (p. 1). Clinefelter (1978) corroborates Denton's findings:

The materials seem to control what goes on. Sometimes the teacher seems to over-ride the effect of the materials, but by and large, as the materials do, so goes the event (the methodology). The students interact far more with the materials than with the teacher. The teacher frequently follows right from the materials when h/she instructs. Also, the materials tend to be the organizational base for the management of the classroom. (p. 15)

A review of successful foreign language programs (Sims, 1981) reveals that educators at all levels have attempted to make foreign language study relevant and exciting to students, going far beyond the coverage of a particular text as its prime strategy. The following statements from teachers and researchers, however, reveal that foreign language classes are not exempt from the influence of curriculum materials and underscore the importance of the textbook in the language classroom.
In 1968, Rivers defined the textbook as one of the primary agents in the foreign language classroom. "The textbook will determine to a great extent what will be taught in the classroom, how it will be taught...and how the student student will learn" (p. 368). The next ten years brought about no significant change in the emphasis placed upon the text. Davison's (1976) comment typifies the traditional approach to teaching in which the student occupies third or fourth place in the teaching/learning scheme. He states that "...After the teacher, the next most important factor in the foreign language classroom is the textbook" (p. 310). In a similar vein, Jenks (1975) identifies the textbook as "the teacher's most important tool" (p. 96), a tool described by Warriner (1977) as being "...omni-present and ever open" (p. 293). Finally, in spite of the influx of media and technology into the foreign language classroom, the importance and position of the textbook remains unchanged. Ariew (1982) observes that:

The foreign language text is the main source of guidance for both students and teachers...and is relied upon heavily by the instructor...The text's sequence, methodology, pacing, and vocabulary usage are followed, almost to the letter by most teachers. (p. 17)

The importance of materials is also evidenced in foreign language training programs where much time is spent in methods classes, workshops, and teacher seminars developing materials to be used in the classroom. A topic analysis on six major foreign language journals (British Journal of
Language Teaching, Die Unterrichtspraxis, Foreign Language Annals, French Review, The Canadian Modern Language Journal and The Modern Language Journal) revealed that over 35% of the articles published in 1983 dealt with materials preparations, textbooks, and textbook evaluations. In addition, a similar topic analysis was performed using the programs from the following meetings: The Ohio Modern Language Teachers Association, (1982-83); The National Joint Annual Meeting for AFTFL/AATG (1983); The Third National Conference on Individualized Instruction in Foreign Languages (1983); The Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (1983). The results indicate that one-third of the sessions and workshops dealt with some aspect of instructional materials development and use in the classroom.

An examination of text materials generally encompasses two major areas: the content and the nature of the material itself. These materials affect pupil learning by influencing the opportunity to learn criterion material through the content (Walker and Schaffarzick 1974; Rosenshine, 1976) that includes "what the student will be exposed to for learning; how this learning is intended to take place; and those skills that will receive the most emphasis" (Johnson, 1979, p. 68).

During the past two decades foreign language educators and researchers offered guidelines for materials selection that focused upon the content in order to
provide for optimal student learning. These earlier evaluations emphasize the teacher-centered rather than the student-centered classroom (Ollman, 1962; Pfister and Troyanovich, 1971; Rivers, 1968; and Davison, 1976).

Chastain (1976) in an earlier review stated that the "acid test of any materials is the compatibility between the personality and teaching practices of the teacher" (p. 524). No mention was made of the compatibility between the personality, or learner characteristics of the student.

The nature of materials, apart from their content emphasis, also affects pupil learning (Cooley and Leinhardt, 1978). For example, materials that are attractive and stimulating are likely to increase pupil motivation and involvement in the learning activity (Cornbleth, 1979). Writers and textbook publishers attempt to appeal to today's media-critical youth through colorful, professional, and artistic photography. Foreign language textbooks depict people in all countries in which the target language is spoken, rather than placing emphasis on past achievements or notable events of civilization. Other changes in the nature of the materials reflect the recent research in psycholinguistics that has suggested experience with language in its communicative function is essential for learning to speak a foreign language. Current textbooks and workbooks incorporate strategies derived from "communicative competencies philosophies" (Jenks, 1975, p. 110).
The content and nature of materials, however, also interact with individual "learner factors", affecting pupil learning significantly. For example, materials and environments matched with certain student characteristics facilitate the learning of particular pupils (Woolson, 1974; Dunn and Dunn, 1978; Shumsky, 1972; Hunt, 1975; Wood, 1973). Another aspect of this student-material compatibility is the congruence between the student's learning style and the type of activity offered (Hosenfeld, 1975). Researchers have identified several cognitive style features that may have bearing on second language acquisition (Naiman et al., 1978; Witkin et al., 1977). One such cognitive characteristic is the dimension of field independence/field dependence. This dimension involves the ability to dissemble simple figures from larger, more complex wholes. Naiman et al. (1978) hypothesized that the field-independent student with the ability to focus on those language stimuli at hand and disregard the inappropriate ones would be more successful in second language learning. In contrast, the field dependent student who lacks these focusing skills, would become confused and frustrated by the details of word order or verb endings. The latter type of students would benefit from target language exercises that require them to locate certain features of the language and identify them, or that require them to "analyze and synthesize information to make inferences about what a missing cue would be or
what conclusions can be drawn from certain information" (Birchbichler and Omaggio, 1978, p. 342)(Flynn, 1982). As Frechette (1976) has noted, in order to improve foreign language teaching, "we must seek out ways to identify individual differences and alternative teaching strategies that will accommodate them" (pp. 380-381).

In spite of the emphasis on (1) the content and nature of the curriculum materials, (2) the individual "learner factors," and (3) the necessity to "match" these individual needs, characteristics, and learning experiences (materials), research has paid little attention to description of materials actually used in foreign language classrooms. Existing instruments frequently used by researchers and teachers foster descriptive and comparative evaluations, lexical and syntactical analysis, and discrete point analysis of grammar (e.g. treatment of the gender of nouns, etc.) in texts. The foreign language teaching profession does not have an instrument that enables researchers or teachers to classify or evaluate foreign language texts based upon individual learner factors or characteristics. The Annehurst Classification System provides such a tool.

The ACCS offers a new approach to the classification and evaluation of classroom materials. Researchers have used ACCS in over 30 studies to describe curriculum materials in terms of individual differences in areas that range from elementary reading to teacher education programs, This
researcher will use an adaptation of ACCS (1) in order to
determine if the instrument can be used as a classification
and evaluation system for foreign language textbooks, and (2)
to describe the specific human learner characteristics that
are present in previously selected Spanish textbooks.
The Annehurst Curriculum Classification System: Theory and Description of the Matching Process

In the present study the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System (ACCS) is used as an instrument to describe and analyze foreign language textbooks in terms of individual differences. Conceptually, however, it is a linking mechanism that helps bring learners and curriculum materials together in ways that will maximize learning (Frymier, 1977). The theoretical propositions of ACCS are as follows:

1. Learners vary in the characteristics that, when influenced, make a difference in learning.

2. Curriculum materials have inherent in them characteristics that are complementary to these learner characteristics.

3. The teacher, by knowing the characteristics of the learner and the characteristics of the curriculum materials can "match" students to materials, creating an optimum learning experience.

Central to ACCS is the concept of human variability and the conviction that pupil achievement is affected by the relationship of the specific nature of curriculum materials to specific pupil needs/characteristics (Frymier, 1963, 1973, 1977a; Duncan and Frymier, 1967). The variation in human characteristics controls learning style and ultimately the response of any learner to a potential curriculum material.

The development of the ACCS began with a group of 42 experienced teachers who generated a list of factors
that they believed had an impact on learning. Subsequently, two groups of educational psychologists and instructional specialists reviewed the lists of dimensions making modifications and suggestions. Using this information, the group developed a conceptual framework composed of ten dimensions of essential learner characteristics: (1) previous experience, (2) intelligence, (3) motivation, (4) emotion/personality, (5) creativity, (6) sociability, (7) verbal expression, (3) auditory perception, (9) visual perception, and (10) motor perception. Each of these ten dimensions are defined in "high/low" terms (Figure 3). The terms across from each other are opposites, while those within the same column are similar. The basic supposition is that the terms in the left hand column are roughly equivalents and terms in the right hand column are roughly equivalents. Taken together, terms in the left hand column comprise a definition of the high end of the continuum, while terms in the right hand column comprise a definition of the low end of that same continuum (Frymier, 1977). The conceptual framework for these ten dimensions presumed that the descriptor terms listed on the left hand column would characterize learners who were "high" on that same dimensions. In order to assess a student on the dimension of experience (Figure 3), the teacher or rater must determine what terms are most characteristic of that particular student.
**Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENCE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has traveled widely</td>
<td>has not traveled much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stimulus-rich background</td>
<td>stimulus-poor background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has read a lot</td>
<td>has read very little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has mastered previous learnings</td>
<td>has not mastered previous learnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has skills of learning</td>
<td>lacks skills of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high achievement</td>
<td>low achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extensive interests and activities</td>
<td>limited interests and activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3**

Learner Characteristics Related to Experience

If the learner is found to be best described by the left-hand side of the chart, the learner is said to be "high" in the learner characteristic of experience. If the learner is best described by the right-hand side descriptors, then he or she is said to be "low" in experience.

Each piece of curriculum material may also be classified on ten dimensions that directly correspond or "match" the learner characteristics. For example, a workbook sheet, textbook page, or visual aid may be assessed on the characteristic of experience according to the descriptors in Figure 4 below.
**EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>special terminology</th>
<th>common vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>provides vicarious experience</td>
<td>provides direct experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requires special training to use</td>
<td>no special training required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advanced/difficult reading level</td>
<td>simple/beginning reading level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advanced in nature</td>
<td>introductory in nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representative of reality</td>
<td>original or actual thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>examples and illustrations are complex and difficult to understand</td>
<td>examples and illustrations are simple and understandable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4

Curriculum Characteristics Related to Experience

If the curriculum material is best described by the descriptors on the left side of the chart, the material is classified as "high" in experience. If the material is best described by the right side of the chart, the material is rated as "low" in experience. Further, a piece of curriculum material is categorized according to one of ten major academic disciplines and several subordinate classes of subject matter, to media format, and to appropriate age level.

The basic rational of ACCS is that a "match" can be made between learner and curriculum material that will enhance learning. The asterisk (*) above the right-hand
column on the curriculum characteristics chart in Figure 4 is used to suggest that students who are deficient on that dimension need curriculum materials that are characterized by the terms in that column. A learner "low" in experience should deal with materials that are "low" in the experience characteristic. A learner "high" in experience could cope with either "high" or "low" materials though "high" experience materials should be more interesting and challenging for this student.

With regard to some other characteristics, however, a "mismatch" is more appropriate. For example, a learner "low" in motivation as a characteristic would not find "low" motivation materials interesting. In such a case, a learner "low" in motivation should be provided with "high" motivation materials (Figure 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTIVATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stimulating</td>
<td>calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evocative</td>
<td>routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>examples provocative</td>
<td>examples lacking or not provocative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marked contrast</td>
<td>contrast not evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compelling</td>
<td>bland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unique</td>
<td>ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex</td>
<td>simple or uniform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immediate feedback</td>
<td>feedback not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activity-oriented</td>
<td>passivity-oriented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5
Curriculum Characteristics Related to Motivation
ACCS provides a framework that enables teachers to focus upon the unique interactions that occur between an individual student's characteristics and the same factors as they relate to a given piece of curriculum material or textbook and its potential use. By using ACCS, these materials can be matched to students precisely to help each student learn (Frymier, 1977).
Objectives of the Study

This study is designed to examine the curriculum characteristics (as defined by The Annehurst Curriculum Classification System) that exist in first- and third-year high school Spanish core textbooks and to determine what differences may exist within and between the two groups of materials.

This analysis builds upon the tradition of examining foreign language materials for a variety of attributes (Quinn, 1971; Joiner, 1974; Jorstad, 1975; and Azevedo, 1978). It extends these research efforts by examining other criteria: curriculum characteristics in foreign language textbooks. This research study is similar to earlier investigations in other subject matter areas (Kraus, 1976; Quickenton, 1977; Davis, Frymier and Clinefelter, 1977; Wade, 1977; Jeter and Kraus, 1973; Wright and Phillips, 1973; Kysilka, 1978; and Cornbleth, 1978) and is designed to achieve three basic aims:

1. To use the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System (ACCS) as a tool for classifying, describing and analyzing a selected group of foreign language materials (Spanish textbooks).

2. To provide information about the curriculum characteristics (as defined by ACCS) of textbook
materials that are being used in first- and third-year high school Spanish classes in the 16 states that have statewide textbook adoption policies.

3. To determine what kind of differences exist in the curriculum characteristics in selected foreign language materials utilized in the aforementioned states.

In order to describe and analyze the selected core textbooks used in high school Spanish classes, while focusing upon curriculum characteristics that relate directly to learner characteristics, the researcher needed an appropriate instrument. A review of the traditional schemes used to describe and analyze foreign language textbooks revealed that none of the existing schemes takes the individual foreign language student into consideration. It was necessary, therefore, to investigate areas outside of foreign language education. Although seven basic schemes were reviewed (See Chapter II) they too, were based upon traditional analytical standards and did not serve the needs of this researcher. On the other hand, The Annehurst Curriculum Classification System, did relate curriculum characteristics to learner characteristics and provided an instrument that could be used in this study.

In order to test the feasibility of using ACCS in the foreign language classroom 14 textbooks used in states with mandated adoption lists were selected for evaluation. Although ACCS can be used to classify, describe, and analyze
all forms of curriculum material (textbooks, workbooks, ditto sheets, slides, realia, etc.) a review of foreign language articles and research reports revealed that the main source of guidance and information for the foreign language teacher and student is the core textbook. In order to obtain a representative sample of texts used in high school foreign language classes, the researcher obtained the names of all Spanish textbooks that have been approved for use by those states that have mandated textbook adoption policies. The pilot study indicated that based upon raw percentage scores there were minimal differences between first- and second-year textbooks, but that differences did occur between the the first- and the third-year texts. Due to attrition between third-year and upper level classes (fourth- and fifth-year), many schools do not offer an advanced level language course, and those that do, generally have no specific core textbook. Therefore, the first- and third-year texts were selected for analysis. This study will address the following research questions:

1. Can the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System be used as a tool for classifying, describing, and analyzing foreign language materials used in first- and third-year high school Spanish classrooms?
2. As determined by the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System, what are the curriculum characteristics of selected materials used in first- and third-year high school Spanish classrooms?

3. Are there any differences in the curriculum characteristics of materials used in first- and third-year classrooms?
Hypotheses

The following hypotheses will be tested for the purposes of this study:

Hypothesis I  There will be no significant differences in the curriculum characteristics of previously selected first-year Spanish core textbooks on state-wide textbook adoption lists as determined by the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System.

Hypothesis II  There will be no significant differences in the curriculum characteristics of previously selected third-year Spanish core textbooks on state-wide textbook adoption lists as determined by the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System.

Hypothesis III  There will be no significant difference between the curriculum characteristics of core textbooks used in first-year Spanish classes and core textbooks used in third-year high school Spanish classes as determined by the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System.
Definitions

Curriculum Materials: Curriculum materials refer to the artifacts of curriculum as opposed to people or actors in curriculum. Such artifacts, or "things" include books, magazines, journals, handouts, films, filmstrips, tapes, and other similar materials. For the purposes of this study, however, the examination of curriculum materials will be confined to the core textbooks used at the first- and third-year levels of high school Spanish classes.

Core Textbooks: Those textbooks that appear on the official list of approved instructional material for each state under the headings of "basal textbooks, instructional materials (not including workbooks, dictionaries, multimedia kits, films, filmstrips, etc.), basic textbooks, or basic textbook series" or that have been presented by the Foreign Language Consultants of each state as the principal text used in first- and third-year Spanish classes.

Human Learner Characteristics: Human learner characteristics refer to those significant aspects of human existence within individuals that affect learning in school (Frymier, 1977). These aspects are: (1) previous experience, (2) intelligence, (3) motivation, (4) emotion/personality, (5) creativity, (6) sociability, (7) verbal expression, (8) auditory perception, (9) visual perception, and (10) motor perception. These ten dimensions, factors, or characteristics are further
defined by a vertical, elaborated continuum of descriptor
terms that defines each human dimension in such a way that
dichotomous, "rich" or "deficient" distinctions are made.
The ten dimensions together comprise a profile of the learner.
For example, the operational definition of "previous experi-
ence is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has traveled widely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stimulus-rich background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has read a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has mastered previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has skills of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extensive interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has not traveled much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stimulus-poor background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has read very little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has not mastered previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learnings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacks skills of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 140 descriptors for the ten dimensions are listed in
Appendix 3.

Curriculum Characteristics: Curriculum characteristics
are those dimensions, factors, or dimensions that relate
directly or "match" the human learner characteristics that
affect learning (Frymier, 1977). These dimensions have names
that are identical to the ten human learner characteristics.
These dimensions are: (1) previous experience, (2) intelli-
gence, (3) motivation, (4) emotion-personality, (5) crea-
tivity, (6) sociability, (7) verbal expression, (8) auditory
perception, (9) visual perception, and (10) motor perception.
These descriptor terms describe materials as "rich" or "deficient" on each dimension. The ten dimensions together form a profile of a piece of curriculum material. For example, the operational definition of "previous experience" is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>special terminology</td>
<td>common vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provides vicarious</td>
<td>provides direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requires special training</td>
<td>no special training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to use</td>
<td>required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advanced, difficult</td>
<td>simple, beginning reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading level</td>
<td>level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advanced in nature</td>
<td>introductory in nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representative of</td>
<td>original or actual thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>examples and illustrations</td>
<td>examples and illustrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are complex and difficult</td>
<td>are simple and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to understand</td>
<td>understandable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 140 descriptor terms used to further define these ten dimensions explain the nature of curriculum materials. They describe what the researcher will look for whenever curriculum materials are being analyzed, classified, and evaluated. These terms are listed in Appendix 3.

Text Profile: A text profile is the combination of "rich/deficient" determinations for each of the ten ACCS dimensions presented together to form a representation or description of each individual textbook.
Significance of the Problem

Research activity of the foreign language teaching profession during the past thirteen years has focused on such areas as individual learning style, learner strategies, learner characteristics, and student-teacher interactions in the classroom (Stern, 1980, p. 212). Educators and researchers have proposed many models for adapting instruction, materials, and environment to particular learning styles (Hunt, 1972, 1975; Dunn and Dunn, 1973; Joyce and Weil, 1972; Wood, 1973). No studies have been conducted, however, that actually examine the curriculum characteristics that relate directly to learner factors in foreign language materials. One of the most important variables in the foreign language teaching-learning process, the textbook, has been neglected. There has been no systematic evaluation of the foreign language text based upon the theory that there are certain "discernible human qualities...that affect learning" (Frymier, 1977, p. 55) present in each student and in each piece of curriculum material.

According to Postman and Weigartner (1971), "Textbooks traditionally assume that all students are more or less alike; that students learn in the same way; and that students are interested in the same things" (p. 115). These assumptions are mirrored in the existing instruments used in the evaluation of content and nature of curriculum. While student motivation, interests, and needs are often mentioned in check-lists and
forms, no instrument exists that focuses upon student needs and differences.

Garfinkle (1973) states that "no single source exists that classifies and evaluates language teaching materials" (pp. 185-186). Pfister and Troyanovich (1971) voiced a similar concern: "There exists no systematic attempt to review textbooks as they appear on the market. Present practice is random and wasteful due to duplication" (p. 93). After a decade, the need for such an instrument has not been met.

A recent survey of eighty school districts evenly distributed among ten states across the country, 20 teacher training institutions, and a random sample of members of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages emphasizes the necessity of a scheme for selection and evaluation. This survey (Brickell and Paul, 1982) was designed to provide information to foreign language educators regarding the current dimensions of professional concerns and to stimulate efforts to address that emerged from the study. They reported that where available, "the typical teacher used only basic textbooks every day" (p. 180). But when asked to rate the materials used in the foreign language classrooms, the basic textbook received one of the lowest quality ratings. The researchers concluded that "textbooks will be used most often by teachers, almost regardless of their quality" (p. 180). These findings indicate that nothing else is as important to foreign language educators as having a good, basic text for
their students. In order to ensure that excellent textbooks are available for teachers' and students' use, publishers, textbook selection committees, and the classroom teacher need a means by which appropriate materials choices can be made.

This study will attempt to fill the two basic needs mentioned above. First, it will develop an instrument based on ACCS to aid foreign language educators in the "classification of curriculum in terms of human variability so that they can meet students' needs and foster the fullest development of each individual human being" (Frymier, 1977, p. 112). Second, it will investigate those aspects of human variability that are directly related to learning and examine and evaluate selected textbooks using those criteria.
Assumptions

Classification of materials on the basis of ten dimensions inherent in the Annehurst Classification Curriculum Classification System reflects the following four assumptions: (1) Just as learners are different and can be characterized in particular ways, so are curriculum materials different and can be characterized in particular ways; (2) The ACCS is a unified system of concepts, definitions, and practices that relates to teaching and learning in schools; (3) The ACCS is built upon those dimensions of human existence that relate most directly to learning; and (4) The ACCS can be further developed to the extent that it is understood, examined, criticized, and used (Frymier, 1977).

Limitations

The following limitations in materials sampling, sample size, and reliability of textbook classifications should be taken into account in considering the findings of this study.

The collection of initial information (names of core textbooks used in Spanish I and Spanish III) was dependent upon the responses of the Consultants for Foreign Language Instruction in each State Department of Education. Results could have been affected by what they did not contribute, for instance, failure to mention a less popular textbook
series, or failure to respond to the questionnaire. Because of the limited sample (14 first- and third-year Spanish textbooks), the results of this study are generalizable only to those textbooks evaluated and analyzed by the researcher.

The extent to which accurate descriptions and evaluations of the textbooks were made was dependent upon the degree of interrater reliability achieved by the researchers and raters.
Organization of the Dissertation

This study is divided into five sections followed by appendices and a bibliography. The first chapter presents the problem that was investigated, a summary of ACCS theory, objectives of the study, research questions and hypotheses to be tested, definitions of certain terms and concepts that are used throughout the study, significance of the problem, assumptions, and limitations. The second chapter is a review of the pertinent literature, and how this particular study relates to important research studies that have already been done. The third chapter describes the procedures and methodology used in the investigation, the survey instrument, used and the analysis employed. In fourth chapter the findings are analysed based on the interpretation of the statistical results, percentage scores, and text profiles. The fifth chapter contains a summary of the study, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

In this study, priority and prominence are given to textbooks as they relate to the foreign language learner. More specifically, this study deals with an analysis of the nature of those Spanish textbook materials that students are currently using in the public secondary school districts with state-wide textbook adoption policies for foreign language education. These textbooks have been classified, described, and analyzed according to the ten curriculum characteristics of the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System (ACCS).

The nature of the study requires a review of the literature in four areas:

1. A brief overview of three basic theories surrounding evaluative instruments.

2. Curriculum and textbook evaluation methods and instruments that have been used in foreign language education.

3. Curriculum classification and analysis systems that in some manner resemble ACCS.

4. Research studies that use ACCS as an instrument to classify, analyze, and describe curriculum materials.
Evaluative instruments for textbooks are traditionally based upon three basic theories of what constitutes a "good text." Spalding refers to the first as "the "score-card" theory. It purports that a "good text" is made up of discrete items that can be examined and rated independently of each other. Scoring weights are assigned to each item or characteristic. The sum of the ratings of individual items is believed to be a measure of the quality of the text and the overall score is used to determine whether the text should be adopted (Cronbach, 1955).

A typical "score card" contains items similar to the following:

**FRENCH TEXTS**

**I. AIM OR POINT OF VIEW OF THE AUTHOR**

1. How well are the cultural or other points of view stated?
2. How well is the correlation with other school subjects developed?
3. How well is the structural, or else the functional point of view treated?

**II. SUBJECT MATTER AND METHODOLOGY**

1. How satisfactory are the exceptions to grammar rules placed in the textbooks?
2. How well is the matter of pronunciation handled?
3. How well is the repetition of important words provided for?

(Clement, 1942, p. 105)

Evaluative instruments that subscribe to the "score-card" theory generally consider five major points: (1)
philosophy or points of view of the author(s), (2) content of the textbook, (3) instructional aids and helps for using textbooks, (4) mechanical features (number of pages, durability and composition of covers etc.), and (5) prominence of publishers.

All of these factors consider only the book by itself. Proponents of "score card" methods believe that the selection of a superior textbook is possible, and that this text will function well in any situation. The evaluative criteria of instruments generally do not include the teacher, student, or environment in which the book is to be used (Cronbach, 1955).

A second theory, developed and published by the American Textbook Publishers Institute, states that "The modern textbook is more and more thought of as an 'assistant teacher' in print...[The author] sets up as clearly as possible the aims which his teaching is to accomplish; whether to develop skills, understanding, or attitudes or some of all three" (Bates et al., 1949, p. 5). It is the author's effort to enter the classroom as personally as the pages of a book will permit. The author, who considers the textbook to be a projection of himself or herself into the classroom, assumes that teachers will recognize the text as what he or she has tried to make it and will use it accordingly. The classroom instructor is expected to cooperate with this "teacher in print" relying upon the text to aid in the planning of class discussions, practice materials, projects,
activities, and further readings. Bates et al., (1949)

state that:

...there is no reason for them [the teachers] to plan the organization of the course in detail. The author of the textbook can do that for them. There is no need for them to think up all the precise instructional language...nor should they have to rely entirely on their own resources for the planning of class activities...The author of the textbook can do these things better than any but the ablest teachers can. (pp. 5 - 7)

Spalding (1955) describes this theory as one in which the teacher does what the text demands, when the text demands it. In his criticism of this theory, he states that:

Initiative and ingenuity are to be encouraged when the author decides that they are necessary. The students are to take account of where they are whenever the author provides this activity. ...The aims of education are to be left in the hands of the authors and publishers, for it is claimed that it is better to have a book which achieves its aims well than to have one which attempts, however, poorly, to achieve ends which are important to the local school system, if these two sets of goals are different. (p. 180)

The Institute suggests that based upon their theory, the selection of a "good textbook" is highly personal and subjective. The text should be rated in terms of its own aims, not on the basis of some general objective that can be applied to all textbooks. This subjectivity, however, is not reflected in actual instruments.

Several instruments developed in the early 1970s (Stevens and Morrissett, 1971; Eash, 1972; Haussler and Pittman, 1973) subscribe to this theory. These instruments
endorse a specific curriculum model selected by the author or publisher, and give unfavorable ratings to all texts that do not follow a similar philosophy (Eraut, 1975).

Cronbach (1955) developed a third good text theory, in which he explains that the text is part of the means by which culture is communicated to the learner. It is a device for helping students interpret, respond, and fit into their environment. It seeks to help learners take advantage of the experience of others. Cronbach (1955) states that "The text is successful when it modifies the learner so that he responds to more of the environmental forces and factors which constitute his world" (p. 31). As a result of learning, students must be able to perceive new relationships, new patterns, and new forces as having positive significance for their activities. The success or failure of the text, therefore, is ultimately determined by what students do or fail to do, what they know or fail to know. This "text-in-use" is really an evaluation of pupils using the textbook. According to Cronbach (1955), "an inquiry into the pupil's use of the text would focus on how the pupil operates with his printed material and on his concept of text use" (p. 214). He postulates that investigations of the pupil as a text selector and user would determine how the pupil actually employs the text as a learning tool. The following statements/questions from "Learning Material Declaration
for Grade 7 Mathematics" (Nystrom, 1974), illustrate this theory.

Directions: Students are to respond on a 2-point scale to the following questions:

The examples often refer to things I know about.
The materials are nice/dull.
The materials are easy/hard to read.
What do you think of the materials you use in mathematics?
How do you like doing mathematics?

Summary

These three theories of "a good textbook" (scorecard, text as teacher in print, and text in use) form the basis for the majority of the instruments used in textbook analysis and description that will be discussed in the next two sections. The first two theories play a dominant role in most of the evaluation schemes even though there is variation among instruments due to the author's philosophies and particular needs that are addressed within each. This is particularly evident in earlier foreign language instruments that are based primarily on content and methodology.
Analysis of Textbook Evaluation Instruments Used in Foreign Language Education

The analysis of foreign language texts is divided into two main sections: (1) an examination of instruments developed for the general evaluation of foreign language textbooks, and (2) an examination of instruments developed for the evaluation of two specific content areas: culture and dialogue.

Instrument Development and Use in General Evaluation of Foreign Language Texts

The changing trends in foreign language education can be analyzed through an examination of the instruments used to evaluate foreign language materials. The early foreign language "primers" were organized according to the traditional sequence of parts of speech. The target language was presented via rules of varying degrees of accuracy and detail, followed by examples and translation exercises that taught the students to convert the native language into the target language (Azevedo, 1978).

Clement (1942) developed one of the first instruments for evaluation of these foreign language texts. He modelled his "Outline for Analyzing and Appraising Textbooks" upon the "score-card" theory and provided certain minimum items and criteria for evaluation of all elementary and secondary textbooks. His manual for text evaluation also incorporates special analysis outlines for Latin and French texts (Appendix
C). The four major divisions of both outlines are: (1) point of view of the author; (2) content of subject matter and methodology; (3) instructional aids and helps; and (4) mechanical features.

These four divisions include criteria based upon emphasis of the target language culture, formal versus functional presentation of the language, direct versus indirect method, and inclusion of maps, illustrations and supplementary readings on the life and customs of the target language culture. Provisions are made for qualitative or quantitative scoring of the "good text." The former includes five estimates (poor, fair, good, very good, and excellent) that are applicable to each division of the scheme. The latter supplies the rater with a numerical score sheet that divides each category into a specific number of points (450 for a "good text"). Although the principal instrument is not subject specific, many of the same criteria incorporated in this instrument are also found in all other evaluative schemes.

In the 1950s a period of rapid change occurred in methodology, textbook design, and evaluation instruments. Azevedo (1978) calls this "the era of textbooks as perishable consumer goods" (p. 406). Textbook committees eagerly replaced old texts for new and better books in the constant search for the "perfect text." In order to choose the "best one" it was therefore necessary to develop instruments to aid committees and teachers in textbook selection processes.
The Modern Language Association (MLA, 1961) designed the first instrument specifically for evaluation of foreign language materials. A committee established criteria for an evaluation form for all teaching materials including textbooks (Appendix C). One hundred and eighty-four teachers used the "Modern Language Association Criteria for the Evaluation of Foreign Language Textbooks" (MLA Criteria) for the evaluation of nearly 2400 items. This instrument lists characteristics of materials within specific categories and rates these characteristics as either "E" (excellent), "A" (acceptable), or "U" (unacceptable) (Ollman, 1962).

In the MLA instrument, criteria for the evaluation of basic foreign language texts are arranged in the following 13 categories: (1) development of the four language skills, (2) scope, (3) organization for school schedules, (4) presentation of material, (5) psychology of learning, (6) exercises, (7) reading material, (8) word study, (9) structure analysis, (10) lesson and end vocabulary, (11) use of English, (12) instructions for the teacher, and (13) layout.

The behaviorist psychology of learning that characterized audiolingual theory is reflected throughout the instrument and texts that do not adhere to the audiolingual method are rated as inappropriate. According to the MLA, the primary objective of the text is language competence. The
secondary goals are cultural insight and literary acquaintance. However, Ollman (1962) states that "factual, authentic, representative, important and interesting cultural information" are required if the text is to receive an "excellent" rating (p. 144).

Pfister and Troyanovich (1971) suggested that the MLA Criteria "are not sufficiently complete to elicit precise textbook evaluations" (p. 98) and revised the MLA instrument. Their "Expanded Version of MLA Criteria for the Evaluation of Foreign Language Textbooks" (Appendix C) included sections for the evaluation of (1) pre-reading material, (2) listening and speaking material, (3) reading and writing material, (4) cultural material, and (5) miscellaneous considerations.

They added only two criteria to the original MLA instrument, both under the category "Miscellaneous Considerations." The first addition deals with the actual physical appearance of the text, and the second deals with the general acceptance or "comfort" with the text by the majority of the school staff. In spite of the revision, this instrument also has a definite bias toward audiolingual textbooks. Materials that provide for "fixed pronunciation habits...memorization of dialogues...habituation of vocabulary and grammar structures...many pattern drills...inductive lessons...and drills based on contrastive analysis" (pp. 93-94) are rated as "adequate" while texts that use different methodological approaches are rated as "inadequate." The form is much
shorter, and the general explanations for each category are more concise than the original MLA instrument but the core criteria remain the same.

Pfister and Troyanovich (1971) used their form to evaluate the strategies of basic college German texts reviewed in professional journals between 1953 and 1965. Their investigation of the rational operant in these texts revealed that the grammar-translation method dominates the bulk of the present classroom teaching aids, and that textbook editors publish texts that are aimed primarily at college and university populations.

In a similar study, Pfister and Rada (1974) used the evaluation criteria of Pfister and Troyanovich (1971) to review nine college level basic German texts published in the United States and Canada between 1968 and 1972. Their analysis concentrated on three basic areas: dialogues, drills, and culture. They reported that due to the influence of the audiolingual method, dialogues were included in the texts. They rated these dialogues as "inadequate," however, "because of the unnatural, stilted speech, disconnected exchange with little meaning, or because of excessive length" (p. 147). Drill material, although present in all textbooks, also received an unsatisfactory rating. The reviewers stated that the majority of these exercises demonstrated the "author's lack of concern for the basic principles of the psychology of learning" (p. 148). Only one
textbook scored an "adequate" for culture. The other eight, treated culture in a strictly narrow sense by including only past and present achievements in the arts or various stereotypical aspects of everyday life. An overall analysis of the 13 criterion points revealed that not one of the reviewed texts could be termed adequate for adoption.

Rivers (1968), in Teaching Foreign Language Skills, advocates a much more subjective, flexible approach to textbook analysis. She offers a "Checklist for Textbook Evaluation" (Appendix C) with 25 groups of questions that address the following points: (1) the method on which the book is based, (2) the amount of interest the materials would have for students, (3) whether the unit designs would allow for a progressive development of the language skills when they are first introduced and the proportion of time allowed to each, (4) the reality and authenticity of the language, (5) the presentation of grammar and vocabulary, (6) the extent to which the native language is used, (7) suggestions for supplementary activities, (8) whether the teacher would enjoy working with the book, (9) cost of the materials and whether they are part of a sequence for different levels, and (10) pretesting of materials.

This subjective checklist does not provide a rating scale that is influenced by one particular method but offers questions that may be adapted to any language program or teaching style. For example: "Is this proportion of
allo for the objectives of your course?" or "Does this grammar presentation suit your purpose?" (Rivers, 1968, p. 369). There is also another significant addition, "indications of ways in which students can be encouraged to use what they have learned in actual communication" (p. 369). This is the first evaluation form that is not primarily concerned with grammatical content, but that takes into consideration the needs and interests of the pupils and their use of materials.

More varied approaches to evaluation occurred during the mid 1970s. Steiner (1973) recognized many of the changes that were occurring within the language teaching profession and the effects these changes would have upon foreign language materials. She described the "textbook of the future" and stressed that texts should be adaptable to many ability levels and to varied pacing, enabling instructors to choose methods and structures to meet the needs, motivations, and interests of students. It became evident that these "new" textbooks would also require different methods of evaluation.

Bartel (1974) was one of the first to recognize the limited usefulness of traditional evaluation forms written for specific language teaching methodologies. He developed an instrument that focuses not only upon the students, but also upon the language program, teachers, and departmental philosophy. He stated that "...different groups of students represent different needs which should be taken into
consideration, both in course planning and materials selection ...and that educators should be prepared to adapt a book to the foreign language program" (p. 323). He also offers guidelines to assist teachers in choosing a text that will match their particular pedagogical and personal practices, preferences, and abilities based upon the premise that "the teacher should reaffirm his conviction in the principles and goals of the program in which he teaches" (p. 328) before considering the selection of a textbook. Bartel's (1974) criteria for evaluation include: (1) the department philosophy, purposes, goals, and practical reality, (2) personnel, their training, general background, and preferences, (3) the students, their goals, and enrollment per class, and (4) the structure of the language program, numbers of years the language is offered, the physical facilities, and actual amount of hours spent teaching, and when classes meet (morning, afternoon, etc.).

Grittner and Welty (1974) also recognized the bias in instruments developed for the evaluation of audiolingual textbooks and developed criteria that did not penalize a text because it did or did not reflect a particular theoretical orientation. Their evaluative criteria comprised fifteen categories: (1) skill development, (2) listening comprehension, (3) pronunciation, (4) speaking, (5) reading, (6) writing, (7) grammar, (8) vocabulary, (9) culture, (10) drills and exercises, (11) length, (12) construction, (13)
flexibility, (14) supplementary materials, and (15) suggested supplementary materials.

They added the dimensions of artistic and popular culture; adaptability of text to meet student interests, abilities, and learning styles; and suggestions for "teacher made" supplementary materials to complement the original basic textbook. In their evaluation they attempted to orient the criteria toward two basic value judgments: (1) "Is this book or series likely to help students learn the target language; and (2) With this goal in mind, is the book teachable?" (p. 315). Using this criteria, their examination and evaluation of five basic German textbooks for high school students published from 1969 to 1973 revealed, however, that all five texts continued to adhere largely to the audiolingual tradition.

In 1976 Chastain abandoned the guidelines normally used in textbook selection and incorporated the variable "individual student" into a system that had principally considered only the "content" of the text, the "method," and the "teacher." He is far less detailed in his suggestions for selecting a text than the MLA Criteria (1961), Rivers (1968), Bartel (1974) or Grittner and Welty (1974). Instead, he recommends a more general subjective evaluation and bases his criteria for text selection on the following eight points: (1) The student learns to do what he does; (2) The student needs to feel successful; (3) The student should be
offered a variety of activities; (4) The student must be led through three steps in the acquisition of language; (5) The student approaches language mastery gradually; (6) A student requires practice in all four skills; (7) A student wants to know about people of the country; and (8) A student is a normal human being...he does what he has to do in order to get by.

Chastain's criteria for evaluation of textbooks fall into five basic categories:

1. The vocabulary should be the kind with which the teacher feels comfortable, and which lends itself to the discussion of actual life by the student;
2. The three learning steps, understanding, practicing, and expressing oneself should be emphasized throughout the book;
3. All four language skills should be practiced in proper balance with each other;
4. The book should develop the language skills in a progressively difficult manner; and
5. The texts should incorporate homework. (pp. 526-529)

Davison (1976) devised an evaluation system that included relationships between the text, students, curriculum, class size, and teacher, as well as the internal construction of the text (Appendix C). Previous schemes had concentrated only upon the student, teacher, curriculum, and internal construction (Clement, 1942; MLA Criteria, 1961; Rivers, 1968; Pfister and Troyanovich, 1971; Bartel, 1974; Grittner and Welty, 1974; Chastain, 1976). Davison realized that there was "little chance of developing a single fool-proof plan of action for text selection" (p. 311) and
provided a list of factors that could be examined subjectively by a selection committee or teacher. These selected factors "point in the direction of consistent evaluation and selection of texts" (p. 311), and as such are useful for a wide variety of situations.

In Davidson's instrument the section on "student/text" is more completely developed. It considers the objectives, needs, age, language background, instructional level, and appropriateness of content and style (literary versus conversational). Although these factors are directed toward "groups" of students (adults versus children, beginning versus advanced students, medical interns versus graduate literature students), he includes no provisions for "individual" student's needs.

The category of "curriculum" considers the objectives of the program, and the actual number of hours or weeks allotted to the language class. Also contained within this category are the ideological constraints (religious or political) and the methodology determined by administrators or teachers.

Other sections examine "class size" (large versus individualized or independent study), "teacher" (fluency in the target language, and experience in language teaching), and "internal construction of the text" (which material is presented and how the material is presented). The questions
posed under this last category include: clarity of instructions, arrangements of grammatical presentations, types of drill activities, explanations, review of material, and incorporation of the four skills.

Cowles (1976) compiled a checklist "in an effort to bring together a variety of considerations germane to evaluating textual materials in a comprehensive format that is easy to duplicate and use" (p. 300). "The Textual Materials Evaluation Checksheet" (Appendix C) is based upon the Stevens (1971) form but also incorporates elements of culture and communicative competence. His 26 points of evaluation include basic language skills, approach (method), clarity and accuracy of statements, means used to improve retention, move toward free expression, supplementary materials, physical appearance of text, and class size. Each section contains two to five descriptor terms (acceptable/not acceptable etc.) that are to be circled and reviewed at the end for an overall view of the text. Although the instrument is an adequate summary of all other evaluation forms, it does not include any new criteria, nor does it include statements that relate directly to student interests or needs.

Johnson (1978) proposed a system of evaluation based upon criteria used in Texas, Florida, Oklahoma, and Virginia for textbook selection and six different instruments (Bartel, 1974; Chastain, 1976; Cowles, 1976; Davison, 1976; Joiner,
1974; Rivers, 1968). He focuses on two principal areas: text content and factors beyond content. Text content evaluation includes an approach to skills teaching and learning, presentation of language, pronunciation and phonology, grammar, exercises and drills, vocabulary, communicative activities, culture, scope and sequence, adaptability and flexibility, supplementary materials, and tests. Evaluation of "factors beyond content" include such areas as organization for school schedules, lesson and end vocabulary, instructions for the teacher, layout, experience and expertise of author(s), evidence in development and research, biases, and costs. In each category the major areas are addressed in the introductory paragraph, and several yes/no questions follow that may help readers to establish a checklist applicable to their local situation (Appendix C).

Evaluation of Textbooks Using Previously Described Instruments

Scanlan (1974) surveyed three major Latin textbooks published between 1969 and 1973. His criteria for analysis included method, content, organization, level of instruction, readings, cultural and historical exposition, and supplementary materials. The survey indicated that textbook authors are aware of and employ many of the latest theories both of learning and of second language acquisition.

Frechette (1974) examined 93 textbooks published between 1968 and 1973 for use at both elementary and intermediate levels in high school and college. Using the
criteria from the MLA Selective List of Materials (1962), Steiner (1973), Rivers (1968), and Spaulding (1961), Frechette reported that the texts surveyed "presented the foreign language teacher with few innovations...the general trend...is a not too well disguised return to pre-audiolingual ways, a return to the traditional mode of presentation" (p. 314).

Based upon the technical literature on textbook analysis, Azevedo (1978a, 1978b) surveyed first- and second-year Spanish college texts, using a sample of such books published in the 1970s. He examined what is taught in first-year and intermediate courses based upon the materials published for each level. He also commented on their salient characteristics as indicators of methodological trends currently accepted by Spanish teachers. The first-year college texts generally revealed an apparent lack of synchrony between theoretical research and practical application in foreign language education. Believing that textbooks are traditional in their approach, Azevedo (1978a) stated that "a segment of the profession is rather conservative as regards to course goals and teaching methods" (p. 407). He reported that while the amount of cultural information has increased, most is trivial and dated. The most promising trends noted were the refusal to insist on methodological dogmatism and the movement toward enlightened eclecticism.
His overview of second-year materials reveals that there is enough variety of content and design to fulfill the basic needs of any non-specialized intermediate course, but there is no marked qualitative difference between the first- and second-year materials. The greatest variation is in the distribution of topics. Azevedo (1978b) interprets this lack of agreement as pedagogical confusion and states that "there are no clear ideas as to what would be the ideal sequence for maximizing the opportunities for learning and retaining language material in a fully integrated way" (p. 8). He suggests that this lacuna is caused by the foreign language educators' lack of knowledge on the characteristics and needs of intermediate learners.

Jenks (1975) provides the most comprehensive overview of Spanish, French, and German materials to date. In an attempt to answer the question "Do contemporary foreign language materials reflect the current thinking and rhetoric of the profession-at-large?" (p. 94), he examined over 100 pieces of print, mixed media, and non-print materials available to the foreign language teacher. A general analysis of print-dominant materials (textbooks, readers, cultural materials, periodicals, and games) reveals that publishers "are reacting in a positive manner to trends involving individualized instruction, performance objectives, end-of-lesson (commercial) testing, teaching target culture, and short courses with varied topics" (p. 110). Textbooks and
workbooks reflect strategies derived from "cognitive code" and "communicative competence" philosophies.

Mixed media (visual and audio materials paired with written materials) are geared to more personalized and intensive learning. Tape cassettes and still visuals (slides and filmstrips) make up over 50% of this category and "seem destined to become the major correlates of printed materials in the future" (p. 115).

Nonprint-dominant materials (films, radio, television, video cassette recordings, computer-assisted instruction, and innumerable teacher-made materials) were the most difficult to evaluate due to their diffuse nature. Current films and filmstrips are moving toward a more realistic portrayal of target language speakers in everyday life situations. Radio and television broadcasts also follow this trend with popular sports broadcasts, commercials, music, and typical daily programs from the target language countries. While teacher-made materials are of higher quality in design than they were previously, and there is "evidence that teachers are making more; there is little evidence that teachers are creating more" (p. 123). In spite of this lack of creative effort, Jenks (1975) remains optimistic. He views the years ahead as "vibrant ones" due to the quantity and quality of materials that are being and will be produced for the foreign language educator.
Instrument Development and Evaluation of Specific Content Areas

Researchers and educators have developed instruments that focus upon specific evaluative tasks, such as the examination of the role of target language dialogue in the textbook and the analysis of cultural content and the effects it may have on student attitudes toward foreign language learning.

Evaluation of Dialogues in German Texts

Clausing (1974) examined dialogues in beginning German textbooks published in the United States between 1967 and 1972 in order to determine to what extent the structure of German textbook dialogues approaches that of actual spoken German, both in content and in length. The results of the analysis indicated that the language used in the dialogues is unnatural due to the lack of redundancy, sentence length, incorrect word choice, and absence of normal speech forms (contractions, affirmations etc).

These results were significant due to the fact that the textbooks followed the audiolingual tradition in which dialogues were the most important component of the text. The structures contained in them represented the spoken language and were the basis for all other components, such as drills and reading selections. By using edited versions of these dialogues in the classroom, instructors were teaching students to speak in an unnatural, stilted manner.
Evaluation of Culture in Textbooks

Although the criterion of "cultural content" has been included in even the earliest manuals for analysis of textbooks, general, systematic evaluation did not occur until the early 1970s. Most of these evaluations are subjective in nature and examine such areas as contemporary culture versus the historical past. Frechette (1972) indicated that few authors deal with contemporary life in France, but Jenks (1975) reported that many new reading texts are constructed around the culture and lifestyle of populations in other geographical locations. The Caribbean, Francophone Africa, Quebec, and Central America are highlighted in many new French texts.

Joiner (1974) created a form for evaluating cultural content of foreign language texts that focused upon the "hidden" cultural content of French textbooks. Using this form, the reviewer is led to investigate the various segments of society, socio-economic levels, age groups, sexes, and life styles of the target language countries and speakers. The evaluator must then indicate his or her overall impression of the passages, or illustrations by placing a check on a semantic differential scale at the point between two adjective pairs that best represents these judgments. The principal aim of this instrument is to promote positive attitudes toward peoples, toward the languages that they
speak, and to insure that textbooks provide stimulus for these positive attitudes.

Two other instruments were developed for the evaluation of deep and surface culture in French college texts. Moreau and Pfister (1978) developed an instrument based upon the work of Tinsley and Woloshin (1974) that identified "five universal problems of cultural orientation, human nature, social relations, man and nature, time, and space (p. 130)." These five cultural orientations were then subdivided into 14 characteristics that are typically French in nature. They evaluated ten intermediate, self-contained, college French texts published between 1972 and 1974 using these criteria. Analysis of the results indicated that only one of the ten textbooks was considered adequate in conveying deep French culture to the intermediate student.

Adapted from the Moreau and Pfister (1978) study that concentrated upon the analysis of deep cultural aspects, Levno and Pfister (1980) focused upon an analysis of five general areas of surface culture and five points dealing with the manner of presentation in first-year college texts published between 1972 and 1978. Of the 21 textbooks analyzed, two were adequate and three approached adequacy.

Summary

According to Joiner (1974) "Evaluating a foreign-language text is at best a difficult task, and all too often
it is poorly done" (p. 243). Ten years later the foreign language teacher is still confronted with the same problem. A review of the principal evaluative instruments revealed that the first popular schemes based their criteria on a particular methodological model (Clement, 1942; Ollman, 1962; Pfister and Trojanovich, 1971; Pfister and Rada 1974). Authors of five more recent instruments recognized the bias apparent in these schemes and expanded the criteria to include the internal construction of the text (content), and the external factors (students, teacher, class size, articulation between levels, etc.) (Rivers, 1968; Bartel, 1974; Chastain, 1976; Davison, 1976; Cowles, 1976). While these five schemes are able to analyze and evaluate a textbook in the traditional manner, they do not identify characteristics that are inherent in textbook materials and that correspond to the needs of the foreign language learner. It is this type of analysis, together with the traditional evaluation that is required in student-centered classrooms.
Review of Seven Schemes for the Analysis of Curriculum Materials

In order to examine the core textbooks used in high school Spanish classes it was necessary to select an appropriate system of analysis. In addition to the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System, the researcher reviewed seven other schemes that analyze curriculum materials as their basic aim. This section provides a comparative and critical survey of these seven published schemes. They are as follows:

1. Curriculum Materials Analysis System, University of Colorado, Boulder. (Stevens and Morrissett, 1968) [CMAS Scheme]

2. Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, Berkeley, California (Hutchins, 1970) [Berkeley Scheme]

3. Maurice J. Eash, University of Illinois, Chicago (1972)[Eash Scheme]

4. Educational Resource Centre, St. Gallen, Canton, Switzerland (Hengartner and Weinrebe, 1972) [St. Gallen Scheme]

5. Peter Haussler and June Pittman, Institute fur die Padagogik der Naturwissenschaften, University of Kiel, Germany (1973) [Haussler-Pittman Scheme]


7. Centre for Educational Technology, University of Sussex, Brighton, U.K. [Sussex Scheme]

The primary purpose of each scheme and technique is to support and improve curriculum decision-making. All of the aforementioned fit the definition of a curriculum
analysis scheme: "an organized set of questions and/or techniques designed for general application to given types of curriculum materials with the aim of elucidating and evaluating their most important characteristics" (Eraut, 1975, p. 33). The seven schemes were designed for analysis of different content areas and different levels of instruction. It is useful, therefore, to distinguish three possible functions for materials analysis in order to compare and describe these systems of evaluation. These functions are:

1. A descriptive-analytic function in which the materials are described and analyzed according to some curriculum model. The purpose is not only to describe the material but also to explain its rationale and its structure.

2. An evaluative function in which the materials are judged against a range of criteria.

3. A decision-making function in which the purpose is to provide a "summary" for those responsible for making decisions about the materials. It is to assist people in making definite decisions in a specific context.

General Description of the Seven Schemes

Curriculum materials are defined in all of these schemes as "materials for either pupil or teacher or both which have a significant influence on decision-making at the part-curriculum level" (Eraut, 1975, p. 4). The term "part-curriculum" refers to any significant segment of the whole curriculum, such as fourth and fifth grade history, first grade reading, middle school social studies, or high school foreign language.
Five of the seven published schemes are subject-specific in origin. The Berkeley Scheme is used for the evaluation of elementary science, the St. Gallen Scheme for elementary mathematics, the Haussler-Pittman Scheme for all levels of science, the Swedish Scheme for secondary mathematics, and the CMAS Scheme for secondary social science curricula. The Sussex and the Eash Schemes are not subject matter specific.

The authors of the Sussex Scheme developed a single general instrument for all subjects and all ages in order to "improve communication across subject boundaries and thus facilitate curriculum decision-making at the level of the whole curriculum" (Eraut, 1975, p. 9). The Eash Scheme, although appropriate for assessment of all instructional materials at all age levels, is much narrower in its scope, and focuses principally upon decision-making at the "part-curriculum" level.

The St. Gallen, Berkeley, Haussler-Pittman, and CMAS Schemes are purely qualitative. The rater responds to questions based upon pre-determined criteria. These responses may be in the form of a list, description, or summary of some particular aspect of the material. The only numbers required are those relating to cost or to time necessary to teach a unit or chapter. The Sussex Scheme is also qualitative, but additional advice is given to the analyst on how to supplement the original instrument with
carefully selective, semi-quantitative tables and profiles. The Swedish Scheme is unique. It uses a combination of qualitative and quantitative questions, rating scales, information tabulation, and a section for opinions by reviewers, teachers, and pupils. The Eash Scheme follows a "yes/no" check list format. The rater must answer a series of questions and then rate each section using a Likert scale from one to seven (poor to excellent).

Analysis Based Upon the Descriptive-Analytic Function

Six of the seven schemes approach the Descriptive-analytic function by using section headings derived from a curriculum model. The CMAS, Berkeley, Eash, Sussex, Haussler-Pittman, and St. Gallen Schemes head their major sections with the titles "Content, Aims, Objectives, Methods and Evaluation." These titles correspond to elements of the descriptive curriculum models proposed by Kerr (Objectives, Knowledge, School Learning Experiences, and Evaluation, 1968), Schultz (Intentions, Themes, Experiences, and Media, 1970), and a number of other writers (Giles, 1942; Taylor, 1967; and Nicholls, 1972). The CMAS, Eash, and Haussler-Pittman Schemes actually endorse a curriculum model based on behavioral objectives advocated by Tyler (1949). Only the Swedish Scheme, whose descriptive section is very short, the Berkeley Scheme, and the Sussex Scheme, avoid endorsing any curriculum development model (Eraut, 1975). The Swedish Scheme remains at the descriptive level with very little
analysis. It includes a short 12-item checklist in addition to the usual publishers information. Its primary concern is the evaluative function. St. Gallen concentrates on analysis with very little description.

The CMAS, Haussler-Pittman, Eash, and Sussex Schemes combine description with analysis. Eash includes a partly descriptive section on objectives as well as three brief descriptive summaries on scope and sequence, recommended methodology, and evaluation procedures (tests) included with the materials. Like the Swedish Scheme, it is primarily concerned with the evaluative function. The only two schemes dealing almost entirely with the descriptive-analytic function are the CMAS and the Berkeley Schemes.

Analysis of the Evaluative Function

Of the seven schemes under review, only the Berkeley Scheme omits the evaluative function altogether. Three schemes (Eash, St. Gallen, Haussler-Pittman) have merged evaluation with description; and three (CMAS, Swedish, Sussex) have separate evaluation sections. Even when there is a separate evaluation section, however, the total separation of the evaluative and the descriptive-analytic functions is impossible. Three kinds of descriptive-analytic questions inevitably carry evaluative overtones. The first and second types, consistency and implementation questions, appear in all of the instruments. For example:
"Do the forms of activity accord with the aims and the proposed methods? (St. Gallen)

How do children entering late adjust to the materials? (Berkeley)

With what kinds of pupils will the materials be most useful and successful? (CMAS)

The third type uses a checklist format that frequently evaluates by drawing attention to omissions. The types of questions often included in such checklists are illustrated by the following table taken from the product description analysis (Part 2.3.3.) of the Swedish Scheme (Nystrom, 1974):

PEDAGOGICAL DISPOSITION

Code: X indicates brief treatment
0 indicates exhaustive treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher Material</th>
<th>Pupil Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEDAGOGICAL DISPOSITION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Code:</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0 indicates exhaustive</strong></td>
<td>treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X indicates brief</strong></td>
<td>treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Division into basic and advanced course | 0 |
| Arrangements for low performers | X |
| Self Instructional design | X |

Eraut (1975) in his review of the Sussex Scheme criticized the evaluative sections of the CMAS and the Eash Schemes because they are based upon one curriculum model. He gives two reasons: (1) the lack of agreement within the field of curriculum on models or rationales for curriculum development, and (2) the conflicting theories regarding learning. The Eash Scheme that is primarily concerned with
the evaluative function and that follows the behavioral psychology model of curriculum development, is "far more concerned with whether the material has been developed according to the 'appropriate model' rather than whether it is any good" (p. 50).

The schemes that are mainly descriptive (Berkeley, St. Gallen, Haussler-Pittman) avoid this "appropriate model" issue by restricting their evaluative function, while the Swedish Scheme minimizes it through its adherence to the National Curricular Guidelines established by the Swedish National Board of Education. By following these guidelines, the scheme permits divergence but only within the prescribed framework. Its main function is seen (Nystrom, 1974) as preparing evidence for the users, without pre-empting the judgments that should properly be made by them.

The CMAS Scheme (Stevens and Morrissett, 1971) requires the analyst to respond to evaluative questions using a Likert scale format, and upon completion of each section, "to write and insert an abstract of the overall evaluation in not more than 100 words" (p. 5).

The Sussex Scheme encourages a divergent approach to evaluation. Whereas the other schemes all appear to assume common standards, the Sussex Scheme anticipates different judgments and acknowledges different standards. In the Sussex Scheme the analyst supplies the evaluative
questions by often referring to previous sections. For example:

Give arguments for and against pursuing the particular aims endorsed by the material in this area of the curriculum. Relate your arguments to potentially competing aims, the patterns of use outlined in Part 3, and various forms of traditional practice. (p. 108)

Giving special attention to patterns of use (Part 3.3) and implementation problems (Part 3.4), evaluate the feasibility of using the materials in various contexts. (p. 108)

The authors of the Sussex Scheme believe that while it is important for decision-makers to understand the sources (or model) of curriculum objectives, there is a limit to the extent to which the responsibility for evaluation can be pushed back on the author (who may or may not be aware of the particular model). They believe in "an independent analyst and goal-free evaluation in which the evaluator looks for outcomes and criteria without special reference to the goals formulated by the author" (p. 48).

Analysis of the Decision-Making Function

Curriculum materials analysis make two separate kinds of decisions: selection decisions and implementation decisions. Eash (1972) provides the most direct approach to selection. He summarizes each of his four sections on Objectives, Organization of the Material, Methodology, and Evaluation with a seven-point rating scale.
The Sussex System has included a "decision-makers' brief" at the end of each analysis that attempts to summarize the main judgments and decisions that will need to be made. The authors present the decision-makers with analyses of curriculum materials that interest them rather than forcing the decision-makers to decide first on what kind of curriculum they want, and then on the materials that best fit their ideal. The last section of the materials analysis scheme is then completed by a member of the proposed user group. According to the criteria established by the Sussex system, the reviewer examines the following areas:

1. The freedom of movement within that particular school and the constraints in terms of resources, facilities, school aims, and articulation with the rest of the school's curriculum

2. The patterns of use that might be adopted by the user group, and problems of implementation that might be tackled

3. The main decision issues that would have to be made for that particular user group in that particular context.

The CMAS Scheme includes a section for recommended uses in which the reviewer "highly recommends, recommends with qualifications, or does not recommend the materials" to be used, given the intended uses described in the previous sections of the scheme (Morrissett, et al., p. 280). The Berkeley, St. Gallen, Haussler-Pittman, and Swedish Schemes do not include the decision-making function in their curriculum materials analysis systems.
Summary

This review of published schemes for the analysis of curriculum materials from several countries reveals that all the systems include a section that describes and/or analyzes materials. While most are evaluative in nature, this evaluation focuses principally upon the goals, objectives of the designated curriculum model, content, organization, adaptiveness of the material to be evaluated, and the methodological approach of the author. The instruments focus upon the necessities of the school system, the articulation of these materials within the system, and the preferences and needs of the evaluator, the school system or the instructor. The seven schemes do not consider the preferences, needs, or the "goodness of fit" of these materials to the student's individual learning needs and, therefore, are not appropriate for use in this study.
Review of Research Studies That Use The Annehurst Curriculum Classification System

During the early 1970s Frymier et al., (1977) developed the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System (ACCS) as a tool for matching individual learners with appropriate curriculum materials. This system has been the focus of a concentrated, systematic research effort for a decade. Researchers using ACCS have provided not only important data about the system but have also demonstrated its utility as an important instrument for conducting curriculum and instruction-related investigations. Thirty research studies have supplied data regarding: (1) the characteristics of materials available to and used by particular learners, (2) the characteristics of materials available in particular content fields and subject areas, (3) the characteristics of learners in the classroom, (4) the characteristics of materials compared with the characteristics of learners, and (5) validation of the ACCS model.

The Characteristics of Materials Available to and Used by Particular Learners

The principal studies in this category (Davis et al., 1982; Hawley et al., 1977; and Frymier et al., 1983) concentrated upon three main areas: a thorough examination and classification of all the types of materials that were available to elementary and middle school children using the ten categories of ACCS (See Chapter I); an analysis of materials
used by students; and a study of the amount of time students
spent using these materials.

Hawley et al., (1977) classified more than half of
all curriculum materials used in the classroom as print-
based. Books, pamphlets, and worksheets constituted by
far the largest percentage of available materials. These
reports are consistent with the research findings of Kysilka
(1978), Wright (1979), Clinefelter and Denton (1973), and
Davis (1982).

After examining approximately a thousand pieces
of curriculum materials used by eleven-year-old pupils,
Davis (1982) reported that geography, mathematics, language
arts, and history tended to be classified "low" while
aesthetics, recreation, biological, physical sciences, and
social-behavioral science were classified "high." Hawley
(1977) reached similar conclusions after examining 1,873
items and classifying them according to the ACCS dimensions
of motivation and creativity.

The study by Frymier and Evans (1983) indicated that
fifth grade students preferred language arts and math ma-
terials that were classified "low" on previous experience,
intelligence, emotion/personality, creativity, and socia-
bility, whereas they preferred materials in the areas of
social studies and science that were classified "high" on
those various dimensions.
However, Johnson et al., (1978) reported that an analysis of social studies and language arts materials revealed eleventh grade students more frequently selected textbook materials that were rated "low" on the dimensions of previous experience and intelligence, and "high" on creativity and motivation.

Hawley and Hill (1977) explained the discrepancies between student preference in these two studies. Their investigation of elementary and middle school curriculum materials indicated that there were significant changes in materials classifications between grade levels. Materials and texts rated "high" in elementary school were often rated "low" in middle school.

Johnson et al., (1978) also stated that not only are there mismatches between materials characteristics and student characteristics but also between student and teacher preferences. Students frequently selected textbook materials with which they were most accustomed. In language arts, for example, students indicated a preference for relatively readable materials, appealing in theme, containing much dialogue, and classified "low" in experience and intelligence. On the other hand, teachers preferred short stories by award-winning authors that generally were "high" in these two dimensions. Therefore, not only are students mismatching themselves to curriculum activities due to the preponderance of "low" materials in the classroom, but they are
also being mismatched by their instructors, who frequently select materials that are based upon their own and not their students' learner characteristics and interests.

An examination of the four ACCS dimensions related to the physical or psychological make-up of the individual revealed that there is little evidence of curricular materials available in schools to provide for learning in response to the perceptual needs of learners (verbal, auditory, visual, and motor) (Hawley, 1977; Davis, 1982; Kysilka, 1978).

An analysis of time spent using materials revealed two important factors: (1) that pupils work on curricular tasks most of the day, an average of four hours and ten minutes; and (2) that the use of language arts and mathematics materials dominate the instructional day (Davis, 1982; Hawley, 1977; Cornbleth, 1979).

The Characteristics of Materials Available in Particular Content Fields and Subject Areas

The focus of the following studies was upon the examination of materials characteristics in the specific areas of social studies, language arts, mathematics, science, aesthetics, and teacher training programs; and the actual amount of student time spent using these materials. The results are similar to studies that classified and analyzed all materials used by particular learners discussed in the previous section. Jeter (1978), Kraus (1976), and
Cornbleth (1978, 1980) reported that the majority of social studies textbooks were classified as "high" on motivation, but "low" on the categories of creativity and experience. Clinefelter and Denton (1978), in an analysis of third grade mathematics and reading materials, reported that "low" classifications in all categories occur the greatest percentage of the time. These results were mirrored in an investigation of fifth-grade materials by Grady (1978). In his study, mathematics and language arts materials used most of the day were judged as having "low" emphasis on each of the ten human dimensions.

Kysilka's (1978) findings supported those by Hawley (1977), Davis (1982), Quickenton (1977), and Frymier (1983). Her review of 120 pieces of material for teaching metrics revealed that they were classified as "low" on all ten dimensions and that there was no material available for students rated "low" on any of the four physical/physiological dimensions of verbal expression, auditory perception, visual perception, and motor perception.

Wright's (1979) analysis of curriculum materials in five subject areas (aesthetics, social science, science, language arts, and mathematics) in varied locales (inner-city, suburban, and rural/small town) revealed that not only are materials generally classified "low" on all dimensions, but that there was no significant difference between school locales and the types of curriculum materials utilized. Three
other multi-state, multi-city investigations confirmed these results (Cornbleth, 1980; Davis, 1982; Jeter, 1978).

The tendency for materials to receive a "low" classification is not only confined to elementary and secondary school levels. The findings of Wade (1978) and Miller (1979) corroborate this statement. Wade revealed that print curriculum materials used in teacher training programs were also uniformly "low" in nearly all human characteristics of ACCS. Miller classified 118 curriculum pieces from eight community colleges as characteristically "low" in the five dimensions included in her study (intelligence, motivation, emotionality, creativity, and sociability).

In her analysis of time involved versus curriculum use, Cornbleth (1979) discovered that academic learning materials were used 83% of the time and that students spent more time interacting with materials than with the teacher. Denton (1978) further developed this concept. He reported that teachers generally relied on materials to provide information or experience for pupils. He also stated that curriculum material dictates instructional interactions to the teachers, thereby limiting their effectiveness. These studies indicate that materials have a greater or equal impact on student knowledge than the teacher does.

Learner Characteristics Patterns

Three research investigations examined the ability of ACCS to assist teachers in identifying human factors
that affect learning and the ability to classify students according to these categories. In these studies 374 teachers classified a total of 5,426 students according to six dimensions of learner characteristics identified by ACCS: experience, motivation, intelligence, emotion/personality factors, social factors, and creativity. The four dimensions of verbal expression, auditory, visual, and motor perception were not included in these studies.

A preliminary investigation by Kysilka (1979) revealed that gifted/talented students could be identified and described using ACCS descriptors and classifications.

Hill and Hawley (1979) reported that after classifying 32 elementary school students, a pattern of four basic learner types appeared. Type I students are "high" on all characteristics but creativity. Type II students are "high" on either experience and intelligence or both and "low" on motivation. Type III students are "low" on experience and intelligence and "high" on motivation. Type IV students are "low" on experience, intelligence, motivation, emotion/personality, and sociability.

In a more extensive study, Frymier (1979), using a sample of 5,268 elementary and secondary students, reported the following:

1. Four of the 64 possible profiles in the ACCS system account for more than half of the types possible. (Table 1)
2. Eight most frequently identified profiles account for two-thirds of the types possible.

3. There were no major differences that relate specifically to grade level or sex.

### Table 1

Eight Major Learner Characteristics Profiles

(Percent of Students Seen By Their Teachers As Having Certain Kinds of Learner Characteristics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profiles</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H H H H H H H</td>
<td>29.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L L L L L L L</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H H H H L H H</td>
<td>8.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L L L L L L H</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L L L H L L H</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L L H H L H H</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L H H H H H H</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L H H H L L H</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 remaining profiles</td>
<td>33.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both studies (Hill and Hawley, 1979; and Frymier, 1979) suggest a manageable number of classroom profiles exist. These profiles enable instructors to select or
devise methods that would be precisely appropriate for a significant number of students.

Denton (1978) examined the profiles of reading materials and discovered that only two profiles out of a possible 64 were used to describe 70% of the basic reading material. One profile was "low" in all six dimensions, and the second profile was "low" in five and "high" in motivation. When paired with the results of Frymier (1979), Hill and Hawley (1979), only one of these material profiles ("low" in all dimensions) matches one of the eight most frequently identified student profiles. These results indicate that only one-eighth of the students in the classroom are correctly matched with the appropriate curriculum materials.

A brief analysis of these learner characteristic patterns reveals that:

1. Teachers are able to classify students according to the learner characteristics of ACCS.
2. A manageable number of student profiles does exist (eight), enabling the instructor to select the most advantageous materials for each student.
3. Many students are being exposed to "low" materials. Frequently this constitutes a mismatch between the needs of the student and the kind of instruction he/she receives.
The Characteristics of Materials Compared with the Characteristics of the Learner

Studies involving materials characteristics compared with learner characteristics may be divided into two different categories:

1. Studies in which an attempt is made to correlate achievement with specific learner patterns; and
2. Studies that examine the match that exists between the learner characteristics and curriculum characteristics in the classroom.

Curriculum characteristics, learner characteristics, and achievement.

Few studies have been conducted to test the theoretical assumptions of ACCS, that is, whether by matching learners and curriculum materials according to certain characteristics, learning will increase. One study by Clark and Grady (1973) did attempt to determine whether or not ACCS learner characteristics and curriculum materials classifications among elementary mathematics students can be used as the dimensions of an aptitude-treatment interaction analysis. Clark and Grady reported no significant interactions and concluded that ACCS variables are poor predictors of academic achievement and student attitudes toward mathematics. The researchers stated, however, that experience and intelligence, as defined by ACCS, played an important role in their investigation. They also stated that more frequently than not, the materials were inappropriate for
the learners. This mismatch between student and curriculum materials influenced the balance of the experimental design.

Berneman (1979) experienced similar unreliable results due to a faulty research design. He attempted to determine the extent to which matching of students and materials on the basis of learner characteristics and procedures as prescribed by ACCS would affect achievement, on-task behavior and interest. He reported no statistically significant differences between the matched and unmatched groups with respect to the three dependent variables. The matching procedure used in this study, however, did not adhere to the basic assumptions in ACCS theory. Berneman matched "high" students with "high" materials (group 1) and "low" students with "low" materials (group 3). Groups 1 and 3 comprised the "matched" group. The "unmatched" groups (groups 2 and 4) included high students matched with "low" materials and "low" students matched with "high" materials. According to ACCS theory, the "unmatched" group was actually more compatibly "matched" with materials than the "matched" group. Due to this flaw in his research design the results must be interpreted with caution.

A correlational analysis by Frymier (1983) revealed that while no significant relationship existed between student achievement, characteristics, and student preference for particular subject matter areas, a relationship did exist between student achievement, characteristics, and
preferences for attributes of curriculum materials that are unrelated to subject matter areas. A relationship between student characteristics and preferences for attributes of curriculum materials was also reported by Langrehr (1980), who stated that human characteristics in curriculum materials preferred by learners reflected their own learner characteristics.

Hill (1979) reported a relationship between patterns of learner characteristics and achievement. The dominant impression was the consistent perception of "high" learner characteristics for high achievement students. More than half of the low achievement learners were perceived to be "high" in only one of three characteristics (experience, intelligence, motivation). Motivation and emotion/personality were also correlated for low achievement learners.

The Match that Exists Between Learner Characteristics and Material Characteristics.

Investigations by Grady (1978), Clinefelter (1978), Miller (1979), and French (1979) revealed that students are consistently interacting with materials that do not match their individual learner characteristics.

In a preliminary research study, Grady (1978) determined that teachers not trained in the use of ACCS do not select curriculum appropriate materials for learners as measured by the ACCS dimensions. When the entire profile of
the learner was matched up against the entire ACCS profile, the material was generally inappropriate for the student.

The remaining three studies (Clinefelter, 1978; Miller, 1979; and French, 1979) examined the match that existed between materials and learner characteristics at three different age levels, material types, and settings (Third Grade Math, Community College, and an Air National Guard Leadership Development Program respectively).

Clinefelter (1978) stated that many children were exposed to "low" materials and "low" events. Analysis revealed a high percentage of appropriate materials for those students "low" in experience and intelligence; however, the students classified as "high" were consequently interacting with inappropriate materials most of the time. This mismatch between the needs of students and the kind of instruction they receive is also evidenced in other two studies.

Miller (1979) reported that 118 curricular pieces demonstrated a composite profile that was "low" on all five dimensions measured (intelligence, motivation, creativity, emotion/personality, and sociability). While there were occasional signals of matches between characteristics of students and materials, the overall findings supported the notion of a mismatch rather than a match.

An analysis of subjects and materials from the Air National Guard Program (French, 1979) revealed that materials
tended to be "low" in experience, intelligence, motivation, emotion/personality, creativity, and social content and that they have little to offer a learner with problems in the areas of verbal expression, auditory, visual or motor perception. The learner group tended to be "high" in experience, intelligence, motivation, emotion/personality, creativity, and social factors. In essence, profiles of student characteristics were "high" and profiles of materials characteristics were "low".

ACCS theory states that students who are identified according to the learner characteristics as "low" on all ten dimensions need materials that are classified "low" on experience, intelligence, verbal expression, and auditory, visual, and motor perception but "high" on motivation, emotion/personality, creativity, and social dimensions. Students who are classified as "high" on all the dimensions may use materials classified as "high" or "low." Clinefelter (1978), however, states that "low" materials retard the development of "high" students. Therefore, both the "high" students and the "low" students are interacting with inappropriate materials most of the time. Because of definite mismatches between students and curriculum material student development is being hampered.

Validation of the ACCS Model

In order for ACCS to be an effective tool for classification of learner and material characteristics, it
must be valid and reliable. In an attempt to define the
parameters of this system, studies have been conducted that
attempt to statistically verify the descriptors used in
the system and the categories and to determine if it is
a practical and feasible means of identifying students and
materials.

Two studies have been done in which ACCS was com-
pared with other reliable instruments for evaluation and
measurement. Kysilka (1979) determined that learner char-
acteristics of the ACCS system were comparable to those of
the Scale for Rating Behavior Characteristics of Superior
Students (SRBCSS). Although correlational analysis did not
reveal high correlation coefficients, they were statis-
tically significant for each category investigated (exper-
ience, motivation, intelligence, social, emotional/person-
ality, and creativity). There are also remarkable similar-
ities between ACCS and the Barclay Classroom Inventory
(BCCI) (Barclay, 1983). The teacher-oriented assessment
procedure and curriculum matching approach of the Annehurst
system is virtually identical with the kinds of groups and
outcomes obtained from the BCCI system.

Grady (1979) statistically sought to verify six
human characteristics of ACCS. When the descriptors
associated with all six human characteristics were pooled
together and factor-analyzed, eight factors emerged. The
ACCS factors of experience, intelligence, social, creativity,
and emotion/personality exist. The ACCS motivation category
did not appear in the analysis. New names were created by
the researcher for the other three factors: structure,
versatility, and cognitive level.

Frymier and Bills (1979) subjected the six of the
twelve ACCS factors to empirical scrutiny. Examining seven
pairs of descriptive terms for each of the six factors an
34-item Q-sort, six new factors emerged: capacity to learn,
human relationships, maturity, independence, experience, and
degree of conformity. There was no factor comparable to the
motivation dimension on the Annehurst system.

Frymier, Clark, and Bills (1980), in an extension
of the Frymier and Bills (1979) study, sought to see whether
second-order factor analysis of the six factors isolated in
the previous investigation would add interpretational lever-
age to their findings. The second-order factor analysis
yielded three interpretable second-order factors. Two of
these, an intellectual/academic factor and an experience-
maturity factor were highly correlated with each other. The
third, second-order factor, a human relations/outgoingness
dimension was also correlated with the other two. Some of
the primary factors bore some resemblance to some of the
ACCS categories. In fact, the oblique solution used in this
study yielded factors that paralleled those categories more
closely than the factors of Frymier and Bills (1979).
The results of these two studies (Frymier and Bills, 1979; and Frymier et al., 1980) indicate that the descriptors are useful to teachers in describing students and that there may be less independence among categories teachers actually use to describe students than would be implied by dimensions they construct when they are communicating with each other about the categories they use.

Pack (1973) conducted a study to determine the interclassifier reliability of ACCS. Ninety-one raters, using ten previously selected pieces of curriculum materials each, agreed upon 34% of the tabulated classifications. High interrater reliabilities have also been reported by Hawley (.93) (1977), Clinefelter (.92) (1978), French (1979), Davis (.83) (1982), Clark (.92) (1979), Grady (.89) (1978), Cornbleth (92.33) (1980), Miller (.83) (1979), and Wade (.83) (1978). These correlations indicate that the level of agreement between and among raters using ACCS is reasonably high in all research studies using ACCS. While some individual raters may be consistently different (i.e., higher or lower) from other raters, the large number of raters, or the extremely high correlations tend to make such variations insignificant.

Summary

The most obvious conclusion is that materials actually used by students most of the day (61% of the time) in the classroom (language arts, mathematics, geography, and
history) have a "low" emphasis on each of the ten human dimensions. Materials in other curriculum areas (aesthetics, recreation, biological, physical and social behavioral science) also have "low" emphasis on the dimensions of intellect, emotion/personality, and creativity. In these same areas, however, researchers found that there was at least one dimension on which materials were judged to have had a moderate or "high" emphasis on "high" classifications. A considerable proportion of the materials in all areas (except language arts and mathematics) were classified as "high" on the motivation dimension.

Three researchers found that most materials used by students were classified as not appropriate for pupils having special learning disabilities (verbal expression, auditory, visual, and motor perception). Other studies revealed that even though intelligent and creative students can work well with both "high" and "low" materials in the dimensions of experience, intelligence, and motivation, there were no materials to stimulate or challenge these individuals. With such extensive use of curriculum materials rated "low", and the evident mismatch that exists between students and curriculum materials, the educational process contributes considerably less than it should to pupils' cognitive development. An analysis of the research articles indicates that while most of the investigations have taken place in elementary schools, the "mismatch" that occurs
between students and curriculum materials is not confined to that level. Middle schools, high schools, specialized adult education programs, and even college methods courses for future teachers exhibit similar tendencies toward "low" materials, regardless of students' individual learner characteristics.

Also evident in the data is the powerful effect of materials in the classroom. The materials control what activities occur and the type of learning that takes place. Cornbleth (1980) reported that students interact far more with materials than with the teacher. She stated that 33% of the total time that pupils were involved in academic learning activities was spent interacting with materials. More frequently than not, these materials were used by the instructor as the organizational base for the management of the classroom and often reflected the match between the instructors' own learner characteristics and preferences rather than the learner characteristics and preferences of the students. Materials with learning profiles that meet less than 13% of the students needs (Frymier, 1979; Hill et al., 1979) are being used for 100% of the classroom population.

In general, research has indicated that the Anne-hurst Curriculum Classification System is not only a useful device for research purposes in education, but it is also a valid system that can be used to classify, store, and retrieve curriculum materials according to the human
characteristics known to be related to pupil learning. This system "encourages the individual students to use their intelligence and motivation to interact with those materials" (Frymier, 1977, p. 29).
Conclusion

In summary, the foreign language teaching profession does not have an adequate instrument to evaluate and classify foreign language textbook materials or to describe how these materials relate to the language learner.

This brief review of available instruments reveals that tools for textbook evaluation generally focus upon the content and nature of materials. These systems (designed for foreign language, and other content areas) are adequate for texts that follow traditional teacher-centered methods of instruction. Today's foreign language textbooks, however, stress the active role of students and require a different method of evaluation. Not only must criteria include the mechanical aspects of texts but also the aspects that directly pertain to students "learner characteristics."

One instrument, The Annehurst Curriculum Classification System, has been used to analyze, classify, and describe materials in diverse subject areas and for all age groups. ACCS serves as a link between learner and curriculum materials.

Much more work needs to be done in foreign language education in the evaluation and description of the primary classroom resource, the textbook, as it relates to the central figure in language teaching, the student. This research will be one step in that direction.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Introduction

This study was conducted during the winter and spring quarters of 1984. The procedures and data collection consisted of eight stages: (1) solicitation of information from states that use a state-wide textbook adoption system, (2) development of an instrument based upon the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System to be used in textbook classification, (3) collection of core first- and third-year high school Spanish textbooks used in each state, (4) development of a training program to instruct graduate students in foreign language education in the use of the classification instrument, (5) check of interrater reliability, (6) sampling procedure for classification of materials, (7) classification of materials, and (8) analysis of the data.

Solicitation of Information

Survey questionnaires were sent to all states that have state-wide textbook adoption policies. The survey packet contained a blank questionnaire/inventory form, instructions for completing the form and forwarding
requested information, and a large self-addressed envelope. The Consultants for Foreign Language Instruction in each State Department of Education were asked to supply the titles of core texts used in first-, and third-year high school Spanish classes, the enrollment figures for first-, and third-year high school Spanish classes, and the total annual expenditure for foreign language instruction (high school Spanish) in the state. The 24 states involved in this survey are as follows: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia. Twenty states or 33% responded to the questionnaire. Of the 20 respondents, a total of 16 met the conditions for inclusion in this study.

Instrument Development

An instrument for the evaluation of foreign language textbooks based upon the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System constructed by Frymier (1977) and associates (Figure 6) was developed that included all ten dimensions of ACCS. The instrument format is a matrix (Figure 7) in which the original descriptors are placed on the vertical grid and numbers from 8 - 1 (rich-deficient) are included on the horizontal grid. The results from earlier studies indicated that previous researchers believed the ACCS system could more
effectively represent reality by providing the opportunity for finer gradations than the "rich/deficient" dichotomy allowed and still be easy for the raters to use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTELLIGENCE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>concept-oriented</td>
<td>fact-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abstract</td>
<td>concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intentions implicit</td>
<td>intentions explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criteria implicit</td>
<td>criteria explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex organization</td>
<td>simple organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evokes analysis-type thought</td>
<td>evokes recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evokes synthesis-type thought</td>
<td>evokes isolated-type thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evokes evaluative-type thought</td>
<td>evokes recall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6**
Original Elaborated ACCS Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RICH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evokes analysis-type thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evokes synthesis-type thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evokes evaluative-type thought</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFICIENT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fact oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentions explicit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria explicit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evokes recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evokes isolated-type thought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evokes recall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7**
Revised Elaborated ACCS Continuum
Collection of Core First- and Third-Year High School Spanish Textbooks

The core textbooks used in first- and third-year high school Spanish classes were requested from publishers as responses to the questionnaires were received and information recorded. A decision was made to examine only those first- and third-year textbooks that are used in over 40% of the states with mandated textbook adoption policies in order to: (1) limit the number of textbooks, (2) exclude supplementary materials (tapes, workbooks, readers, used in only one or two states, and (3) analyze only the most widely selected texts. Of the 33 first- and third-year Spanish textbooks on the current adoption lists, eight first-year and six third-year texts were selected for analysis. A complete list of those textbooks included in the study appears in Appendix 3 of this report.

Training of Raters

Eight graduate students in foreign language education were trained in the classification of materials by ACCS criteria. Two researchers, previously trained in the use of ACCS at earlier sessions with Frymier in June, 1983, conducted the training sessions in April, 1984. The initial training period consisted of one five-hour session in which the researchers presented the basic theory of ACCS and
explained the use of the instrument. Interrater reliability was established at the end of this training session.

**Interrater Reliability**

Two formulas were used to compute the reliability coefficients. The Scott is normally used to determine reliability, where the data are in the form of percentages of occurrence of different categories of an observational system. The formula for Scott's is:

\[
P_i = \frac{Po - Pe}{1 - Pe}
\]

where

\[
Po = \frac{N}{r}
\]

\[
N = \text{number of observations}
\]

\[
r = \text{number of agreements}
\]

\[
Pe = \text{probability}
\]

This formula, however, does not account for the chance or error factor. Because of the dichotomous classification system, there is a 50% chance of agreement for such rating. Therefore Scott's reliability figure must be corrected, taking into account this chance or error factor. This probability can be computed using the Formula of Binomial Probability:
\[ P(r) = \frac{N!}{r! \beta!} p^r \beta^\beta \]

where
\( \beta = N - r \)
\( N = \text{number of observations} \)
\( r = \text{number of agreements} \)
\( p = \text{probability of the "desired" outcomes in a single trial} \)
\( \beta = \text{probability of the "desired" outcomes in a series of observations} \)

The above Formula for Binomial Probability is a revision of the formula used by Denton (1973) and reported as follows:

\[ P(r_1, r_2) = \frac{N!}{r_1! r_2!} p_1^{r_1} p_2^{r_2} \]

where
\( N = \text{number of trials} \)
\( r = \text{number of agreements} \)
\( P = \text{probability of chance agreement} \) (p. 113)

The researcher classified every tenth page of each textbook collected for this study. In an attempt to verify
this researcher's classification of the 14 selected text-
books, reliability checks were made: (1) between this
researcher and another trained researcher, and (2) between
both of the aforementioned and pairs of trained graduate
students.

Initially, another trained researcher independently
rated each tenth page of one first- and one third-year
Spanish text selected at random (Table 2). The highest
reliability coefficient for this initial rating was 1.00,
and the lowest, .313 (Table 3). Previous research studies
reported reliability indexes ranging from .33 to .93. For
the ten ACCS dimensions, .93 was assumed to be an index of
reliability that would be acceptable for the stated
purposes of this study. Subsequently, the same trained
researcher independently rated ten pages from each of the
remaining twelve textbooks classified in this study. Scott's
coefficient of correlation was computed between two sets of
data from four randomly selected textbooks resulting in .933
(Table 4).
Table 2
Reliability Measures Between Two Trained Researchers
For First-Year Danish Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Percent of Agreement</th>
<th>Scott Coefficient</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>7.451 E-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.323 E-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>7.451 E-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion/Personality</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>1.155 E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>1.155 E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>7.451 E-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>1.155 E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.323 E-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>7.451 E-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.323 E-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Reliability Measures Between Two Trained Researchers
For Third-Year Spanish Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Percent of Agreement</th>
<th>Scott Coefficient</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>5.245 E-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.384 E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion/Personality</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.384 E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.384 E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.384 E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.384 E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.384 E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.384 E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.384 E-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Reliability Measures Between Two Trained Researchers
For Three First- and Three Third-Year Spanish Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Percent of Agreement</th>
<th>Scott Coefficient</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>2.399 E-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>2.530 E-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>4.230 E-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion/Personality</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>1.065 E-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>2.253 E-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>0.955</td>
<td>2.968 E-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>1.210 E-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>1.210 E-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>3.201 E-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further reliability checks were made between both researchers and trained pairs of graduate students. At the end of the training session, raters worked in pairs and classified four pages of material in randomly selected first- and third-year Spanish textbooks. Interrater reliability was established between the trained graduate students and two trained researchers by comparing the classification results on each of the ten dimensions. If the reliability coefficient between the paired researchers and the paired raters was below .80, an additional training session was given to those raters until overall agreement reached .30 or above. This procedure has been followed in other studies using ACCS (Frymier, 1977a; Davis, Frymier, and Clinefelter, 1982; Clark and Grady, 1978, Clinefelter, 1978; and Denton, 1978).
Reliability checks were made between these groups after each group had independently classified one page. Further checks were made after classifying every second, third, and fourth pages. Finally, checks were made after each pair of raters had classified four randomly selected pages in three first- and third-year Spanish textbooks. By dimension, the lowest reliability coefficient was .731 for intelligence, and the highest was 1.00 for visual and motor perception (Table 5). Using the Scott and binomial probability formulas .99 was the reliability coefficient for the ten ACCS dimensions.

Table 5

Reliability Measures Between Researcher and Raters by Dimension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Percent of Agreement</th>
<th>Scott Coefficient</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>3.972 E-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>3.923 E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>4.920 E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion/Personality</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>1.282 E-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>1.282 E-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>2.263 E-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>0.950</td>
<td>2.968 E-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>5.204 E-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sampling Procedures

To ensure a representative sample of activities, exercises, and readings in each text, a prescribed method for sampling selected curriculum materials was used by the researcher in this study. This method is based upon a formula that was developed by Dale and Chall (1943, p. 11) for testing the grade level difficulty of reading materials.

The directions that guided the researcher are as follows:

1. Selected Samples
   For books, review by chapter selecting each tenth page. A "page" in this study is defined as a two-sample, that contains a representative example of the lesson in that chapter. If one or both pages open before the researcher was blank or contained irrelevant instructional material, the next page(s) on which print appeared was classified.

2. Labeling Worksheet
   Enter such information as name of rater, name of text, page number classified, appropriate age level, overall "rich" or "deficient" rating, and date classified, for each sample to be analyzed.

The researcher modified the original ACCS Classification Form (Appendix A) to meet the needs of the present investigation. Each selected textbook page was classified in
terms of its experience, intelligence, motivation, emotion/personality, creative, social, verbal expression, and motor, auditory, and visual perception. The researcher reproduced instructions for the use of ACCS, each of the elaborated continuum diagrams of ACCS, and the operational definitions of descriptors for each rater (Appendix 3).

Classification of Textbooks in Terms of Curriculum Characteristics

In classifying core textbooks according to curriculum characteristics, the raters first studied each designated page and reviewed the description of these characteristics to see if the terms in the right-hand or the left-hand column generally applied. After reviewing the list of curriculum characteristics, the raters made decisions upon:

1. The age level for which the materials are deemed appropriate (5-3, 9-12, 13-15, 17-adult);

2. The human qualities that are important for learning: previous experience, intelligence, motivation, emotion/personality; creativity, and social; and

3. The aspects of human existence that are basically physical in nature: verbal expression, auditory perception, visual, and motor perception.

The rater decided whether the textbook pages were "rich" or "deficient" with respect to the characteristics in question. That decision was recorded and the process was repeated for each page.

Five rules developed by Frymier (1977) to aid the raters in making these classification decisions were
duplicated and discussed at the initial training session.

1. Read the descriptions of curriculum characteristics while classifying materials. Do not operate from memory, from a common sense definition of the factor, or classify in terms of personal interests or preferences.

2. Use the descriptions of curriculum characteristics in a general way. Do not force a one-to-one correspondence between each piece of curriculum material and every term in the list of characteristics in either the right or left columns.

3. If none of the terms in either the right or left columns apply, classify the materials "against the asterisk." If none of the descriptions on a particular dimension seem to apply, classify the material "rich" if the problem develops on the experience or intellectual dimension, but "deficient" if it arises on the motivation, emotion/personality, creativity or social dimension.

4. Do not consider how a teacher or student might use the materials in the classroom unless "directions for use" are printed on the page. For example, a teacher might use a printed list of vocabulary words in a "Bingo" or "Lottery" game. Such use might generate interest and enthusiasm in the list of words. Such a possibility should be classified as "rich" in motivation. If the page contains only a printed list of words, however, it probably would be classified as "deficient" in motivation.

5. In order to select the correct age grouping, the rater should study the curriculum material carefully, make a general assessment about its interest, cognitive, readability, and vocabulary level, then classify the material as appropriate for one or more of the stated age groups.

In summary, classifying textbooks according to human learner characteristics with ACCS requires the rater to do three things: (1) Study the pages carefully; (2) Study the elaborated continuum of curriculum characteristics, and
operational definitions of the descriptors carefully; and
(3) Make a decision that the pages are "rich" on that dimen-
sion (i.e., if the terms in the left-hand column generally
apply), or that they are basically "deficient" on that di-
mension (i.e., the terms in the right-hand column generally
apply) (Frymier, 1977). The rater will then record that
decision by circling "rich" or "deficient" for each page
rated.

Analysis of Data

The analysis and presentation of the data related
to this study is divided into two main sections. The first
section is a statistical analysis of the findings as they
relate to each hypothesis. The FUNCAT (Functions of Cate-
gorical Responses) nonparametric statistics procedure was
used to analyze the data. The FUNCAT program, available in
SAS (Statistical Analysis System) at The Ohio State
University, produces minimum chi square estimates according
The data were analyzed to determine (1) if there were any
significant differences in the human learner characteristics
of first-year Spanish high school texts, (2) if there were
any significant differences in the human learner character-
istics of third-year Spanish high school texts, and (3) if
there were any significant differences between the human
learner characteristics of first- and third-year Spanish high school texts.

The second section includes a descriptive analysis based upon the tabulation of raw data into percentage scores of the number of "rich" ratings received by each book in the ten ACCS dimensions and the representation of these percentages in the form of text profiles and bar graphs.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This chapter, concerned with the analysis and presentation of the data related to the study, is divided into two main sections. The first section is a statistical analysis of the findings as they relate to each hypothesis presented in Chapter 1. The second section includes a descriptive analysis of each text based upon tabulation of the number of "rich" ratings received by each book in the ten ACCS dimensions into percentage scores and the representation of these percentages in form of bar graphs and text profiles.

The textbook titles were obtained from the Consultants for Foreign Language Education in 16 states that have state-wide textbook adoption policies for foreign language language texts and from the classification of 14 textbooks by trained researchers and raters. A decision was made to analyze only those first- and third-year textbooks used in over 40% of states surveyed. Tabulation of information received in the questionnaires indicated that these texts were most widely recommended for use. Those materials listed on the inventory form but not analyzed by the researcher included texts used in only one or two states, workbooks,
media kits, dictionaries, and supplementary readers. A complete list of respondents and textbooks currently used in each of the 14 states is included in Appendix G. The textbooks analyzed for this study are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish Level I</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
<th>Percent of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Espanol: A Descubrirlo</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuestros Amigos</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueva Vista</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish for Mastery</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churros y Chocolate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persona a Persona #1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Today</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usted y Yo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish Level II</th>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
<th>Percent of Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Espanol: A Descubrirlo</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivista Cultural</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salsa y Salero</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Spanish Grammar</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galeria Hispanica</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persona a Persona #3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vuelo</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Frequency of Use = Number of states responding to questionnaire in which texts are used

Results for Three Hypotheses

The following data were analyzed using the FUNCAT (Functions of Categorical Responses) nonparametric statistics procedure. FUNCAT is available in the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) and produces minimum chi square estimates. The data were input in the form of "1's" for "rich" and "0's" for "deficient for each category on all rated pages.
The complete analysis included 9650 observations and seven variables (rater, book, Level I, Level III, Level I/III, dimension, and page number). The results of this analysis as they relate to the three hypotheses are discussed below.

Hypothesis I. There will be no significant differences in the curriculum characteristics of previously selected first-year Spanish core textbooks on the statewide textbook adoption lists as determined by the Annehurst Classification System.

Five of the ten curriculum characteristics were found to be significantly different in the eight first-year texts evaluated by the researcher at a probability level of .01. On the basis of these findings, the hypothesis of no significant difference in the curriculum characteristics found in first-year Spanish textbooks was retained for the categories of creativity, verbal, auditory, visual, and motor perception and rejected for the categories of experience, intelligence, motivation, emotion/personality, and social. Table 6 presents the "rich" and "deficient" ratings in curriculum characteristics by means of chi square to each of the ten characteristics in first-year Spanish textbooks.
Table 6

Ten Curriculum Characteristics Related to Rich/Deficient Ratings in Eight First-Year Spanish Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chi Sq</th>
<th>Prob</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>28.59*</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>32.22*</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>55.16*</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>25.50*</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>.0249</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>25.43*</td>
<td>.0006</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>15.19</td>
<td>.0335</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>.0740</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>15.64</td>
<td>.0285</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.9342</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Total number of "rich/deficient" observations per category

df = 7

* p < .01

Hypothesis II. There will be no significant differences in the curriculum characteristics of previously selected third-year Spanish core textbooks on the statewide textbook adoption lists as determined by the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System.

Six of the ten curriculum characteristics were found to be significantly different in the six third-year texts evaluated by the researcher at a probability level of .01. On the basis of these findings, the hypothesis of no
significant difference in the curriculum characteristics found in third-year Spanish textbooks was retained for the categories of social, auditory, visual, and motor perception and rejected for the categories of experience, intelligence, motivation, emotion/personality, creativity, and visual perception. Table 7 presents the "rich" and "deficient" ratings in curriculum characteristics related by means of chi square to each of the ten characteristics in third-year Spanish textbooks.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chi Sq</th>
<th>Prob</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>19.73*</td>
<td>.0014</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>23.12*</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>24.30*</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>17.93*</td>
<td>.0030</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>19.09*</td>
<td>.0013</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>12.12</td>
<td>.0332</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>.1083</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>.2672</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>29.24*</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>.9984</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Total number of "rich/deficient" observations per category
df = 5
* p < .01
Hypothesis III. There will be no significant difference between the curriculum characteristics of those core textbooks used in first-year Spanish classes and those core textbooks used in third-year high school Spanish classes as determined by the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System.

Four of the ten curriculum characteristics were found to be significantly different in the eight first-year and six third-year Spanish textbooks evaluated by the researcher at a probability level of .01. On the basis of these findings, the hypothesis of no significant difference in the curriculum characteristics found in first- and third-year Spanish textbooks was retained for the categories of motivation, emotion/personality, creativity, social, visual, and motor perception, and rejected for the categories of experience, intelligence, verbal, and auditory perception. Table 3 shows the "rich" and "deficient" ratings in curriculum characteristics related by means of chi square to each of the ten characteristics in first- and third-year textbooks.

A comparative analysis (Table 9) within and between levels indicates that the dimensions of experience and intelligence were significantly different within each level and between levels one and three. Motivation and emotion/personality were significantly different within each level, but no differences were detected between the two groups of texts. Differences were noted within the first- and between
the first- and third-year texts in the dimensions of creativity and visual perception, but not within the third-year texts. Verbal and auditory perception exhibited differences between the first- and third-year textbooks but not within the levels. Significant differences were noted within first-year texts in the social dimension but not within third-year or between the two levels. In the dimension of motor perception no significant differences were noted.

Table 8

Ten Curriculum Characteristics Related to Rich/Deficient Ratings in Fourteen First- and Third-Year Spanish Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Chi Sq</th>
<th>Prob</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>70.40*</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>77.88*</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.0924</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotion</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.9271</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>.4193</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.1514</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>12.55*</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditory</td>
<td>7.65*</td>
<td>.0057</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>.5547</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.7465</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Total number of "rich/deficient" observations per category

df = 1

* p < .01
### Table 9

Ten Curriculum Characteristics Related to Rich/Deficient Ratings in Fourteen First-and Third-Year Textbooks Within and Between Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension(s)</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Experience/Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exp/.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Exp/.0014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>Exp/.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation/Emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mot/.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mot/.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>Mot/.0924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creativity/Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cre/.0249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cre/.0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>Cre/.4193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verbal/Auditory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ver/.0335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ver/.1083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>Ver/.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Soc/.0006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Soc/.0332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>Soc/.1514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mtr/.9342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mtr/.9984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>Mtr/.7465</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the chi square analysis used in this study is able to determine which dimensions differ significantly within and between first- and third-year textbooks, chi square or probability scores do not reveal how these differences occur. For example, significant differences within first- and third-year texts in the experience dimension could be attributed to "rich" scores in first-year, and "deficient" scores in third-year or vice versa.
Also, FUNCAT does not determine the overall rating of each
text or individually compare texts according to the ten ACCS
dimensions. What is the overall rating for individual
textbooks? Which texts are "rich" in the dimensions of
creativity or emotion? Do the data collected reveal that
texts are generally rated "rich" or "deficient" in verbal
expression? In order to answer these and other similar
questions, examine differences, and compare overall ratings,
it was necessary analyze percentage scores and profiles for
each textbook.

Results from Analysis of Percentage Scores of First-Year
Spanish Texts

The percentage scores for each text were computed
by summing the number of "rich" observations and dividing
by the total number of observations for each dimension.
These scores represent the percent of activities (exercises,
readings, questions, puzzles, dialogues, etc.) that are
"rich" in specific dimension. This decision is based upon
classification according to the descriptor terms used to
define the ten ACCS characteristics. A score of 25% "rich"
in creativity indicates that 25% of the pages evaluated
contain exercises that evoke imagination, offer many re-
response possibilities and alternative ways to interpret the
material, and presents activities in unique, or unusual way.
The remaining 75% of the activities evoke routine reproduc-
tion, offer only one response possibility, limit responses,
and presents these activities in a conventional, predictable way. Because the percentage of "deficient" ratings may be computed by subtracting the percentage of "rich" ratings from 100 they are not included in this report.

The terms "rich/deficient" or "high/low" should not be interpreted as "good/bad." ACCS theory states depending upon the particular student, activities rated as "deficient" may be more beneficial for that individual. A student who is "deficient" in experience will not benefit from exercises that require extensive background knowledge for interpretation. Learners who are familiar with the concepts being presented and who enjoy challenges, would benefit from exercises that are more advanced in nature ("rich" in experience). There is, therefore, no "ideal score" for the foreign language textbook. The percentage scores attempt to describe and quantify the characteristics that exist in first- and third-year Spanish textbooks. They do not indicate what characteristics "should" be present or "how much" of each dimension should be included in each text.

The following abbreviations are used in all tables and textbook profiles: Exp - Experience; Int - Intelligence; Mot - Motivation; Emo - Emotion/Perssonality; Cre - Creativity; Soc - Sociability; Ver - Verbal Perception; Aud - Auditory Perception; Vis - Visual Perception; and Mtr - Motor Perception.
In five of the eight texts examined, the category with the highest ratings was experience (Table 10). These five texts were rated as "rich" on at least 50% of the pages. These results indicate that 63% of the textbooks used in first-year Spanish require the students to have knowledge of grammatical terminology, to be able to read long and complex sentences in their target and native languages, and to have had considerable experience with format, or content in order to be able to use the textbook efficiently. Students who do not bring this prior knowledge or experience with them into the language classroom may encounter difficulty using a text that is classified "rich" in experience.

Table 10

Percentage of "Rich" Scores in Eight First-Year High School Spanish Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Int</th>
<th>Mot</th>
<th>Emo</th>
<th>Cre</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Ver</th>
<th>Aud</th>
<th>Vis</th>
<th>Mtr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text A</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text B</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text C</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text D</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text E</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text F</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text G</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text H</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second category that exhibited high scores was intelligence. Fifty percent of the textbooks rated scored at least 54% on this dimension. Due to the nature of the dichotomous scale and the selected descriptors, it was not possible to determine what factors were the most influential in this category; however, ratings revealed that texts that scored "rich" in this category generally are concept-oriented and abstract as opposed to fact-oriented and concrete. The organization of the texts is also generally complex, intricate, and involved, with as many as four different points of grammar and structure presented on two pages. On the other hand, texts that were classified as "deficient" on this dimension often contain exercises that are simple, straightforward, uniform, with an obvious and predictable response pattern for exercises. Texts classified as "deficient" in the category of intelligence generally evoke recognition, isolating discrete bits of information so that awareness and recognition are often sufficient ends in themselves for completion of exercises or readings.

Only one of the eight texts scored "rich" in the category of motivation. Seventy-seven percent of the pages rated in Text D received high scores. The activities and exercises contain high interest topics for first-year high school language learners, involve students by requiring personal response or group discussion, frequently
present these activities in situational or novel contexts, and are aesthetically appealing in format. While the other texts evaluated generally were rated as attractive with marked contrast in color and composition with variation in response mode, print, pictures, etc., the topics of the lessons were often rated as routine, dull, and uninteresting for the particular age group using the textbooks. These texts were also characterized by uniformity of structure indicating that they are the same as or similar to most other textbook materials in format and arrangement of activities and exercises.

All first-year texts were rated as "deficient" in the seven remaining categories. In the category of emotion/personality Texts A, C, E, G, and H received the lowest percentage of activities (zero to 19%) that were ego-involving, or that depicted people who empathize with others in true-to-life-situations. In these texts, the decisions or responses required are more frequently dictated by textbook authors, teachers, or simply by chance than by the student. Because of the stasis-oriented nature of these texts, learners are unable to express their true feelings or to create alternate courses of action. The remaining three texts directly involved the learner in 24% to 45% of the rated assignments.

The category of creativity examines curriculum material for its unusual or novel nature, and its
alternative response possibilities. None of the texts received high scores in this category, and only Texts A, C, D, and F scored from 20% to 34% in their abilities to evoke imagination within the learner and encourage a variety of response options to questions in the text.

In the social dimension, the percentage of activities rated as "rich" ranged from zero percent to 45%. Only three texts (B, D, and F) encourage the learner to actively use the language with others and reflect positive concern or sensitivity for the target language speakers in at least 25% of the activities. In five texts (A, C, E, G, and H) less than 20% of the activities invite students to demonstrate interest in the people portrayed in the text, or foster the use of interpersonal skills in which the learner is invited to talk to, work, and share ideas with the teacher or other students in the class. Over 50% of the descriptor phrases in this category were marked "non-applicable," indicating that in these texts, target language speakers are mentioned only to stress grammatical concepts or are not mentioned at all.

According to ACCS theory, "classifying curriculum material on the four dimensions of verbal expression, auditory perception, visual perception, and motor perception - requires a different perspective than classifying materials on the other dimensions" (Frymier, 1977, p. 151). Each of the four dimensions involves neuromuscular or neural
capabilities. For example, very young children who do not speak well, or whose motor coordination is poor, generally can benefit from working with materials and in situations where they have a chance to practice in the area of these deficiencies. The researcher rated textbooks not only on their appropriateness for pupils having special learning disabilities, but also considered whether or not the curriculum material required the students to interact with texts employing their verbal, auditory, visual, or motor perception skills in the context of the foreign language classroom.

All of the materials were classified as "deficient" or not appropriate for pupils having special learning disabilities. The data also revealed that only Textbooks A, D, and F direct or invite oral response (pronunciation exercises) or interaction with others (questions, dialogue situations etc.). These texts received percentage scores of 31%, 30%, and 23% respectively in the category of verbal perception, indicating that verbal skills are stressed in at least one-fourth of all activities. The remaining five texts require verbal response in less than 22% of the examples evaluated indicating that minimal or no oral responses are necessary.

All texts were judged as having low emphasis (less than 22%) in the dimension of auditory perception. Only two texts, (D, F) require the learner to listen actively and
respond to some type of auditory stimulus in 30% and 28% of the examples evaluated. The remaining six texts encourage active listening in less than 20% of the examples evaluated.

All texts were rated as "deficient" in the category of visual perception. The percentage results indicate that Texts A, D, E, and G require the student to interact visually with (read, answer according to, look at and describe) pictures, maps, diagrams, etc. from 17% to 31% of the pages rated. Text C requires no active interaction with visual stimulus, and Texts B, F, and H invite the learner to interact with less than 15% of the material in the textbook.

For the dimension of motor perception, the data revealed that only Text G requires the student to exercise physical control of the body or to use fine motor coordination in such activities as making a piñata, drawing, manipulation of classroom objects, cooking, or dancing etc., on six percent of the pages evaluated.

Results from Analysis of Percentage Scores of Third-Year Spanish Textbooks

As displayed in Table 11, percentage scores in the areas of experience and intelligence range from 64% to 100%. This indicates that third-year textbooks require a more in depth understanding of the target language. Learners are often required to deal with higher order grammatical terms such as "passive versus active voice,"
"pluscuamperfecto del subjuntivo," or "reciprocal action of the plural reflexive pronouns." The foreign language student is also confronted with literary concepts as well as major authors of Spanish literature. The readings in the target and native language often include many polysyllabic and unusual words that are not used in the learner's native language. It is necessary for the learner to have had considerable experience with format, content or process in the texts in order to use the material. The information is more concept-oriented and abstract in third-year than in first-year texts. The complex organization of the material evokes both analysis and synthesis-type thought, requiring students to "take apart" and "pull together" ideas in the form of summaries and generalizations.

Table 11

Percentage of "Rich" Scores in Six Third-Year High School Spanish Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Int</th>
<th>Mot</th>
<th>Emo</th>
<th>Cre</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Ver</th>
<th>Aud</th>
<th>Vis</th>
<th>Mtr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text AA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text BB</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text CC</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text DD</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text EE</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text FF</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the category of motivation two textbooks, EE and FF, contain examples that evoke reaction, response, and stimulate thought in 43% and 39% of the activities classified. The remaining four texts ranged from zero percent to 13% of "rich" scores in this category. These low scores indicate that the material, although complex, is presented in a dull, unattractive format, and relates lessons to topics that are not of high interest for learners.

An examination of the emotion/personality continuum and percentage scores reveals that only three texts (DD, EE, FF) present activities: (1) that students can relate to; (2) that enable them to make decisions, and (3) that offer alternative responses in 22% to 50% of the pages evaluated. The other three texts (AA, BB, CC) do not actively involve the learner. The questions and exercises are unequivocally set and imply or stipulate that invariability is the general rule. Texts that receive low ratings in emotion/personality generally contain many pattern drills or impersonal questions in which only one answer is acceptable. The student, therefore, is rarely asked to express a personal opinion.

The dimension of creativity reflects some of these same concepts. Materials rated as "deficient" in this area evoke routine reproduction, copying, monotonous repetition, constancy, and similarity in response to questions or other learning tasks. This similarity of concepts is evidenced by similar scores. The texts that received generally low
ratings in emotion/personality received similar or equal scores in creativity. These texts to not create questions, possibilities, or variabilities in the learner's mind, but focus rather upon conventional and often pre-determined answers. On the other hand, Texts DD, EE, and FF contain activities that encourage or require a variety of responses, encourage latitude in utilization, and interpretation, and often contain explanations or activities that are novel or unusual.

The ACCS category receiving the lowest scores in the non-perceptual categories was the social dimension. The scores range from 0% (CC) to 29% (FF) and indicate that 83% of the third-year textbooks do not invite interpersonal activity or demonstrate an active interest in the people portrayed in the text. While the material may present target language speakers in a realistic setting, there are few instances if any where learners are invited to give individual opinions about what they have read or are encouraged to empathize with the individuals presented in the text. Even though language learning is stressed as a communicative skill, the low percentage scores indicate that there are no interpersonal skills required to complete the text. The material can be experienced as a separate entity without presence, involvement, or interaction with others.

An analysis of the four perception skills reinforces the statement that materials can be used alone, without
interaction with other students or teacher. The highest score in verbal perception was 17% (Texts EE and FF). This indicates that the four remaining texts require or invite little or no verbal response. In the category of auditory perception, only two texts (BB, and EE) received scores of eight percent to 12% respectively. The remaining four texts did not require any active listening by the learner. In the category of visual perception, only two texts (BB, FF) received scores above 35%. This indicates that when using these texts the learner is invited to describe, comment upon, or respond according to visual stimulus (map, picture, line drawing etc.). Percentage scores for the other texts range from zero to 12%. Text FF received a "rich" score of two percent in the category of motor perception. The instructions for one lesson invited the students to participate in a reenactment of a play presented in the text. All other texts received zero percent in this category.

Results from Analysis of Percentage Scores of First- and Third-Year Spanish Textbooks

An analysis of the percentage of "rich" scores in first- and third-year Spanish textbooks reveals that in the category of previous experience, 86% of the texts are classified as "rich." In these textbooks over 50% of the activities and exercises in the first-year texts and over 68% of the activities and exercises in the third-year
texts assume that students have acquired enough experience with format, content, process, and vocabulary in order to be able to successfully use the material presented (Figure 8).

In intelligence, there are significant differences within and between the texts at both levels. The mean score for first-year texts is 45%, while the mean score for third-year texts is 93%. While 71% of the first- and third-year materials are rated "rich" in intelligence the percentage profile indicates that third-year texts are generally more complex and abstract in nature (Figure 9).
Intelligence — Percentage of "Rich" Scores in First- and Third-Year High School Spanish Texts

Overall scores indicate that first-year texts contain more "rich" activities that are stimulating, evocative, and attractive than third-year texts. Three texts (D, EE, FF) received scores ranging from 39% to 77%. The other texts, however, are characterized by uninteresting material, both in topic and format (Figure 10).

Six texts contain activities that are ego-involving or that enable students to make decisions by offering them alternative response options. The others are characterized by questions and exercises that are set and unequivocal, stressing the fact that there is only one "right" answer (Figure 11).
Motivation - Percentage of "Rich" Scores in First- and Third-Year High School Spanish Texts

Emotion/Personality - Percentage of "Rich" Scores in First- and Third-Year High School Spanish Texts
One third-year text (E) received a "rich" rating for creativity. The other texts are characterized as evoking imitation, requiring restricted responses, and directing the learner to use them in specific nondeviating ways or toward a single non-variable goal (Figure 12).

The social dimension received the lowest scores among the non-perceptual categories. Only two texts fostered the use of interpersonal skills in over 40% of the activities. Low scores also indicate that most texts demonstrate little or no positive concern or sensitivity for the target language speakers (Figure 13).
While five of the first-year texts stress verbal expression in at least 20% of the activities and exercises, only one third-year text receive a score of 17%. Three third-year texts require no oral response in any of the rated activities. Paradoxically, although the difficulty level of the material suggests that students have mastered the target language, these texts do not invite students to actively use it in conversation (Figure 14).
In 11 textbooks, active listening as defined by ACCS is required in less than 15% of the activities evaluated. These "deficient" scores indicate that students are not invited or required to listen actively to teacher or student response, or follow verbal directions. Texts that score low on social, verbal, and auditory require little or no active communication in the target language (Figure 15).
Auditory Perception – Percentage of "Rich" Scores in First- and Third-Year High School Spanish Texts

Two first- and two third-year texts invite some type of interaction with the visuals presented. Photographs, maps, line drawings, etc., in these texts not only contribute to the attractive format but also require the learner to use them in some way. Students may be required to respond according to some type of visual stimuli (describe the picture, follow a map, etc.). Texts scoring below 15% generally use visuals strictly for aesthetic appeal (Figure 16).

Only two texts afford learners opportunities to become involved in manipulative activities such as crafts, dance, or mini-dramas (Figure 17).
Figure 16

Visual Perception - Percentage of "Rich" Scores in First- and Third-Year High School Spanish Texts

Figure 17

Motor Perception - Percentage of "Rich" Scores in First- and Third-Year High School Spanish Texts
Results from Analysis of Text Profiles of First-Year Spanish Textbooks

The basic rational of ACCS is that a "match" can be made between learner and curriculum material that will enhance learning. In order to facilitate this "match," a curriculum profile must be developed. In this study, text profiles were formed by classifying all dimensions below 50% as "deficient" and all dimensions above 50% as "rich." In all tables reporting ACCS profiles, a one (1) represents a "rich" classification and a zero (0) a "deficient" classification. A profile is depicted as a list of ten digits, either ones or zeros, representing "rich" or "deficient" in a particular ACCS category. An example from one of the tables is shown below. In this example, two profiles are identified, reading from left to right. The first profile, in the first row, has zeros in each category except for the first two, experience and intelligence, where ones (rich) are recorded. The second profile consists of all zeros (deficient).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Int</th>
<th>Mot</th>
<th>Emo</th>
<th>Cre</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Ver</th>
<th>Aud</th>
<th>Vis</th>
<th>Mtr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Y</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that there are 1024 possible profiles that could result when dichotomous classifications are made in ten categories, as is done with ACCS. An analysis
of the ACCS profiles of eight Spanish first-year textbooks (Table 13) reveal, however, that only two distinct profiles exist. Four textbooks (A, D, F, and H) were classified as "rich" in the categories of experience and intelligence and "deficient" in the remaining eight categories. Three textbooks (C, E, and G) were classified as "deficient" in all ten categories. Textbook B was classified as "rich" in experience and "deficient" in the remaining nine categories.

Only one profile emerges from the analysis of six third-year Spanish textbooks. All texts but one (EE) are classified as "rich" in the categories of experience and intelligence and "deficient" in the remaining eight categories (Table 13).

Table 12

ACCS Profiles of First-Year Spanish Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Int</th>
<th>Mot</th>
<th>Emo</th>
<th>Cre</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Ver</th>
<th>Aud</th>
<th>Vis</th>
<th>Mtr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

ACCS Profile of Third-Year Spanish Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exp</th>
<th>Int</th>
<th>Mot</th>
<th>Emo</th>
<th>Cre</th>
<th>Soc</th>
<th>Ver</th>
<th>Aud</th>
<th>Vis</th>
<th>Mtr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

The general findings of this study indicate that the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System can be used as a tool for classifying, describing, and analyzing textbooks used in first- and third-year Spanish classes. The analysis of the data indicates that the following curriculum characteristics are present at both levels: experience, intelligence, motivation, emotion/personality, creativity, social, verbal, auditory, and visual. The only characteristic, as defined by the descriptor terms, that did not seem to apply in this study was motor perception. The dimensions that exhibited the most variability within and between texts were experience, intelligence, motivation, emotion, creativity, and visual. The verbal, auditory, social, and motor dimensions exhibited the least variability. The text profiles indicate that approximately
50% of the texts may be classified as "rich" in the dimensions of experience and intelligence, and "deficient" on the remaining eight dimensions. Third-year texts are classified as 100% "rich" in the dimensions of experience and intelligence, and "deficient" on the remaining eight dimensions.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was designed to examine the curriculum characteristics (as defined by The Annehurst Curriculum Classification System) of first- and third-year high school Spanish core textbooks and to determine what differences may exist within and between the two groups of textbooks.

Twenty-four states were involved in the survey. Data and information were obtained from 20 of these states from November, 1983 to February 1984. Of the 20 respondents, a total of 16 met the conditions for inclusion in this study. Lists were made of first- and third-year textbooks used in these states. An instrument for the evaluation of these foreign language textbooks based upon the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System constructed by Frymier and associates (1977) was developed and tested during training sessions in April, 1984, conducted by two researchers previously trained in the use of ACCS. During the month of April, a team of trained raters, which included eight graduate students and two researchers, classified 968 pages according to the ten ACCS dimensions (experience, intelligence, motivation, emotion/personality, creativity,
social, verbal, auditory, visual, and motor) from 14 first-
and third-year Spanish high school textbooks for a total
of 9650 observations.

The data collected, analyzed, and classified were
subjected to statistical tests of significance for nominal
data. The .01 level was employed as the probability level
necessary for rejecting the null hypothesis. Data were
also grouped and analyzed according to percentage scores and
ACCS profiles.

Conclusions Based Upon the Three Statistical Hypotheses

The first null hypothesis of no significant differ-
ences in the curriculum characteristics of first-year
Spanish texts was retained for the categories of creativity,
verbal, auditory, visual, and motor perception and rejected
for the experience, intelligence, motivation, emotion/
personality, and social dimensions.

The second null hypothesis of no significant
differences in the curriculum characteristics of third-
year Spanish texts was retained for the categories of
social, auditory, visual, and motor perception and rejected
for the categories of experience, intelligence, motivation,
emotion/personality, creativity, and visual perception.

The third null hypothesis of no significant differ-
ences between the curriculum characteristics of first-
and third-year Spanish texts was retained for the categories
of motivation, emotion/personality, creativity, social,
visual, and motor perception and rejected for the categories of experience, intelligence, verbal, and auditory perception.

Conclusions Based Upon Analysis of Percentage Scores and ACCS Profiles.

Experience

Cronbach (1955) states that concrete experience is most essential when a person has not had adequate prior contact to the subject matter. To give the person a new experience, the writer must use words that have developed meaning in the reader's past experience, so that these experiences are used to conceptualize the new event.

Of the first-year texts analyzed, three of the eight met this criteria. Their scores clustered around 25% to 50% of exercises "rich" in previous experience. An examination of the descriptor phrases used to classify materials as "deficient" in this category revealed that these textbooks generally related material to the reader's past experience by frequent reference to common, concrete instances. These texts often relate new material to knowledge and concepts already anchored in the learner's cognitive structure and build upon the learner's new acquired knowledge. Such ratings might be expected in the results of the analysis of first-year materials because of the new experiences language learning affords the students. A reasonable assumption would be that this category should see an increase in "rich"
ratings in upper level texts or within the same textbook as the student gains in experience through contact with the material. The first-year texts that score above 50%, however, generally assume that students are familiar with the syntax and semantics of their native language and will be able to transfer this knowledge to the target language. Some first-year texts that receive "rich" ratings in experience may automatically exclude those high school students who read below grade level or who have not mastered grammatical concepts in English.

The percent of third-year texts classified as "rich" in previous experience (100%) reveals that by the third-year the learner is expected to be familiar with higher order terms and deal with many complex ideas such as surrealism versus realism in literature or complex grammatical analysis. The descriptor phrases used to evaluate the textbooks in third-year that are "rich" (50% or above) in previous experience indicate that the course content in these texts is generally remote, addresses events in abstract ways, and requires the learner to have had considerable experience with format, content, or process in order to use the material. Students may be required to define and use the concepts of "rhyme" and "meter" in an original sonnet, read stories that often have 25 marginal notes per page, and comment upon regional celebrations, literary characters, or famous target language authors and historical
figures. In many cases it is apparent the authors and teachers presuppose that learners have acquired the background knowledge to deal with these complex ideas. In reality, however, previous texts or chapters have not adequately prepared students for these tasks.

In order to be able to read and comprehend the material, the learner must bring meaning to the text. It is this meaning, or previous experience that is essential if learners are to make sense of what they have read. Anything that they cannot relate to previous experience will be incorrectly interpreted and meaningless. Ausubel (1968) states that students interpret or acquire new knowledge through the process of concept assimilation. It is a process in which "they learn new conceptual meanings by being presented with the criterial attributes of concepts and by relating these attributes to relevant established ideas in their cognitive structures" (p. 94). Textbooks that receive "rich" ratings in experience should be examined carefully to ensure that content in previous chapters or texts in the series builds upon the learner's background or previous experience and that bridges exist between the old and new syntactical, cultural, literary, or historical concepts and facts presented in the future lessons within the text.

Intelligence

The category of intelligence as defined by ACCS actually contains two concepts. The first involves the
overall complexity of the material and the second involves the manner in which the text presents the material (i.e., Does it actually make the student think or simply recall information, remember factual data, or "recite by heart" concepts learned in previous lessons?).

Fifty percent of the first-year texts were rated as "rich" on the dimension of intelligence. The scores of these texts were similar to the scores received on the dimension of experience, in five instances varying only by five percentage points. This would seem to indicate that these "rich" scores were achieved for the intelligence dimension not because the material evokes analysis, synthesis or evaluative type thought but rather because of the material's complex nature (involved grammatical explanations, higher order vocabulary terms, etc.).

The texts classified as "deficient" were described as being fact-oriented, concrete, and simple in organization, with exercises that evoke simple recognition and isolated-type thought. These texts often present pattern practice and repetition drills that focus upon form but do not stress awareness of phrase meaning, and substitution drills that frequently concentrate upon only one specific element necessary to make the appropriate change. While these types of exercises may be suitable for first-year texts in beginning chapters, a text that receives a "deficient" rating should be examined carefully to determine if the material actually
does evoke thought. Foreign-language learning obviously requires considerable practice of the basic and characteristic structural patterns of the language. But unless students understand the relationship between the verbal manipulations practiced in drills and the changes in meaning that occur with these manipulations, the practice is not meaningful and will not be retained (Ausubel, 1968). Jarvis (1971) states that "the more meaningful and personal the material, the better it will be retained" (p. 410). Hosenfeld (1975) has indicated that correct responding is not contingent upon complete comprehension of the material. Most students in her research study did not attend to meaning but only to the information in the exercises that was needed to complete the task. The activities and exercises examined in first- and third-year Spanish texts continue to foster this type of thought with simple, convergent questions that require one specific response, substitution drills that focus upon form and not meaning, and comprehension questions that may be answered by finding a similar passage in the reading and copying that same passage for the response with little or no attention to actual meaning.

Motivation

The function of motivation is generally recognized in most up-to-date textbooks. Ninety-three percent of the textbooks rated are attractive, with full page color pictures
arranged so that they are aesthetically appealing to the eye. The attempt to gain students' interest by including pictures or drawings of target language speakers of the same age group occurs in textbooks of both levels. Arousing a casual interest, however useful in promoting willingness to read, is not equivalent to arousing serious purpose. While all but one text would have received a "rich" rating on attractiveness alone, when all descriptors on the ACCS continuum of motivation were considered, only one text (D) received a score above 50%. The other texts are characterized by uninteresting material, both in topic and format. These activities and exercises have little dull, routine manner. Thirteen or 93% of the texts were evaluated as "deficient" in the category of motivation. The relationship between motivation, experience, and intelligence can be clearly seen in this dimension. In order to maximize cognitive drive, texts should arouse intellectual curiosity, arrange lessons so as to ensure ultimate success in learning, and use attractive materials. Although the format of the text may be attractive, the activities and exercises are frequently uninteresting and unrelated to the learners background. Texts that should be stimulating, evocative, and compelling, often create feelings of failure and frustration.

Emotion/Personality

The category of emotion/personality received an average score of 20%. The textbooks did not directly
consider the learner (ego-involving) or express emotion in the positive or negative sense. The data revealed that decisions are controlled by others (e.g., textbook author, teacher, or by chance) and that learners have a minimum amount of input into activities that were set, unequivocal, and stasis-oriented. The "deficient" scores also indicate that these textbooks continue to teach one method to all students, regardless of individual differences and learning styles. Students are not given the opportunity to practice the target language by employing new and original combinations, nor are they encouraged to experiment with the language by creating alternate responses.

Rivers (1964) has spoken of students who can demonstrate "glib fluency" in controlled situations, but who are quite at a loss when asked to express themselves in a real act of communication. By combining the descriptors from the motivation and emotion/personality dimensions, it is evident that authors still encourage students to become proficient in automatic mechanical manipulation in which meaning is irrelevant. In the real world of actual communication the speaker controls the language. In these basic sentence responses and pattern drills, however, the language controls the speaker. These observations were substantiated by the overall scores. All 14 textbooks were rated as "deficient" with scores ranging from zero to 47%. Thus, although language learning must offer many varied guided opportunities
to practice new structures, few texts invite students to directly involve themselves with the material by expressing their own opinions, feelings, emotions, or needs in the target language.

Creativity

In order to foster creativity within the learner, the curriculum material must evoke imagination, offer many response possibilities to the learner, and create questions, possibilities, in the learner's mind. Students interact creatively with materials when they work out the best course of action to take in solving a problem. The text, however, must lend itself to this type of creative thinking. The material or text inhibits creation when it suggests "one best way."

The overall analysis of percentage scores representing first- and third-year textbooks "rich" in creativity, reveals that only one text received a high score. Text EE contains activities that encourage or require a variety of responses, encourage latitude in utilization, and interpretation, and often contain explanations or activities that are novel or unusual. The other texts evaluated ranged from zero to 34% on this dimension. These results suggest that teachers are using materials that evoke routine reproduction, copying, monotonous repetition, constancy, and similarity. Many exercises discourage or curtail variation in response. If learning is viewed as a creative act, a
reorganization of past experiences in meaningful ways, then these textbooks do not foster learning, but rather simply require the learner to restate in some predetermined form what has already been presented in the textbook.

Social

Stern (1983) stresses that language learning should focus upon two areas. First, it should enable the learner to become familiar with the structural, functional, and socio-cultural aspects of the language; and second, it should also offer opportunities to live the language as a personal experience through direct language use in contact with the target language community. Strasheim (1979) expands the socio-cultural aspects of the language to include the idea of "interdependence." She states that language learning should also focus upon the concepts of "global dependence where each community experiences the language and life styles of others" (p. 29). Texts should foster this idea of interdependence, that includes the give-and-take of real communication between individuals, an awareness and comparison of the diversity of ideas and practices found in target language societies, and also discussions of how ideas and ways of one's own society might be viewed from other vantage points. The social dimension in ACCS stresses an awareness of and communicative contact with target language users and community. These interactions may occur either in person or vicariously through writings, media, role playing, or
immersion. In this way, students become actively involved as participants in authentic language use.

An analysis of the social dimension indicates that only two first-year texts (B, D) foster interpersonal activity or encourage active interest for the people portrayed in the text in 40% and 45% of the activities. In the other texts, this interpersonal activity and interest occurs less than 30% of the time. The low scores are particularly ironic in third-year texts. One of the primary purposes of language is communication with others and the complexity of all third-year materials requires that for successful completion of the texts students must possess the language skills to interact meaningfully in the target language. In all texts, however, they are neither encouraged nor given the opportunity to do so.

Verbal Expression

Speaking is defined as a major objective in foreign language classes. Chastain (1976), for example, states that "a large percentage of students enrolled in second-language classes are there because they want to learn to speak the language" (p. 330). In an effort to determine if the textbooks address this objective and need, the researcher examined and evaluated the texts by asking if the curriculum material directs or invites oral response or interaction. While no first year text received a "rich" rating in this category, four of the eight first-year texts (A, D, F, and
G) scored from 22% to 31%, indicating that approximately one-fourth of the activities evaluated in these textbooks stressed verbal skills. The remaining four first- and all third-year texts received scores of below 20% indicating that the activities made little or no verbal demands on the learner. The activities evaluated in these textbooks were characterized by oral repetition, substitution drills, and simple "yes" or "no" responses in which the learner was required to repeat initial questions with only one basic verb change in the answer. Fifty percent of all textbooks received scores of under ten percent, indicating that overall it is possible to interact with textbook materials and not talk aloud at all. Based upon this criteria, these texts meet neither the objectives of the foreign language classroom teacher nor the needs of the students studying the language.

Auditory Perception

The dimension of auditory perception in ACCS focuses upon the amount of active listening that is required by the learner. By comparing the percentage scores of the verbal and auditory dimensions, it is possible to separate the texts that stress speech sound discrimination and memory of significant speech sounds, obviously important in audio-lingual language training and those texts that stress interactive communicative skills. Texts that receive similar percentage scores on these two dimension generally require
the learner to speak to someone and/or respond to some type of verbal stimulus (D, F, and G). Texts that receive higher scores on the dimension of verbal response, and notably lower scores on the dimension of auditory perception (A, E), generally require the learner to read or practice pronunciation aloud or reply orally to a written stimulus, but do not require anyone else to reply verbally to the student. Active listening defined under these terms occurs in three percent to 22% of the activities evaluated in first-year Spanish and in only 12% of one third-year text (FF). Rivers (1976) estimates that of the time adults spend in communication activities, 45% is devoted to listening, 30% to speaking, 16% to reading, and a mere nine percent to writing. Over 70% of the texts evaluated, however, allocate less than 10% of the activities to the listening skill and over 50% to written exercises. Much of the enjoyment in foreign-language use comes from listening activities -- watching films, plays, listening to radio broadcasts, songs, or talks by native speakers. Most textbooks used in today's classrooms, however, do not adequately prepare learners for involvement or participation in these activities.

Visual Perception

Textbooks have been made increasingly attractive, especially in their use of maps, photographs, and realia. A genuine effort is being made to appeal to students through colorful, professional, and artistic photography.
Target language speakers are depicted in their everyday environment and in all countries in which the foreign language is spoken. An evaluation of pictures, line drawings, maps, realia, etc. revealed, however, that only four textbooks (E, G, BB, and EE) contain activities that directly related to the material being presented or that require the learner to interact visually with some type of stimuli in over 30% of the activities evaluated. The researcher defined this interaction as some type of guided activity in which the learner was required to read a map, answer according to diagrams and line drawings, or to look at a picture and describe it in some way.

Researchers and educators (Scanlan, 1976; Mollica, 1979; McCoy and Weible, 1983) have noted that visuals can be used to stimulate divergent production. Students can exercise their imaginations by describing, formulating questions about, or providing captions for pictures, line drawings, ads, etc. The ratings indicated, however, that in 71% of the textbooks, photos become mainly ornaments that authors and publishers hope will enhance the appeal of the book to teachers, since students, as evidenced by the high percentage of "rich" scores in the category of experience, lack background knowledge to be able to accurately interpret the visual stimuli. In texts rated "deficient" on the visual dimension, editors and authors have ignored one of the most colorful and motivating resources available.
Motor Perception

In the category of motor perception, ACCS evaluates textbook materials to determine if they do afford the learner opportunities to become involved in manipulative activities that require movement of large body parts such as dancing, painting pictures, making a pinata, or cooking. All of the texts in this study received a "deficient" rating in this category.

According to one curriculum theory (Piaget, 1969) the learner approaches maturity in four periods: in the first, predominantly overt activity includes trying out, observing and manipulating the familiar objects of the surrounding environment; in the second, development proceeds from sensorimotor representation to prelogical thought and solutions to problems; in the third, prelogical thought is replaced by logical solutions to concrete problems; finally, the student learns to solve abstract as well as concrete problems. A child's development in the first two periods (birth to 7 years of age) involve coordination, body balance, and physical manipulation of objects. These characteristics, therefore, should be present in texts designed to teach foreign languages to elementary or middle-school students. Asher et al. (1966, 1972, 1974) have developed and tested an approach that relies primarily on student's physical responses to the teacher's oral commands at the early stages of language learning. There is a paucity of studies, however, conducted
on the secondary school level. Further research that defines the importance of physical activity in high school or adult foreign language classes may determine that category of motor perception does not apply to upper level curriculum materials.

Conclusion

A broad, general finding of this study is that textbooks used in these states by over 500,000 pupils have been assessed as consistently "deficient" on nearly all dimensions of the ACCS (motivation, emotion-personality, creativity and social content) and that they are not applicable to teaching-learning situations in which there might be verbal expression problems or problems of visual, auditory, or motor perception. These texts, as defined by the descriptors, also afford minimal opportunities for foreign language learners to practice verbal, and auditory perception skills. Overall, the results of this investigation are generally in keeping with the results of earlier studies that examined textbooks in other content areas and one recent investigation by Harewood (1984) that analyzed French secondary materials used in Canada. The lack of difference among first- and third-year Spanish textbooks suggest that the broad spectrum of needs that are believed inherent in learners both in the cognitive and affective domains is probably not being met by the instructional materials.
The research using the Annehurst Curriculum Classification System has provided not only important data about the textbooks currently being used in 16 states that have statewide adoption textbook lists, but it has also demonstrated the utility of the system as an evaluation instrument. It is an effective method for analyzing, classifying, and describing textbooks according to the types of curriculum characteristics they exhibit as defined by the instrument.
Implications and Recommendations for Further Study

This study was designed to provide information about the nature of those textbook materials that are used in 16 states with mandated textbook adoption policies for foreign language programs. The Annehurst Curriculum Classification System was used as a tool for analyzing, classifying, and describing these textbooks. Implications and recommendations based upon the conclusions of this study have been divided into five categories: (1) suggestions for further research, (2) suggestions for ACCS adaptation, (3) suggestions for publishers, (4) suggestions for teachers, and (5) suggestions for teacher-education programs.

The findings of the present study suggest two areas for further research that concentrate upon: (1) materials description and analysis, and (2) adaptation of the ACCS instrument.

Materials Description and Analysis

The conclusions of this study are based upon the evaluation of one foreign language (Spanish). It is therefore recommended that similar research be conducted that would involve studies that investigate differences between the curriculum characteristics of Spanish textbooks and textbooks of other languages (i.e. French, German, Italian, Latin, etc.).

This study should be replicated for second-, fourth-, and fifth-year textbooks or readers to determine if there
are there any differences between the curriculum characteristics found in second-, fourth-, and fifth-year language texts and those found in first- and third-year textbooks. Studies should also be undertaken of textbooks used by pupils of different age levels (e.g., Are any differences in the curriculum characteristics of the textbooks used in elementary, secondary, or college level courses?).

Based upon the description and analysis of these materials, textbook authors, publishers, and teachers could then examine the results to determine if specific patterns exist. Are the majority of textbooks rated "deficient" in the areas of social, emotion/personality, or creativity? Do these materials really meet the needs of foreign language students? How could textbooks be improved in order to "match" those needs?

The textbooks selected for examination in this study are used in those states with mandated textbook adoption lists. Further research would indicate if there are any differences in the curriculum characteristics of the materials in states with a state-wide textbook adoption policy versus those states with no such policy or if there are any differences in the curriculum characteristics of the textbooks used in private versus public institutions.

Research in other content areas indicates that students and their teachers differ in preference for selected curriculum materials (Johnson et al., 1978). Similar studies
should be conducted to determine if similar differences exist between student and teacher preferences for foreign language materials of given characteristics that have been defined using ACCS. These results would indicate not only the types of textbooks that students and teachers prefer, but also how students and teachers actually view the materials that they use daily. Are textbooks written for students or for teachers? What type of activities or format are most appealing? Descriptive studies using ACCS could provide some of these answers.

Teachers frequently adapt and supplement textbook materials to suit individual abilities, and interests. Researchers should use ACCS, therefore, to analyze not only textbooks but also other curriculum materials used by foreign language learners. Conclusions from such research will extend the results obtained here and would provide valuable information about the patterns and variability, if any, of use and general array of materials used. For example, it would reveal the extent to which all pupils in an instructional group use identical or similar materials. It would also reveal if there are any differences between the curriculum characteristics of professionally produced materials (textbooks, workbooks) and teacher produced materials (dittos, handouts, etc.).

Adaptation of the ACCS Instrument

The following recommendations are based upon revision of the original instrument, training of researchers, classification
of almost 1000 pages on the ten previously defined, and analysis of 9650 observations. The most significant of these recommendations relates directly to the implementation of the ACCS as a quantitative instrument and the applicability of the descriptor phrases for foreign language textbooks.

The alternative to the strictly "high/low" distinction of the original ACCS instrument afforded the researchers and trained raters an opportunity to rate each piece of material more precisely. Even though the final analysis did not reflect these numerical values, by calculating the overall mean for each individual descriptor phrase using the numerical value given by raters for each phrase, it was possible to obtain a profile of a single page or of an entire textbook by category (Figure 18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RICH</th>
<th>CREATIVITY</th>
<th>DEFICIENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evokes imagination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open-ended</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evokes imitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Versatile</td>
<td></td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative responses possible</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nondirective</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restricted responses required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unusual/Novel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not lend itself to being judged right or wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td>Predictable/Conventional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 18**

Creativity - Profile of Text D Using Mean "Scores" of Descriptor Phrases from Raters A, B, C, D
For example, the following "scores" were tabulated for the descriptor phrases "evokes imagination/evokes imitation" on the creativity dimension of Text D (Figure 13, Table 14).

Table 14

Scores for "evokes imagination/imitation" on the Creativity Dimension of Text D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Rater A</th>
<th>Rater B</th>
<th>Rater C</th>
<th>Rater D</th>
<th>Total Score Per Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Score Per Phrase: 58

The following formula was used to calculate the average mean score for the descriptor phrase "evokes imagination/evokes imitation."

\[
\bar{X} = \frac{Z}{N} = \frac{58}{16} = 3.6
\]

where

\[Z = \text{sum of "scores" for each descriptor phrase}\]

\[N = \text{total number of pages rated}\]
These quantitative profiles may be used to further refine the instrument. The researcher reviewed descriptor phrases that were consistently marked "non-applicable" or that did not seem to "match" the overall profile in an effort to determine if these phrases were ambiguous, confusing, or not appropriate for the task. For example, the descriptor phrase "unusual/predictable" (Figure 13) received extremely high scores when compared to the other seven phrases. This type of profile analysis also enabled the researcher to check descriptor phrases that presented problems for raters. If three raters consistently marked one descriptor phrase with a score of "7" or "8" and one rater marked that same phrase with a score of "1" that particular rater may be misinterpreting the phrase. This type of "error" or "disagreement" analysis would enable researchers to increase interrater reliability. Further investigation using the revised version of the ACCS would indicate descriptor phrases that (1) most appropriately describe foreign language materials, and (2) do not apply. A detailed analysis of descriptor phrases using this the revised format would enable researchers to "fine tune" the ACCS instrument, increasing validity and reliability.

Instrument adaptation and research alone, however, are not sufficient. The general findings of this study indicate that suggestions should also be made to publishers, authors, teachers, and for teacher-education in an effort to improve the quality of foreign language texts.
Suggestions for Publishers and Authors

Publishers and authors must consider not only the needs of the curriculum planners and teachers, but also needs of the students. Texts should be flexible and adaptable to many ability levels and should be capable of adaptation to varied pacings, depending on the motivations, interests, and abilities of students. They should offer alternatives and allow instructors to choose the method, pace, and structure that will be most beneficial for their students (Steiner, 1973). Textbooks that give greater consideration to the interests of students will also have to involve students in the development of their study materials. A cooperative effort should be made that reflects pedagogically sound research knowledge of foreign language learning and learners. For example, efforts must be made to build upon the learner's previous knowledge and experience. Where this knowledge and experience is lacking, texts must then introduce these new concepts and refer to them frequently in subsequent presentations. Many texts stress grammatical, historical, or cultural concepts that have never been introduced in the native or target language. Most third-year texts expect students to make the transition from reading eight to ten sentences in isolated exercises, or contrived written paragraphs to comprehension of literary selections containing highly abstract vocabulary, complex syntactical patterns, sophisticated style, and content.
Although students may possess a certain mastery of the language, they have not received adequate training for reading comprehension. This training should be incorporated in foreign language texts at all levels.

Since learning to speak a foreign language involves communication and social interaction, texts should reflect these interpersonal skills. Most texts emphasize primarily the intellectual and experiential dimensions and neglect the affective domain. If students are to become truly proficient in the target language, they should be given ample opportunity to express their feelings, thoughts, and needs to others.

Suggestions for Teachers

Foreign language instructors should be aware of learner types and material types and the relationship between the two. They should consider ways of adapting core texts to meet the needs of the individual students, or groups of students. Teachers should learn to identify and classify individual students' learner characteristics in order to effect a "match" between the student and the materials used. In order to provide learners with appropriately "matched" materials, many types of activities, texts, and resources are needed. This implies cooperation within foreign language departments and between schools. Sharing, efficiency, revision, and cooperation are the keys for successful implementation of this plan.
It is also the professional duty of teachers to let publishers and authors know what type of texts students need. Instructors should become informed consumers, and express what they and students consider to be "sense" versus "nonsense" in current texts.

Suggestions for Teacher-Education Programs

Teacher-education programs should incorporate the discussion of learner characteristics, curriculum characteristics, alternative teaching-learning strategies, and adaptation of materials if future teachers are to teach to the individual rather than to the group. These preservice teacher education, methods courses for novice teachers, and inservice programs for experience teachers should include not only description and diagnosis of learner types, but also examination and evaluation of materials and textbooks.
APPENDIX A

Annehurst Curriculum Classification System

Learners' Characteristics
### Learners' Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has traveled widely</td>
<td>patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has not traveled much</td>
<td>impatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stimulus-rich background</td>
<td>open-minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has read a lot</td>
<td>accepts blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has mastered previous learning</td>
<td>generous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has not mastered previous</td>
<td>has sense of humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning</td>
<td>confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has skills of learning</td>
<td>inattentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high achievement</td>
<td>impatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extensive interests and activities</td>
<td>independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deliberate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>internal locus of control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dependable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Intelligence

| rational                          | irrational                       |
| can integrate ideas               | cannot integrate ideas           |
| contemplative                     | shallow thinker                  |
| quick to learn                    | slow to learn                    |
| intermixed with complexity        | inattentive                      |
| reflective with ideas             | impulsive with ideas             |
| has good memory                   | has poor memory                  |

### Motivation

| energetic                         | lazy                             |
| persistent                        | easily discouraged               |
| shows initiative                  | lacks initiative                 |
| enthusiastic                      | bored                            |
| tries hard                        | gives up                        |
| purposeful                        | aimless                          |
| insatiable                        | indifferent                      |
| future oriented                   | present oriented                 |
| curious                           | uninterested                     |
| able to delay gratification       | demands instant gratification    |

### Emotion-Personality

| impulsive                        | traditionalistic                 |
|                                  | rigid                            |
|                                  | genial                           |
|                                  | cautious                         |
|                                  | restricted with ideas            |
|                                  | conforming                       |
|                                  | difficulty elaborating           |
|                                  | difficulty forming new patterns  |
|                                  | imaginative                      |
|                                  | unimaginative                    |

### Creativity

| imaginative                      | traditionalistic                 |
|                                  | rigid                            |
|                                  | genial                           |
|                                  | cautious                         |
|                                  | restricted with ideas            |
|                                  | conforming                       |
|                                  | difficulty elaborating           |
|                                  | difficulty forming new patterns  |
|                                  | imaginative                      |
|                                  | unimaginative                    |

### Social

| communicative                    | uncommunicative                  |
|                                  | lonely                           |
| participatory                    | uncooperative                    |
| cooperative                      | holds a grudge                   |
| forgiving                       | unfriendly                       |
| friendly                         | callous                          |
| empathetic                       | unsympathetic                    |
| sympathetic                      | prejudiced                       |
| tolerant                         | selfish                          |
| altruistic                       | disrespectful                    |
APPENDIX B

Operational Definitions of the Curriculum

Characteristics
PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

SPECIAL TERMINOLOGY

Higher order terms (walk/perambulate); technical terms (suprasegmentals); unusual words or phrases (forgetting/oblit-erative subsumption) for that particular discipline.

PROVIDES VICARIOUS EXPERIENCE

Allows one to read about some person, place, or thing; it allows one to feel or to believe that conditions or situations although unreal, are real and genuine (e.g. role-playing etc.)

REQUIRES SPECIAL TRAINING TO USE

User must follow specific sequence; requires that special equipment be used; specific used; specific training; use of tape recorder, A-V equipment, etc.

DIFFICULT READING LEVEL

Long and complex sentences; polysyllabic words; unusual words; punctuation elaborate and difficult to follow.

ADVANCED IN NATURE

Necessity for learner to have had considerable experience with format, content or process in order to use the material.

REPRESENTATIVE OF REALITY

Use of charts, diagrams, pictures, maps, line drawings, that represent reality. e.g. periodic table of chemistry, international phonetic alphabet, phonetic transcription.

EXAMPLES AND ILLUSTRATIONS ARE COMPLEX

Will cause difficulty in understanding; the significance of illustrations must must be pointed out; the relationship of examples to the rest of the material is not apparent.

*CM = Curriculum Material

COMMON VOCABULARY

CM* reflects terms and phrases that are common for the particular age of learner.

PROVIDES DIRECT EXPERIENCE

One goes on a trip with a foreign language class; one uses the language rather than reads or talks about it.

NO SPECIAL TRAINING REQUIRED FOR USE

Most textbooks do not require special training in order to use them.

SIMPLE/BEGINNING READING LEVEL

Sentences are short, simple; appropriate for the age level.

INTRODUCTORY IN NATURE

A beginner can cope with the material reasonably well.

ORIGINAL OR ACTUAL THING

No substitutes for reality: An actual menu, target language food etc.

EXAMPLES AND ILLUSTRATIONS ARE SIMPLE AND UNDERSTANDABLE

The significance of illustrations is obvious. The illustrations are relevant and easy to follow.
INTELLIGENCE

CONCEPT ORIENTED
Deals with "big ideas". Facts "added-up" to make a larger whole. CM make a point. (e.g. the concept of numbers: singular, plural; numerals; time; measurement; dimensions; money)

ABSTRACT
CM is theoretical, portrays generalizations. Rules for forming the plural but no reinforcing exercises are given.

INTENTIONS IMPLICIT
Purpose of CM is implicit, the intentions of CM must be ferreted out. (e.g. write a paragraph describing your plans for the year 2000.)

CRITERIA IMPLICIT
Criteria by which one judges CM are not obvious; criteria are imbedded in CM in an obscured way. (e.g. standards for judging essay questions)

COMPLEX ORGANIZATION
Arrangement of ideas, information or stimulus material in CM is complex, intricate and involved. The pattern is difficult to detect. (e.g. many relative clauses in one sentence; complex ordering of object pronouns etc.)

EVOKES ANALYSIS-TYPE THOUGHT
CM "starts wheels turning", makes learner think "I saw one of those one time." CM when sequenced, makes learner discriminate, separate, and compare. Learner makes mental categorizations. Invites learner to "take apart" CM.

EVOKES SYNTHESIS-TYPE THOUGHT
CM encourages learner to bring information together, integrate ideas CM sequenced in such a manner that patterns, relationships, or larger wholes are fostered. CM invites learner to "pull together ideas: inductive generalizations.

EVOKES EVALUATIVE-TYPE THOUGHT
CM requires the learner to develop, adopt, or employ criteria; to make comparisons and render decisions. CM requires the learner to involve standards of conduct or moral development, or scientific, linguistic discrimination.

FACT ORIENTED
Deals with isolated factual details CM simply recounts specific data. (e.g. naming cardinal numbers)

CONCRETE
CM is concrete, practical, and specific. CM does not focus upon generalizations.

INTENTIONS EXPLICIT
Purposes for which CM were prepared are obvious. Intentions stated explicitly, behavioral terms. (e.g. conjugate two verbs using future tense)

CRITERIA EXPLICIT
Criteria or standards by which one judges CM are explicitly stated, apparent, obvious for all. (standard for judging fill-in blanks)

SIMPLE ORGANIZATION
Arrangement of ideas, information, or stimulus material is simple. Organization is straightforward and uniform. The pattern is obvious, predictable.

EVOKES RECOGNITION
CM evokes simple recognition; it isolates discrete bits of information so that awareness and recognition are sufficient ends in themselves.

EVOKES ISOLATED-TYPE THOUGHT
CM evokes isolated type thought. Information and stimulus material are such that random arrangements and illogical clusters emerge.

EVOKES RECALL
CM requires learner to recall information, remember factual data, or "recite by heart." CM requires learner to recount from memory or recall specific instances.
MOTIVATION

ATTRACTIVE
CM is attractive: colors, print pictures, or sound are arranged so that they are aesthetically appealing to eye, ear, or other senses.

STIMULATING
CM is stimulating when one looks at, listens to, or senses in a tactile or other way. It "turns people on." The topic captures student interest.

EVOCATIVE
CM evokes reaction and response. It "brings something out of" the learner who looks at or listens to it, or experiences it in some other way.

EXAMPLES PROVOCATIVE
Examples in CM stimulate thought, reaction, and response. They incite action, feeling, emotion, and a desire for rebuttal. A desire to agree or disagree with the CM.

MARKED CONTRAST
CM shows a marked contrast in color, sound, or organization in its composition. There is variation in shape, size, response mode, or in another way.

COMPELLING
CM "grabs" the learner's interest. Learner says "It is a book I could not put down."

UNIQUE
CM "stands out" as being novel and different. It is varied in some important manner.

COMPLEX
CM is complex, intricate, and involved. It is filled with nuance, inter-relationships and complexities.

IMMEDIATE FEEDBACK
CM provides immediate feedback. The user of the materials can know quickly and conveniently how s/he is progressing, whether efforts are right or wrong, on target, and central to the task on hand.

ACTIVITY ORIENTED
CM can be picked up and manipulated or used in some active way.

PLAIN
CM is unexciting, unattractive, and "dull" to look at or listen to.

CALMING
CM is calming and quieting. "It turns people off."

ROUTINE
CM is routine, dull. It can be ignored or overlooked. It is uninteresting.

EXAMPLES LACKING OR NOT PROVOCATIVE
Examples are limited or none at all. They are not relevant, and thus make it difficult to "relate" to the materials. The illustrations are neither dramatic nor significant.

CONTRAST NOT EVIDENT
CM is uniform. There is no variation in size, shape, response mode. There is no color sound, or organizational contrast.

BLAND
CM is bland, uninteresting and does not "hold" the learner's attention.

ORDINARY
CM is ordinary. "What we have always had before." It is the same as or similar to most other materials in format, arrangement, or other ways.

SIMPLE OR UNIFORM
CM is simple and uniform. There is simplicity, symmetry, and uniformity of structure.

FEEDBACK NOT AVAILABLE
CM does not provide immediate feedback. User must wait for several days or minutes for reaction, and confirmation. User cannot know how s/he is progressing; are efforts right or wrong, on or off target, or peripheral to the task at hand.

PASSIVITY ORIENTED
CM is basically a piece that the learner must look at, or listen to in an inactive way.
EMOTION-PERSONALITY

AMBIGUOUS
CM is vague, unclear, obscure, indistinct, and puzzling.

CHANGE-ORIENTED
CM implies or stipulates that alteration, innovation, and variation are appropriate and possible.

EGO-INVOLVING; REFLECTS POSITIVE SENSE OF SELF-ESTEEM
Use of or interaction with material will enhance self-concept of individual. There is something in the material that every learner could relate to. The material will convince the learner that s/he is a person or worth and dignity.

REFLECTS APPROPRIATE EXPRESSION OF EMOTION
CM shows and describes people who empathize with others in true-to-life situations. CM encourages learners to express feelings of understanding or compassion. (N.B. "appropriate" must be a classifying decision-not a censorship decision.)

DECISIONS CONTROLLED BY LEARNER
CM allows learner to identify and create alternate courses of action. Allows learner to make decisions to anticipate consequences to self and others when various courses of action are pursued.

SET AND UNEQUIVOCAL
CM is clear, definite, distinct, and unmistakable in its intentions.

STASIS-ORIENTED
CM implies or stipulates that constancy, permanence, or invariability is the general rule. Only one answer is acceptable.

NON-EGO INVOLVING; REFLECTS NEGATIVE SENSE OF SELF-ESTEEM
CM does not lend itself to the learner's relating to it in an ego-centric manner; nothing in the material ties directly or indirectly to the learner's sense of self-esteem. The material implies or states that the learner has no value, or is insignificant or unimportant in some way.

REFLECTS INAPPROPRIATE OR NO EXPRESSION OF EMOTION
CM suggests or portrays people who feel elated when others suffer. CM supports behaviors in which other's property, sense of values, or self-esteem is destroyed.

DECISIONS CONTROLLED BY OTHERS OR BY CHANCE
Decisions are controlled by others, e.g., textbook author, teacher or by chance.
CREATIVITY

EVOKE IMAGINATION
Evokes visionary images, transformation of ideas, things, new combinations, and different arrangements.

OPEN-ENDED
Many response possibilities. Encourages or requires a variety of ways of responding to CM.

VERSATILE
Portrays, fosters variability, changeability, mutability, and versatility.

ALTERNATIVE RESPONSE POSSIBLE
Latitude is present in CM, in meaning, utilization, interpretation, form.

NONDIRECTIVE
Many ways in which CM may be used and many meanings that may be derived from it.

INTERROGATIVE
CM creates questions, possibilities and variabilities in the learners mind.

UNUSUAL/NOVEL
CM is exceptional, extraordinary, uncommon, rare. It is unusual, different, unique and novel.

DOES NOT LEND ITSELF TO BEING JUDGED RIGHT OR WRONG
Difficult to evaluate. Causes discomfort to label CM as "correct" or "incorrect" or "sound" or "unsound."

EVOKE IMITATION
Evokes routine reproduction, copying, monotonous repetition, constancy, and similarity.

CLOSED
Only one response possibility. Discourages or curtails variation in response.

LIMITED
CM portrays constancy, stability, unalterability, invariability and limitedness.

RESTRICTED RESPONSES REQUIRED
There is a narrowness of interpretation, inference, utilization, and form.

DIRECTIVE
CM directs learner to use it in specific nondeviating ways, or towards a single, non-variable goal.

DECLARATIVE
CM stipulates, obligates, postulates.

PREDICTABLE/CONVENTIONAL
CM is typical, predictable, conventional, and usual. It is ordinary, customary, prevalent, common, and normal.

DOES LEND ITSELF TO BEING JUDGED RIGHT OR WRONG
Easily judged as "right" or "wrong", or "good" or "bad."

SOCIAL

(CM must invite interpersonal activity or demonstrate active interest in people portrayed in text)

RESPECTS INDIVIDUALITY

Respects individuality of learner or people portrayed in CM. Shows that learner has dignity and worth by inviting learner to become involved in or with the CM. Learner is invited to give individual opinion. There is an objective and humane quality in the descriptions made by the CM.

STEREOTYPICAL

Implies or portrays stereotypical notions about people. Treats learner or uses as impersonal instead of an an individual. Format is stereotypical, or implies convention to a "type" accepted by a specific "social class." Bias and distortion rather than a balanced view are portrayed or implied. Stereotypical programmed responses are invited.

REFLECTS POSITIVE CONCERN FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE DIFFERENT

CM portrays people positively who differ in ethnic background, sex, race, age, religion, occupation.

REFLECTS SENSITIVITY TO PEOPLE

CM reflects sensitivity to human beings and human concerns. Suggests that people are important; that they "count"; that life is worthwhile. CM treats information about people in a humane way. Encourages empathy between learner and material. Examples used in CM tend to leave user with a feeling of warmth and satisfaction.

LACKS SENSITIVITY TO PEOPLE

CM implies that people are not not as important as institutions, property, or things; That human considerations are not as worthwhile as nonhuman considerations. Examples in CM tend to show ideas as detached, remote, and separated from people who would normally "act out" these ideas.

NONPREJUDICIAL

CM is objective, factual, and nonprejudicial. Shows accuracy and balance in referring to human beings or to conditions.

PREJUDICIAL

CM is prejudicial, ethnically or racially, or sexually discriminating; it is incorrect, nonfactual, unbalanced, and distorted in its references to human beings and to conditions.

Fosters Interpersonal Skills

CM fosters use and development of interpersonal skills. Examples invite learners to talk to, work, and share with each other. Requires social interaction, communication, give-and-take, and tolerance for other people, their ideas, and ways. CM examples and exercises encourage interaction.

NO INTERPERSONAL SKILLS REQUIRED

Material can be experienced alone or even in isolation. Can be experienced as a separate entity without the presence, involvement, or interaction with others. CM does not invite or encourage interaction.
VERBAL EXPRESSION (SPEECH)

[CURRICULUM MATERIAL DIRECTS OR INVITES ORAL RESPONSE OR INTERACTION]

**REQUIRES EXPANDED VERBAL RESPONSE**
CM requires expanded verbal response. Learner is expected to elaborate upon ideas, develop themes, analyze issues, vary sentence length, intonation, enunciation, or emphasis.

**REQUIRES SIMPLE YES-NO VERBAL RESPONSE**
CM makes no verbal demands on learner. "Yes" or "No" responses are adequate. It is possible to interact with CM and not talk aloud at all.

**REQUIRES SEQUENCING OF SPOKEN TERMS**
CM requires learner to sequence words and ideas to complete sentences and conceptual wholes. Logic of sequencing is important to communication. Precision in ordering of words, phrases aloud is an essential requirement.

**DOES NOT REQUIRE SEQUENCING OF SPOKEN TERMS**
Random verbal response or no verbal response is possible.

**REQUIRES CATEGORIZING**
CM requires learner to categorize ideas, words, etc. aloud according to sound, meaning, function, or form.

**DOES NOT REQUIRE CATEGORIZING**
Possible to interact with CM and not categorize ideas aloud.

**REQUIRES DIFFERENTIATION OF OPPOSITES**
CM requires learner to differentiate opposites aloud, verbalize polar differences, articulate antonyms.

**DOES NOT REQUIRE DIFFERENTIATION OF OPPOSITES**
No spoken differentiation or analysis of conceptual differences aloud.

**REQUIRES DISCRIMINATION OF PARTS AND WHOLES**
CM requires learner to articulate discrimination of parts and wholes. Differentiate perceptually and articulate verbally an awareness of the composite and its particulars. Describe total pattern, separate in thought and word the composite parts, summarize and synthesize specifics into meaningful and intelligible totalities, e.g., story telling, reporting an event, summarizing giving testimony.

**DOES NOT REQUIRE DISCRIMINATION OF PARTS AND WHOLES**
Differentiation and discrimination not required.

**REQUIRES DISCRIMINATION OF SINGULAR AND PLURAL FORMS**
Enables learner to talk about singular and plural forms, distinguish between one and many in verbal ways.

**DOES NOT REQUIRE DISCRIMINATION OF SINGULAR AND PLURAL FORMS**
No discrimination of singular and multiple phenomena required.

**EMPHASIZES RHYTHM OF LANGUAGE**
Requires learner to emphasize and perform according to rules that govern rhythm, flow of spoken language; to be cognizant of and speak according to knowledge of syllabication, punctuation, articulation, pronunciation, stress, pitch, and intonation.

**DOES NOT EMPHASIZE RHYTHM OF LANGUAGE**
These things are neither emphasized nor required.
AUDITORY PERCEPTION

[Requires active listening]

**REQUIRES ORGANIZING, REPRODUCING OR SEQUENCING OF SOUNDS AND WORDS**

CM requires learner to organize, reproduce or sequence sounds in a particular order after s/he has heard them, e.g. pronunciation drills.

**REQUIRES IDENTIFYING AUDITORY SIMILARITIES**

CM requires learner to identify similarities between words and sounds. Learner is expected to detect similar pronunciations, inflections.

**REQUIRES IDENTIFYING AUDITORY DIFFERENCES**

Learner is expected to make discriminations and differentiations among spoken words music, tones, or other sounds.

AUDITORY DIRECTIONS REQUIRED

CM requires student to listen and respond to auditory directions. Learner must follow spoken instructions, e.g. Rose technique, shared nomenclature.

**REQUIRES IDENTIFYING SPECIFIC SOUNDS**

CM provides opportunities for learner to identify specific sounds; to isolate and label or otherwise differentiate one sound from another. e.g. listen to audio tape.

**REQUIRES LEARNING RHYMES, SONGS, TONGUE TWISTERS**

Learner is expected to listen to and learn to repeat rhymes, songs, poems, tongue twisters, etc.

**DOES NOT REQUIRE ORGANIZING, REPRODUCING OR SEQUENCING OF SOUNDS AND WORDS**

Does not require organization, reproduction, or sequencing of sounds.

**DOES NOT REQUIRE IDENTIFYING AUDITORY SIMILARITIES**

No detection of similarities is required.

**DOES NOT REQUIRE IDENTIFYING AUDITORY DIFFERENCES**

No detecting of audio differences is possible or expected with the CM.

**AUDITORY DIRECTIONS NOT REQUIRED**

No auditory directions required.

**DOES NOT REQUIRE IDENTIFYING SPECIFIC SOUNDS**

No differentiation of sounds is required.

**DOES NOT REQUIRE LEARNING RHYMES, SONGS, AND TONGUE TWISTERS**

No such expectation demanded by the CM.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Visual Perception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requires the student to identify visual similarities and differences</td>
<td>Does not require the student to identify visual similarities and differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM requires student to &quot;match&quot; phenomena according to color, shape, size or function.</td>
<td>CM does not require learner to identify similarities and differences among phenomena according to visual stimuli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires student to organize, reproduce, and remember a sequence of visual stimuli.</td>
<td>Does not require the student to organize, reproduce, and remember a sequence of visual stimuli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM requires learner to remember, organize, or reproduce (on a piece of paper or with the objects themselves) a particular sequence or pattern of visual stimuli.</td>
<td>CM does not require learner to remember, organize, or reproduce a sequence of visual stimuli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires finding a specific object against a crowded visual environment or background.</td>
<td>Does not require finding a specific object against a visual environment or background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM requires learner to identify a specific object against a larger, more complex visual background, to make visual figure-ground discriminations, to look for consistencies or inconsistencies, regularities or irregularities of visual stimuli.</td>
<td>CM does not require learner to find a specific object against a visual environment or background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires student to differentiate right-left, front-back, near-far, top-bottom, and comparable characteristics of visual stimuli.</td>
<td>Does not require student to differentiate right-left, front-back, near-far, top-bottom, and comparable characteristics of visual stimuli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM requires learner to identify or respond to right-left distinction of visual stimulation, front-back, top-bottom, straight-curved, symmetrical-asymmetrical, or other characteristics of phenomena that can be visually perceived.</td>
<td>No such distinctions or responses are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires student to interact visually with pictures, maps, diagrams etc.</td>
<td>Does not require student to interact visually with pictures, maps, diagrams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM requires learner to read a map, answer according to diagrams and line drawings; to look at a picture and describe it, etc.</td>
<td>No such interactions are required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MOTOR PERCEPTION

[Requires movement of large body parts]

REQUIRES BODY BALANCE

CM requires learner to exhibit or develop body balance, to exercise physical control of the body in unusual activities e.g. headstands, walking balance beam etc.

DOES NOT REQUIRE BODY BALANCE

CM does not require learner to exhibit or develop body balance.

REQUIRES LOCOMOTOR ACTIVITY

CM requires learner to move about, jump, run, turn, or use special equipment or facilities while engaging in these activities.

DOES NOT REQUIRE LOCOMOTOR ACTIVITY

CM does not require locomotor activity.

IN VolVES BODY PARTS

CM requires learner to use hands, arms, feet or knees, e.g. in typing, playing the piano, etc.

DOES NOT INVOLVE BODY PARTS

CM does not require or involve the use of body parts.

REQUIRES ImitATIVE MOVEMENTS

CM encourages learner to "follow along" as in dancing, painting pictures etc.

DOES NOT REQUIRE ImitATIVE MOVEMENTS

Imitative movements that are physical are not required.

REQUIRES FINE MOTOR COORDINATION

CM requires learner to exercise fine motor coordination, e.g. using an electronic calculator, an art activity, making a pinata, cooking. Rose technique.

DOES NOT REQUIRE FINE MOTOR COORDINATION

CM does not require learner to exercise fine motor coordination.

REQUIRES USING BODY PARTS OF ONE OR BOTH SIDES OF THE BODY

CM requires learner to use hands or arms from one side of body or both. Learner is expected to distinguish between right-side movements and left-side movements, or both-side movements.

DOES NOT REQUIRE USING BODY PARTS OF ONE OR BOTH SIDES OF THE BODY

CM does not require the learner to do these things.

REQUIRES HAND AND ARM MOVEMENTS PAST THE STATIONARY.

CM requires learner to make hand and arm movements past the midline of the body while the head is stationary (e.g. golf).

DOES NOT REQUIRE HAND AND ARM MOVEMENTS WHILE HEAD AND BODY ARE STATIONARY.

CM does not require the learner to do these things.
APPENDIX C

Evaluation Instruments for Foreign Language Materials and Textbooks
1. Aim or Point of View of the Author
   a. Is the cultural value of French emphasized by the author? Yes _ _ _ _ _ _ No _ _ _ _ _ _
   b. Is the correlation with such other subjects as, for example, English, Latin, and Spanish emphasized? Yes _ _ _ _ _ _ No _ _ _ _ _ _
   c. Is the primary emphasis on the formal and structural side, or on the functional? Formal _ _ _ _ _ _ Functional _ _ _ _ _ _

2. Subject Matter and Methodology
   a. Are the exceptions to grammar rules placed within the body of the textbook, or in the appendix? Body of textbook _ _ _ _ _ _ Appendix _ _ _ _ _ _
   b. Does a vocabulary accompany each lesson? Yes _ _ _ _ _ _ No _ _ _ _ _ _
   c. Is the matter of pronunciation handled in the conventional manner, or by the use of vowel charts, etc? Conventional _ _ _ _ _ _ Vowel charts, etc. _ _ _ _ _ _
   d. Is the direct or indirect method of teaching employed, or both? Direct _ _ _ _ _ _ Indirect _ _ _ _ _ _ Both _ _ _ _ _ _
   e. Is the distributed repetition of important words provided for? Yes _ _ _ _ _ _ No _ _ _ _ _ _

3. Instructional Aids and Helps
   a. Are maps and diagrams included? Yes _ _ _ _ _ _ No _ _ _ _ _ _
   b. Are there illustrative materials found throughout the textbook? Yes _ _ _ _ _ _ No _ _ _ _ _ _
   c. Are any supplementary English or French readings on the life and customs of the French people suggested? English _ _ _ _ _ _ French _ _ _ _ _ _ Both _ _ _ _ _ _

MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF MATERIALS
(March 1961, Revised May 1961)*

These criteria were developed pursuant to a contract with the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The evaluator should decide whether the item(s) should be rated as excellent (E), acceptable (A), or unacceptable (U). In the following pages the initials E, A, and U are used to designate these three qualities. In some instances, it seemed unnecessary to make separate statements for excellent and for acceptable, since the characteristics differed only in a degree and not in kind. The single statement given should be construed as describing the acceptable characteristics. If the item fulfills all of these requirements exceptionally well, then it rates an E for this aspect.

BASIC TEXTS

1. DEVELOPMENT OF THE FOUR LANGUAGE SKILLS

E: Listening comprehension and speaking represent the major concern at the beginning and throughout the period covered by a basic text, followed by the teaching of reading and writing, which occupy no more than one third of the total teaching time.

A: The text recognizes the importance of introducing all four skills and generally observes the accepted relative emphases.

U: The text is not written in accordance with the principles above.

2. SCOPE

EA: (a) The text reflects one dominant objective, language competence, to which are eventually added two others, cultural insight and literary acquaintance. (b) It is designed to familiarize the student with high-frequency structural patterns in the three systems of sound, order, and form (phonology, syntax, morphology)

U: (a) The emphasis on cultural insight or literary acquaintance is so great as to be detrimental to the development of language competence. (b) The text does not distinguish between structures and usages that are important because frequently used and those that only a full description of the language would include, their importance being relatively minor. It places a principal effort upon the learning of irregular and exceptional forms.

3. ORGANIZATION FOR SCHOOL SCHEDULES

EA: The material to be learned is organized to fit into the schedule of the usual class periods and school terms.

U: The material is not so organized.

4. PRESENTATION OF MATERIAL

EA: (a) The material of the first weeks or months of the course (depending on age level) is designed for a period of oral presentation by the teacher, with or without the help of recorded material. In this first stage of delayed use of the written language, the student has little or no need to refer to the printed word. (b) The text presents new learnings in the FL in dialogue form or in the form of narrative or model sentences usable in conversation. (c) Structure is learned by use rather than by analysis. (d) Exercises enable the student to adapt new learnings to his own conversation without reference to English.
U: (a) The text does not provide for an initial audio-lingual period or for the oral introduction of new material and the beginner is obliged to refer to the printed word in order to carry on his class work. (b) The text is based on an inventory of the parts of speech or it presents sentences in the FL that "translate" English sentences literally but are not authentic in the foreign culture. (c) It assumes that the analysis of structure must precede the learning and use of that structure. (d) No provision is made for the student's gradual and guided progress from mimicry and memorization to free use of the FL in conversation.

5. PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING

EA: It presents language models and exercises that, in their selection and preparation, sequence, apparatus, and appearance on the printed page, reflect concern for the basic principles of the psychology of learning: (a) The text is based on the development of skills (habit formation) rather than the solving of problems. (b) It provides models to be imitated for both spoken and written language. (c) It observes the principle of small increment in which problems are isolated and drilled one at a time, making the change of error negligible, before two or more related but contrasting structures are drilled in a single exercise. (d) It provides for repetition and reintroduction of material previously learned. (Repetition is the mainstay in over-learning and habit formation.)

U: The text shows little or no awareness of these basic principles of the psychology of learning.

6. EXERCISES

E: (a) There are copious and varied drills dealing with language elements that have occurred in the utterances presented in the dialogue, narrative, or sentence form. (b) It includes no exercises in which the FL is to be translated into English.

A: It contains much drill material as in (a) above and no exercises as in (b).

U: (a) There is a paucity of drill material. (b) The exercises include translation from English into the FL of sentences not previously learned by the student.

7. READING (if present)

EA: Any reading materials foster the cultural or literary objectives or both. (a) Cultural information should be factual, authentic, representative, important, and of interest to the learner. (b) Other reading selections should be chosen for their quality as examples of literature, for the appropriateness of their length, their interest to the learner, and their adaptability to his competence in the new language.

U: The reading material given has no cultural or literary merit, or it is faulty in information or in language, or it is inappropriate to the learner because of its length, content, or linguistic difficulty.
8. WORD STUDY

**E:** The text promotes the learning of vocabulary by observation and use of words in context and not in lexical lists. (The learning of vocabulary is minimized while the learning of structure is maximized during the period in which a basic text is appropriate.)

**A:** Only a few vocabulary items are added which are not necessary to the drilling of structures.

**U:** Many unnecessary vocabulary words must be memorized, to the detriment of the learning of structures.

9. STRUCTURE ANALYSIS

**EA:** (a) The explanations are in English. (b) In the latter part of the text, the structures that have been gradually learned are drawn together in a clear and systematic way for ready reference.

**U:** (a) The text attempts to explain structures in the FL. (b) It presents structure summaries before examples have been learned through use.

10. LESSON AND END VOCABULARY

**EA:** Appropriate lists of the foreign phrases, idioms, and words, with or without English equivalents, appear at the ends of sections, or in a complete list at the end of the book or both.

**U:** The lexical aids offered are inadequate or the glossary is inserted in the running text or in other ways that hinder learning.

11. USE OF ENGLISH

**EA:** English is used for directions, comments, explanations, and for establishing the meaning of what is to be learned. It is occasionally used as an aid in distinguishing between forms in the FL that are otherwise not easily learned.

**U:** The text presents the learnings in the FL as a series of translations from English, rather than as selections from a language code that is entirely independent of English. It presents dubious and faulty English designed to "lead" the learner into the patterns of the FL.

12. INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE TEACHER

**E:** There is a separate manual containing instructions for the teacher concerning: (a) preparatory explanation and ground rules for the class; (b) presentation of the material to the class; (c) techniques for overlearning the basic material (dialogue or narrative); (d) techniques for drilling sound patterns, structure, and vocabulary; (e) techniques for checking in class the outside work; (f) techniques and suggested plans providing for the frequent re-entry into class work of previously learned items; (g) techniques of audio-lingual review and testing; (h) instructions for procedure with a particular unit whenever the material demands it.

**A:** No compromise is acceptable for (a), (b), (c), or (d).
U: The instructions for the teacher do not meet the standard for "A" or not applicable as given.

13. LAYOUT

EA: The type size and arrangement reflect the relationships between language models, drills, and explanations, and their relative importance to the learner. (b) Dialogues, narratives, and reading material in the FL can be read without English being visible.

U: (a) The layout does not reflect these relationships or it is confusing to the learner. (b) It is printed so as to encourage constant reference to English.

"EXPANDED VERSION OF THE MLA CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEXTBOOKS"

I. THE PRE-READING MATERIAL

1. Are there materials for the pre-reading period provided in order to fix pronunciation habits?
   Yes __ __ __ __ __ __ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ No __ __ __ __ __ __ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _
   If yes: adequate __ __ __ __ __ __ inadequate __ __ __ __ __ __
   adequate: extensive presentation of German phonemes in the context meaningful patterns for teaching modeling.
   inadequate: presentation of phonemes in isolation and/or for visual recognition by means of compensatory English spelling.

2. Are there certain basic structures to be learned?
   Yes __ __ __ __ __ __ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ No __ __ __ __ __ __ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _
   If yes: adequate __ __ __ __ __ __ inadequate __ __ __ __ __ __
   adequate: the structures represent a unified speech event in dialogue form.
   inadequate: the structures represent isolated utterances which do not lend themselves to memorization.

II. The Listening and Speaking Material

3. Is there adequate dialogue material presented from the beginning with short, natural lines of dialogue?
   Yes __ __ __ __ __ __ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ No __ __ __ __ __ __ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _
   If yes: adequate __ __ __ __ __ __ inadequate __ __ __ __ __ __
   adequate: utterances are short, natural and exhibit a systematic and cumulative presentation of contrasting phonemes.
   inadequate: utterances are too long for easy memorization and/or unnatural and/or exhibit no systematic and cumulative presentation of contrasting phonemes.

4. Is dialogue content and level of maturity appropriate to American college students?
   Yes __ __ __ __ __ __ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ No __ __ __ __ __ __ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _
   If yes: adequate __ __ __ __ __ __ inadequate __ __ __ __ __ __
   adequate: the content of dialogues reflects the activities and interests of the average college student.
   inadequate: the content of the dialogues is either too juvenile or too highly specialized to appeal to the average college student.

5. Are vocabulary and grammatical structures introduced in such a way that the learning burden is neither too great not too small in each lesson?
Yes________________No________________

If yes: adequate_________inadequate_________

adequate: vocabulary and grammatical structures are presented in a manner which promotes habituation (not too many in each unit).

inadequate: vocabulary and grammatical structures are presented in a manner which promotes problem-solving (many principles in every lesson).

6. Is there adequate provision for periodic review and testing?

Yes________________No________________

If yes: adequate_________inadequate_________

adequate: systematic review exercises at least every six chapters.

inadequate: review of material is less frequent than every six chapters.

7. Are the drill materials for the teacher to use directly in the classroom completely presented in the text of teacher's manual?

Yes________________No________________

If yes: adequate_________inadequate_________

adequate: drill cues and direct responses are presented in their entirety.

inadequate: correct responses are not presented.

8. Are drill materials based on contrastive analysis of the structure of English and the FL?

Yes________________No________________

If yes: adequate_________inadequate_________

adequate: the author begins by presenting those patterns which are identical or only slightly different from English patterns and only then proceeds to those which are very different.

inadequate: the author presents the patterns in a sequence which is different from that described above.

9. Is there enough drill material to provide variety and also permit sufficient repetition of the structures (or other points) to be learned?

Yes________________No________________

If yes: adequate_________inadequate_________

adequate: drills are primarily of the pattern drill type and a variety of pattern drill techniques are employed. They are sufficiently numerous to promote habituation.

inadequate: cognitive code drills predominate and/or pattern drilling does not exhaust pattern drill potential.
10. Are the grammatical rules presented in such a way as to give the students a sense of the patterns of the language, and these explanations come after the drills on these points?

Yes ______ No ________

If yes: adequate ______ inadequate ______

adequate: grammar explanations come after the drills.

inadequate: grammar explanations come before the drills.

III. READING AND WRITING MATERIAL

11. After the pre-reading period ends, are the exercises given in the textbook for homework assignments of the sort that fix language habits rather than rely on the "problem solving" translation process?

Yes ______ No ________

If yes: adequate ______ inadequate ______

adequate: assignments are of the sort that fix language habits

inadequate: assignments rely on the problem solving translation process.

12. Does the book provide adequate opportunities after the pre-reading period for teaching reading and writing?

Yes ______ No ________

If yes: adequate ______ inadequate ______

adequate: a reading selection of the recombination type is present, accompanied by patterned writing exercises.

inadequate: the reading selection requires problem solving skills and same can be said for the written exercises.

13. As the student learned to read the FL, is the amount of textual material given in English (e.g., directions or cultural material) decreased correspondingly?

Yes ______ No ________

If yes: adequate ______ inadequate ______

adequate: a decrease in the use of English is evident.

inadequate: the use of English is kept on a constant level.

IV. THE CULTURAL MATERIAL

14. Is culture regarded by the textbook writer in its widest sense, including not only past and present achievements in the arts, but also dealing with various aspects of present-day daily living: social classes, meal-time customs and foods, educational and religious institutions, transportation, customs or courtship?

Yes ______ No ________

If yes: adequate ______ inadequate ______
adequate: culture is treated in its refinement as well as its way-of-life sense.

inadequate: culture is treated only as refinement or only as way-of-life.

V. MISCELLANEOUS CONSIDERATIONS

15. Is the text physically attractive, durable, and reasonably priced?

Yes ______ No ______

If yes: adequate ______ inadequate ______

adequate: hardcover, relevant illustrations, Roman print, clearly arranged.

inadequate: any of the above missing.

16. Would a majority of the staff at the school be comfortable using this book after they have had a year of experience with it?

Yes ______ No ______

If yes: adequate ______ inadequate ______

adequate: 2/3 of the above criteria are fulfilled in an adequate manner, including the following items: 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, and 12.

inadequate: less than 2/3 of the above criteria are fulfilled in an adequate manner and/or any of the following elements are missing or found inadequate: 3, 9, and 12.

1. On what method is the book based? Is this method appropriate for your purposes? Is this method carried through well in the unit design?

2. Is the material of a kind which would interest junior high school or senior high school students? Is it too juvenile? Is it too dull? Does it make too obvious an effort to amuse?

3. Does the unit design allow for progressive development of and practice in listening comprehension? speaking? reading? writing?

4. Is provision made for the presentation of new work in oral form first? Can this material be presented in oral form first in any case?

5. If there are dialogues, are they realistic, authentic in language and situation, with sentences which are not too long for memorization? Are the dialogues too long to be useful?

6. Is reading introduced early or late? Does the reading material provide for progressive teaching of the reading skill? Is it interesting and written in language which is appropriate for the content, and for your students?

7. Is writing introduced early or late? Do the writing exercises provide for progressive development of each skill?

8. What is the proportion of working time which is allotted to each skill in the unit design? Is this proportion right for the objectives of your course?

9. Is the language in the lessons authentic (not stilted/artificial; not old-fashioned; correct for the persons and relationships for which it is used)?

10. How is pronunciation dealt with? Is this satisfactory? Is attention paid to distinctions between near-equivalents in the native and foreign languages, and within the foreign language? Is the sound system taught as an interdependent whole? Are stress and intonation considered?

11. Is the grammar presented through structures? Some other way? Does this suit your purposes? Is the grammar summarized from time to time? Are the grammatical descriptions sound? Do you think the number of structures (or the amount of grammar) is sufficient for this level? Too much? Are there significant omissions? Is provision made for thorough drilling before new structures are introduced? Are the structures reintroduced systematically through the different units? Are verb forms drilled sufficiently for this level? Are there summaries of verb forms (paradigms, conjunctions) somewhere in the book?

12. How much is the native language used in the exercises (or other sections of the book)? Could the foreign language have been used instead?

13. Is there variety in the types of exercises? Do they give adequate practice in what they purport to teach? Do they test instead of teaching? Are the exercises interesting? Do the grammatical exercises and drills emphasize the contrasts which are most likely to cause native-language interference? Are the drills well designed (programmed)? Are there enough (too many) exercises and (or) drills in each unit for practical use?
14. Is the vocabulary well presented? How much per lesson? Is the vocabulary reintroduced sufficiently within the unit and in successive units? Is it summarized in some way? At the end of the book? in a foreign-language dictionary section or in a bilingual list? Does the way it is summarized suit your teaching approach? Is attention paid to roots, cognates, synonyma, antonyma, thematic groupings? Is choice of vocabulary based on a frequency count? If so, is the level of the count of this book sufficient, or too advanced, for your purposes?

15. Are there indications of ways in which students can be encouraged to use what they have learned in actual communication (in speech and writing)?

16. Does the material give a fair, balanced picture of life in the foreign country? Does it bring out contrasts between the foreign culture and the culture of your students? Are there pictures, maps, diagrams?

17. Are the illustrations in a style which is likely to make the book seem old-fashioned or ridiculous to your students?

18. Are indications given of extra activities (games, songs, poems, crossword puzzles) which would add variety to the lessons? Does the publisher provide a teacher's manual with indications of how to use the book and suggestions for extra activities?

19. Are tapes, films, slides, filmstrips, or flashcards available with this book? Is so, are they well constructed methodologically and effectively produced? Are there practice records for the students? Are these aids reasonably priced?

20. Are supplementary readers, workbooks, or tests available with this book?

21. Is the book printed in an interesting style? Is the type clear? Is the work set out so that it is easy to find what you want? Are the binding, cover, quality of paper, and general spacing satisfactory? Is there a detailed index?

22. Would you enjoy working with this book at this level? Is it hard on the teacher in any way? Could other teachers (particularly the inexperienced ones) work with it?

23. Is the price reasonable for your school situation?

24. Is the book part of a series which would be adequate for the sequence of classes in your school? Are the later books in the series satisfactory for the purposes of your school? Are the later books in the series satisfactory for the purposes of your higher classes?

25. Has the book been pre-tested in schools and revised before being printed in its final form?

TEXTUAL MATERIALS EVALUATION CHECKSHEET

To: ____________________________

Please evaluate ____________________________

to determine suitability for ____________________________

During your evaluation ensure that phonology, morphology, syntax, vocabulary, orthography, and the skills of comprehension and expression are all examined. Check or circle as many responses as are applicable to each item. Comments in addition to the 'suggested' answers are urgently solicited. Use the reverse of this sheet for a short summary of your evaluation (required) and other comments.

1. GUIDANCE: Are objectives stated to student? (Well)(Poorly)(No)(Other: ________________)

2. APPROACH: (Dialogue)(Structural)(Combination) If 'combination' explain: ________________

3. PRESENTATION: (Morphological)(syntactical)(Structural--morphology and syntax jointly)

4. SEQUENCE OF PRESENTATION: (Monostructural)(Polystructural) If polystructural, estimate the number new items per lesson, chapter section etc.: ________________

Could out students handle it? Please comment: ________________

5. SIZE OF STEPS IN PRESENTATION: (Too big)(About right)(So small -- bogged down in minutias)

6. SEPARATION OF SPoken AND WRitten FORMS: (None)(Written first)(Spoken first)

If separate, what is time lag?

(Day)(Days)(Week)(Month)(Other: ________________)

7. ACCURACY OF STATEMENTS (RULES): (Complete and always true)(Guidelines which can be added to as material increases in complexity) (Loaded with exceptions)

8. CLARITY OF STATEMENTS: From student viewpoint, correctly understood when first heard or read? (Yes)(Possibly)(No)

9. FEEDBACK: Confirmation/correction of responses is (Immediate)(Requires teacher assistance)

10. MEANS USED TO IMPROVE RETENTION:

a. Impact of presentation: (Excellent)(Average)(Poor)(Presentation draws attention to itself at the expense of material presented.)

b. Re-entry cycle: (Short range)(Long range saturation: all aspects of a topic covered in one or more long drills)(Long range spaced practice: various aspects spread over many days)

11. PRONUNCIATION: (No organized phonological material)(In special chapter)(In each unit)(No exercises)(Exercises related/not related to textual vocabulary)(Stress and intonation included)


13. MATERIAL ADAPTABLE TO ORAL WORK: (Readily)(With some leading-in) (Not worth the trouble)
15. TRANSITION TO FREE EXPRESSION: (Too abrupt)(Gradual)(Little, no emphasis on self-expression as a goal)
16. READING COMPREHENSION DEVELOPMENT: (Too much, too fast)(Consistent with items 4, 5, 6) (Inadequate)
17. USE OF ENGLISH: (Excessive)(Only for rules)(None)(Constant frequency) (Frequency decreases as material progresses)(Inconsistent) (Other: _____)
18. SONGS, POEMS, GAMES, ETC: (None)(Infrequent)(Each unit)(Contrived)(Native)
19. ILLUSTRATIONS & GRAPHICS: (Pages: crowded/open)(Contrasting color typography: None/useful/clashes/a gimmick/Other: ) (Relevant/irrelevant to oral material) (Appropriate/inappropriate to student interests and age levels) (Maps: none/(do/don't) show places mentioned in text/(are/aren't) located near geography-related textual material) (Other: _____)
20. TYPES OF INSTRUCTION APPROPRIATE: (Class)(Group)(Self)
21. WORKBOOK: (None)(Used only with recordings)(Does/Doesn't duplicate text exercises)(Exercise suitable 'as is' for testing)(Self-correcting: Yes/No) (Pages: Perforated/punched/both)(Not necessary/A 'must' because: _____)
22. RECORDED MATERIALS: (Do/don't fit student interests and attention spans) (Instructions and models: clear/require teacher assistance)(Script: in text/in____})(Include listening comprehension)(Suitable for oral testing)
23. PUBLISHER'S TESTS: (Suitable 'as is')(Require few/moderate/major modifications to fit our testing program)(Useful as source material only)(Useless because: )
25. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS: (Write on other side and include comments relative to items not covered by this form as well as to those that are.)
26. MATERIALS ARE in my opinion: (Suitable)(Not suitable)(Will require additional evaluation)

(Signature)

RETURN THIS FORM BY:

A SUMMARY: EVALUATING AND SELECTING TEXTS FOR THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE CLASSROOM*

I. STUDENT/TEXT

1.1 Objectives of students: Do the objectives of the students and the skills to be taught in the text match? (e.g., does the text emphasize conversation skills while the student's needs are in the area of proficiency in reading or vice versa?)

1.2 Age of students: Do the situations and vocabulary in the text match student interests as determined by age?

1.3 Is the text written for a specific language background group (e.g., Spanish speakers? Arabic speakers)?

1.4 Level of students: Does the level of the text match the level of the students? Is the text meant for advanced, intermediate, or beginning students?

1.5 Style and content: (a) Style appropriate for students? Does the text teach the register appropriate for the needs of the students? (b) Content appropriate for students: Does the content of the material (the social situations) match the life style the students now or soon will experience?

II. CURRICULUM/TEXT

2.1 Objectives of the curriculum: Do the objectives of the curriculum match those of the text?

2.2 Time allotted: (a) Does the text allow for its effective use in the amount of time allotted to the class in terms of the number of class-hours per week, month, term, or year? (b) Is the textbook set up for many outside assignments, and are these assignments realistic in their goals?

2.3 Ideological constraints: Are there situations where ideology, religious, or political, will intervene in text selection?

2.4 Methodology: Does the text conform to the methodological requirements determined to be suitable by administrators or the teachers themselves?

III. CLASS SIZE/TEXT

3.1 Are the objectives and methodology of the text reasonable, given a situation where there are large classes? Small classes? Individualized instruction etc.?

IV. TEACHER/TEXT

4.1 Does the text assume or require that the teacher have near-native fluency? Can it be used only by experienced teachers? Is the teachers' handbook adequate?

V. INTERNAL CONSTRUCTION OF THE TEXT

5.1 Are the teaching points identified and are they easy to find?

5.2 Are adequate explanations given regarding the teaching points?

5.3 Are explicit instructions provided for the exercises?
5.4 Is only one teaching point presented at one time?

5.5 Are the teaching points arranged so that they proceed from easy to more difficult levels? In grammatical patterns? In vocabulary?

5.6 Is there a variety of drill types? Are they distributed in a way that leads the students from easy to more difficult exercises?

5.7 Is there frequent review of previously introduced material?

5.8 Are there ample exercises to provide practice in the skills you wish to teach?

SUMMARY: AN EVALUATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEXTBOOKS

I. CONTENT

1. Approach to Skills teaching and learning

Is the approach to skills teaching and learning a balanced one? Is sufficient opportunity present for classroom development of the oral skills? Is the approach one which has a logical progression from easy to difficult? Am I, the teacher, at ease with the methodology advocated and used in the materials? Is there a prereading phase incorporated into the beginning materials presentation? Do the skills production activities progress from controlled to free expression?

1.2 Presentation of language

Is spoken language introduced to the student before written language? Is the written language introduced as a separate concern? Are there dialogues? Is the spoken language representative of various levels of speech? Are slang words and expressions freely used or avoided? Is written language representative of contemporary and past writers?

1.3 Pronunciation/Phonology

Is time devoted to the phonological system of the language? Is the pronunciation treatment relegated to a special section of the text? Are there pronunciation exercises and/or tests to encourage student mastery of the sounds? Are exercises and tests of pronunciation based on the vocabulary and structures already assimilated by the student? Are there diagrammatic aids to show organ placement for the difficult sounds of the language or for all sounds? Are English equivalent sounds given where applicable, or comparisons made to the articulation of certain sounds in English?

1.4 Grammar

Is the grammar presented inductively? Deductively? Does it vary with the topic? Is the language of grammar presentation English? Are specific structures used for grammar presentation? Are structures reintroduced in later units? Does the grammar correlate well with the presentation of language in the unit? Are explanations clear and to the point? Are sufficient examples provided? Are exceptions to the rule treated or avoided?

1.5 Exercises and drills

Are the exercises and drills sufficient in number and variety to guarantee reasonable assimilation of the structures presented? Do the exercises use the vocabulary of past units as well as the present one? Do the exercises have an interest level that will appeal to the students? Are there opportunities for the students to communicate information about themselves while manipulating the structures of the drills? Do the exercises proceed from easy to difficult? Do the exercises provide for the use and practice of all the skills? Are answers provided the students for self-correction?

1.6 Vocabulary

Are there vocabulary lists with glosses in each unit as well as an end vocabulary? Are there thematic vocabulary groupings? Is the vocabulary suitable to the interests of the students? Is the vocabulary introduced in context? Are the translations or explanations of new words adequate? Are synonyms or antonyms in the language ever
used to convey meanings, or are they always translated into English? Is the text vocabulary based on a frequency count? Is new vocabulary used in grammar presentations, exercises, and drills?

1.7 Communicative activities

Are there opportunities for both mechanical and meaningful use of the language throughout the text? Is the percentage of time devoted to either the manipulative of meaningful too heavy, or is the text well-balanced in this regard? Do the communicative activities progress from easy to difficult? Are meaningful activities structured to provide opportunities for impersonal, personal, and self-disclosing questions and responses?

1.8 Culture

Will the cultural information provided be of interest to the students involved? Are there sufficient cultural material provided? Is culture reflected in the presentation of language? Are all segments of society represented in the texts and illustrations? Is there geographical representation of the peoples who speak the target language? Are there comparisons made between the foreign culture and American culture? Are similarities as well as differences between the two cultures mentioned? Is a significant amount of time spent on contemporary youth in the same age group as the students who will be using the text? Are there descriptions of some of the non-verbal behaviors typical to the culture? Are past cultural achievements reflected in the text?

1.9 Scope and sequence

Does each unit follow a sequential pattern? Are the number of new structural units or items and vocabulary words per lesson reasonable? Does this rate of introduction seem realistic for both students and teachers in terms of the amount of material presented? Is the progression of material well articulated from unit to unit so as to provide continuity and re-entry of vocabulary and structure? Are there review units to give the students the opportunity to see their progress on a larger scale than with individual units? Is the scope of the material sufficient or excessive for the amount of time allotted to the course?

1.10 Adaptability and flexibility

Do the text materials lend themselves to different student abilities and interests? Is there provision for small group, large group, and individual language practice? Would different learning styles of students be addressed sufficiently by the text? Are there materials available to permit more systematic individualization of learning, such as learning activity packets? Could a teacher decide to skip certain material within the text without losing complete control of the structure and/or vocabulary?

1.11 Supplementary materials

Do the following supplementary materials exist? Workbooks? Tapes? Tests? Flashcards? Visuals? Filmstrips? If there a workbook, do its exercises correlate well with the text in vocabulary, structure, and over-all difficulty? Do the exercises basically duplicate those of the text or do they present new material? Could the workbook exercises also serve as testing exercises? If there are supplementary reading materials, do they match the acquired structure and vocabulary abilities of the students? Are the materials of sufficient interest for the level of the students involved? If there are records, tapes, filmstrips, films, etc., do they present a solid structural base which
correlates well with the text material? Would these materials be of interest to most students?

1.12 Tests

Does a testing program exist? Does the content of the tests appear to measure what it purports to measure? Are quizzes provided as well as unit or larger tests? Do these tests measure all four skills? Is adequate testing provided for the oral skills? Are there tests on the cultural information provided? Is free expression permitted at some point during the testing program? Are grading keys and/or suggestions provided?

II. EVALUATION: BEYOND CONTENT

2.1 Organization for school schedules

Does the organization of the material fit with the school year organization, including all possible ways of adaptation? Does the organization of material fit with the school day organization with all possibilities for adaptation? Would inservice (preschool) sessions be needed for adoption of these materials? Is it possible to have a publisher's representative demonstrate materials for the school before the academic year begins? Would the school's schedule permit this kind of inservice training?

2.2 Lesson and end vocabulary

Do lesson-end and/or text-end vocabularies exist? Are there thematic vocabulary groupings within text units? Are English equivalents given? Are they ever intensified in the target language or by visuals?

2.3 Use of English

Are dialogue translations provided? Are vocabulary words glossed in English? Are translations ever required from the target language to English and/or from English to the target language? Are grammar explanations provided in English? Are culture sections presented all or partially in English?

2.4 Instructions for the teacher

Is there a separate section of manual for the teacher? Does it have detailed explanations and instructions for the use of the text? Is there a suggested daily or weekly lesson plan approach? Do teaching hints include time for culture discussion and exchange? Are answer keys provided throughout the teacher's edition? Is there a detailed description of the language from the view of applied linguistics for the teacher?

2.5 Layout

Are errors minimal? Is the prose style satisfactory? Are the print, photographs, and drawings of high quality and clarity? Is the text easy to follow in its format and individual units? Are the materials well organized? Is the text appealing to the casual as well as the concerned observer?

2.6 Experience and expertise of author(s)

Are you familiar with the experience and expertise of those involved in the development of the materials under consideration? If not, can you find out from the professional literature or through professional organizations and contacts about the qualifications and past work of
the author(s)? Once familiar with this expertise, are you satisfied with the type of approach you believe the author(s) will take in the materials under consideration?

2.7 Evidence in development and research

Is formal evidence of any kind provided by the publishers as to success of the materials? Is informal teacher testimony available on the materials? Have the professional journal reviews of the texts indicated past and probable future success?

2.8 Biases

Is there obvious stereotyping in photos or texts in any of the above categories? Are there gaps between men's and women's roles in professional or personal life situations?

2.9 Costs

Will the state provide textbooks at no cost to the student? If not, will the local district provide these materials? Can the school afford the purchase of the supplementary materials upon adoption of the materials being considered? If not, can arrangements be made to purchase some of all of these materials over time? Is the text viable without the supplementary materials? Is there sufficient equipment in the local schools to allow for use of supplementary materials without additional purchase?

III. FURTHER QUESTIONS AND CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 What kinds of students will be using these materials? For how long will these students study the language? Will these materials encourage the further study of the language by their approach, quantity, quality, of difficulty level? To what extent does this series of textbook materials form a cohesive balanced, well articulated program? Is the old adage still true that "the first book is just right, but the second is overwhelming!"

APPENDIX D

Seven Evaluation Schemes for Curriculum Materials
THE CURRICULUM MATERIALS ANALYSIS SYSTEM *

1.0 PRODUCT CHARACTERISTICS

This section gives a general overview of the curriculum materials, including a complete description of the physical characteristics and a brief description of the selected substantive characteristics.

1.1 Subject Content

Indicate the most prominent discipline(s). How sound is the substantive content of these materials?

1.2 Intended Use

For what grade level(s) are these materials most appropriate according to the author? Are there any particular kinds of students, teachers, schools or communities for which these materials would be especially suitable/unsuitable? What does the author consider the most appropriate length of time (weeks/years) for the use of the whole set of materials?

1.3 Printed Materials and Other Media

1.3.1. Check which of the following items are available and covered in this analysis:

Student Text/Other printed student materials/Teacher's guide/Tests/Other printed teacher materials/Media other than printed materials/

1.3.2 Are there other materials and media which are closely related to the materials which have been analyzed but which are not included in this analysis? Describe them briefly.

1.3.3. What is your general overall judgment of the physical and technical quality of the materials, including all media?

1.3.4. As compared with the average cost of supplying curriculum materials for the social studies class at the grade level(s) for which these materials are intended, how are the costs of these materials?

1.4 Dominant Instructional Characteristics

Describe the dominant types of teaching/learning activities that are prescribed/suggested by these materials.

1.5 Performance Data Availability

1.5.1. How much information of performance results of these materials is available?

1.5.2. If data is available, how unfavorable/favorable are they with respect to the intended results?

1.6 References

1.6.1 List the one/two most useful references which give information about the materials in addition to the information found in the materials themselves.
2.0 RATIONAL AND OBJECTIVES

2.0.1. Can the author's rationale be found explicitly and clearly in the materials or in other sources available to the analyst? Can it be found implicitly? Does it seem that none exists?

2.0.2. How clear is the author in setting forth his objectives?

3.0.3. To what extent do you, the analyst agree with the author's rationale and objectives?

2.1 The Individual and Society

2.2.1. What is the author's view about the source(s) of knowledge and about how man acquires it?

2.2.2. What is the author's view about the source(s) of values and how man acquires values?

2.5 Affective Objectives

2.5.1. To what degree are affective objectives emphasized in the materials?

2.5.2 How clearly does the author state his affective objectives?

2.5.3. To what extent does the author attempt to have students take positive and committed stands on values?

2.6 Psychomotor Objectives

To what extent are psychomotor objectives present in the materials?

3.0 CONTENT

3.1 Cognitive Content

3.1.1. How useful does the author view each of the following to be in explaining his discipline?

3.1.2. What discipline(s) is (are) emphasized in the materials?

3.1.3. What other subjects are emphasized?

3.1.4. Would you judge the overall cognitive content of the material to be biased?

3.1.5 What is the substantive quality of the cognitive content?

3.1.6. How would you judge the overall affective content of the materials?

3.1.7. Do the materials emphasize the affective or the cognitive content?

3.1.8. To what extent is the author's view of his discipline consistent with the cognitive content of his curriculum materials?

3.2 Affective Content

3.2.1. What is the author's view of the affective content of the discipline?
3.2.2. How are the values and attitudes presented in the materials?

3.2.3. To what extent are the values and attitudes studied parallel to the present and future needs of the student?

3.2.4. To what extent is the author's view of the affective content of his discipline consistent with the affective content in his curriculum materials?

4.0 Theories and Strategies

4.1 Learning Theory

4.1.1. What explicit statements does the author make in the materials or elsewhere which reflect his position toward a particular theory of learning?

4.1.2. If there are no explicit statements made by the author, what implicit statements does the analyst find in the curriculum materials or in associated writings that reflect the author's position toward a particular theory of learning?

4.1.3. What is the author's view, as evidenced explicitly/implicitly in these materials, and what is the importance of each of the following categories of learning theory: specialist theory, field theory, personality theory.

4.2 Instructional Theory

4.2.1. What explicit statements in the materials or elsewhere does the author make which reflect his position toward a particular theory of instruction?

4.2.2. If there are no explicit statements made by the author, what implicit statements does the analyst find in the curriculum materials or in associated writings that reflect the author's position toward a theory of instruction?

4.2.3. How well is the author's theory of instruction supported by evidence and/or logic?

4.2.4. To what extent do you agree with the author's theoretical position on instruction?

4.3 Teaching Modes

4.3.1. What are the principal teaching modes, as identified by the author, that are to be employed in teaching the materials?

4.3.2. What terms describing the modes are used by the author, e.g. inquiry, discovery, directed discussion?

4.3.3. How carefully are the author's terms describing teaching modes defined?

4.4 Strategy Pattern

4.4.1. What is the predominant pattern of strategy use?

4.4.2. How clear is the author about the pattern?

4.4.3. How consistent do you judge this strategy pattern to be with objectives, content, and theory?
4.5. Effectiveness

4.5.1. In general, how effective do you think these strategies will be in teaching the materials?

4.5.2. Could you teach these materials?

5.0 Antecedent Conditions

5.1. Physical Characteristics

5.1.1. At what grade level(s) should students be in order to have the most success with these materials?

5.1.2. At what grade level(s) should students be in order to have moderate success with these materials?

5.1.3. These materials are suited for pupils of what academic status?

5.1.4. Indicate with a check mark the success the various groups indicated might have with the materials: Blacks__/Indians__/Jews__/Mexicans__/Orientals__/Whites__/Others__.

5.4 Community Characteristics

5.4.1. What type of community is best suited for the successful teaching of these materials?

5.4.2. In what geographic areas will materials be most successful?

5.4.3. What should the occupational-industrial makeup of the community be to successfully implement these materials?

5.4.4. What should the social attitudes of a community be to successfully implement these materials?

5.5. Relationship to Other Aspects of Curriculum

5.5.1. How well do these materials relate to other materials being taught in the existing K-12 curriculum structure?

6.0 Evaluation

6.1. Sources of Evaluative Data

6.1.1. With respect to the analysis and use of the materials, what primary sources of evaluative data are available?

6.2. Effects Predicted of Reported

6.2.1. In general, what effects of use of the materials would you predict?

6.2.2. In general, what actual effects of use of the materials were reported by researchers, evaluators, observers, and/or students?

6.2.3. To what degree do your predictions and the reported effects agree?

6.2.4. In general, how successful in sue were the materials reported to be?
6.3. Comparisons

In general how do these curriculum materials compare with respect to the following: author's intentions; other similar curriculum materials; standards of analysts.

6.4. Recommended Use

6.4.1. In general, to what degree would you recommend that the materials be used, given the intended uses described in sections 1.2 and 5.0 above?

6.4.2. To what degree do the sources, other than the analyst recommend use of the materials?

7.0 Background of Materials Development

7.1 Institution and/or Person(s) Responsible for Materials

7.1.1. What is the institution or agency responsible for development of the materials?

7.1.2. Check the type of institution or agency: Federal__/State__/University__/Commercial__/School District__/Private not-for-profit__/Other__/

7.2 Duration and Funding of Project

7.2.1. What was the major source of funding of the project?

7.2.2. Check the type of agency that was the major source of funding: Federal__/State__/University__/Commercial__/School District__/Private not-for-profit__/Other__/

7.3 Dissemination

How much dissemination work -- to teachers, school districts, state departments, colleges, the public, and others--was (is) done by the project and/or publisher?

7.4. Associated Programs

Describe briefly other materials development projects or programs in which the principal personnel of the project are involved. What is the nature of this involvement?

8.0 Background of the Analysis

The purpose of this section is to give information about the background of the analyst(s), the circumstances under which the analysis was done, the reasons for analyzing these particular materials, and the references used by the analyst(s) in performing the analysis.

8.1 Characteristics of the Analyst(s)

8.1.1. What is the analyst's educational affiliation? Elementary__/Junior high__/Senior high__/College__/State department__/Other__/

8.1.2. What is the analyst's professional affiliation? Education__/Social Science__/Other__/
8.1.3. What is the analyst's highest academic degree? BA or BS_/MA or MS_/PhD or EdD_/ 

8.1.4. How many curriculum materials analyses has the analyst done prior to this one, using this system or a similar system? 

8.2 Circumstances of this Analysis 

8.2.1. Approximately how many hours were spent doing this analysis? 

8.2.2. Describe the circumstances under which this analysis was undertaken. 

8.3 Selection of Materials 

Was there any reason why the analyst chose these particular materials to analyze, such as previous familiarity with them or plans to teach them in the future? 

8.4 References 

If the analyst used any references which helped him understand and apply the analysis system to these materials, indicate those which were most helpful. 

8.5 Attitudes and Opinions of the Analyst 

8.5.1. How adequately does the analyst think his analysis represents the materials analyzed? 

8.5.2. How does the analyst feel about the system used to make this analysis? 

THE BERKELEY SCHEME

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
What is the rationale for the curriculum development?
What are the goals?

CONTENT AND MATERIALS
What is to be learned?
What relationship is there to other fields of learning?
Are tests provided?
What materials are used?
Description of program parts.
Contents of Standard Part B Kit (an audiovisual description of the materials)
Materials not included in Part B Kit

CLASSROOM STRATEGY AND ACTIVITIES
What is the pattern of activities in a lesson?
What is the teacher's role?
What teacher preparation is required?
What do the students do?
How are students tested and evaluated?

IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS
What subject areas and grade levels are covered?
Is it a complete or supplementary curriculum?
How much of the curriculum is now commercially available?
Who is the publisher?
What is the target student audience?
Must the curriculum be introduced one grade at a time?
How do children entering late adjust to the curriculum?
Are particular forms of school organization required?
What is the administrator's role?
What teacher preparation and in-service training is required?
How much time does the curriculum require?

AN INSTRUMENT FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS (FORM IV) *

I. OBJECTIVES

A. Are there objectives stated for the use of the material? YES NO

1. General objectives

2. Instructional objectives?

3. Are the objectives stated in behavioral terms?

4. If stated in behavioral terms, do the objectives specify:
   a) type of behavior?
   b) conditions under which it will appear?
   c) level of performance expected?

5. List examples of objectives.

B. If there are no objectives stated for the use of the material, are the objectives instead implicit of readily obvious? YES NO

1. If yes, please outline below that objectives you believe govern the purpose of the material.

C. What appears to be the source of the objectives (both stated and implicit objectives)?

1. Are the objectives related to a larger frame of instruction?

2. Are the objectives specific to a subject skill?

3. Are the objectives related to a broader behavioral pattern that is to be developed over a period of time?

4. What seems to be the emphasis of the objectives: (Check as many as are appropriate.)
   a) Attitudinal
   b) Motor skills
   c) Cognitive development skills
   d) Subject skills

5. Are the objectives drawn from: (Check as many as appropriate.)
   a) A learning approach
   b) Society needs (citizenship)
   c) Demands of subject
   d) Demands and needs of child

D. Quantitative rating: Objectives

Directions: Please make an X on the rating scale below at the point that represents your best judgment on the following criteria. Please place the X ON a specific point.
Objectives are vague, unclear, or missing. Those included not useful. Fails to distinguish between general and instructional objectives, mixes various types of objectives, confusing to the teacher.

The objectives are stated clearly and in behavioral terms. Both general and instructional objectives are stated in a consistent conceptual framework. Excellent, one of the best, useful for a teacher.

II. ORGANIZATION OF THE MATERIAL (Scope and Sequence)  YES  NO

A. Has a task analysis been made of the material and some relationship specified between the tasks?

B. If a task analysis has been made, what basis was used to organize the materials:
   (Check as many as are appropriate.)
   1. Errorless discrimination
   2. Simple to complex
   3. Figure-ground
   4. General to specific
   5. Logical order
   6. Chronology

C. If no indication of a task analysis has been made what assumptions do you believe the authors have made concerning the organization of the instructional sequence of the material?

D. Is there a basis for the scope of the material included in the instructional package?

1. If there is a basis, is it:
   a) Related to the subject area
   b) To a motor skill development
   c) To a cognitive skill area
   d) To an affective response system
   e) Other (specify)

2. Has the scope been subjected to analysis for:
   a) Appropriateness to students
   b) Relationship to other material

E. Is there a recommended sequence?

1. What is the basis of the recommended sequence?
   (Check as many as appropriate.)
   a) Interrelationships of a subject
   b) Positive reinforcement and programmed sequence
   c) Open ended development of a generalization
d) Advanced organizer (cognitive)  
 e) Other (please specify)  

F. Briefly outline the scope and sequence.

G. Quantitative rating: organization of the materials (scope and sequence)

Directions: Please make an X on the rating scale below at the point that represents your best judgment on the following criteria. Please place the X ON a specific point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequence illogical or unstated, teacher is left to puzzle it out.</td>
<td>Average in organization.</td>
<td>Excellent organization of scope and sequence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives are vague, unclear, or missing.</td>
<td>Some help but teacher must supply much of organizational sequence.</td>
<td>Conceptually developed based on a consistent theory; task analysis may be too narrow (or broad).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those included not left to puzzle it out. Does not appear to have subjected material to any analysis to build an instructional design. Scope is uncertain, seems to contradict sequence. Little help unintentionally to teacher or children in organizing material.</td>
<td>Average, some of the criteria for objectives met, some missing, at conceptually developed.</td>
<td>Sequence is not detailed enough and may not have been tested with a range of children's experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Does the author(s and/or material suggest any methodological approach?  

B. Is the methodological approach, if suggested, specific to the mode of transaction?  

1. Does the mode of transaction:  
   (Check as many as appropriate.)

   a) Rely upon teacher-centric method (largely teacher directing?)  
   b) Rely upon pupil-centric method (largely self-directing?)  
   c) Require active participation by the students?  
   d) Passive participation by the students?  
   e) Combination of active and passive participation by the students?  
   f) Direct students' attention to method of learning as well as the learning product?  
   g) Provide for variation among students - uses several approaches to method.  

C. Does the methodology suggested require extensive preparation by the teacher?  

1. How much deviation is permitted in methodology?  
   Much____ Some____ Little____
2. Does the methodology require unusual skills obtained through specific training?  

3. Is there any statement on how methodology was tested: any experimental evidence?  

4. If you have tried the recommended methodology, how successful did it seem for your students?  
   - Most succeeded  
   - Approximately half succeeded  
   - Few succeeded  

   a) Please provide a brief description of the students who were successful and those who were not successful.  

   b) What variations on recommended methodology have you used?  

D. In a brief statement describe the recommended methodology.  

E. Quantitative rating: methodology.  

Directions: Please make an X on the rating scale below at the point that represents your best judgment on the following criteria. Please place the X on a specific point.  

| Very little help is | Gives help to the teacher, but would like more. Some students would be able to cope with suggested methodology, but others not. Doesn't appear to have been widely field tested. Teacher has to work out variety for students with special learning difficulties. Uses a variety of modes in the transactions. Does not chain a teacher to a mode without reason, but provides assistance for different abilities. Describes the field test of the methodology. Teachers will find methodology easy to use and believe students will respond. Methodology is part of goals of instruction and not just vehicle for contact. |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  2  3  4  5  6  7| Very little help is given on methodology. or methodology is too abstract and complex for most students and teachers. Methodology appears to be unrelated to content and an afterthought in the learning package. Too active or passive for most students. Teacher required to participate fully with too many students at every step. Doesn't have appropriate methodology for variety of learning ability among students. | Gives help to the teacher, but would like more. Some students would be able to cope with suggested methodology, but others not. Doesn't appear to have been widely field tested. Teacher has to work out variety for students with special learning difficulties. Uses a variety of modes in the transactions. Does not chain a teacher to a mode without reason, but provides assistance for different abilities. Describes the field test of the methodology. Teachers will find methodology easy to use and believe students will respond. Methodology is part of goals of instruction and not just vehicle for contact. | Uses a variety of modes in the transactions. Does not chain a teacher to a mode without reason, but provides assistance for different abilities. Describes the field test of the methodology. Teachers will find methodology easy to use and believe students will respond. Methodology is part of goals of instruction and not just vehicle for contact. |

IV. EVALUATION  

A. Are there recommended evaluation procedures for teachers and students in the instructional package?  

1. What do the evaluation procedures emphasize?  
   (Check as many as appropriate?)  
   - Cognitive skills  
   - Subject skills  
   - Psychomotor skills  
   - Affective response  

   YES  NO
2. Are the evaluation procedures compatible with the objectives?  
3. Are the evaluation procedures developed for several different levels:  
   (Check as many as appropriate.)  
   a) Immediate feedback evaluation for the pupil  
   b) Evaluation for a variety for the areas in 1. above, and over a period of time.  
   c) Immediate feedback evaluation for the teacher  
   d) Evaluation on a norm referent  
   e) Evaluation on a criterion referent  

B. Are the evaluation procedures contained in the package?  

C. Does the evaluation give attention to both product and process learning?  

D. Is there information on how evaluation procedures were tested and developed?  

E. Briefly state what evaluation procedures are included. If possible give examples.  

F. Quantitative rating: evaluation

Directions: Please make an X on the rating scale below at the point that represents your best judgment on the following criteria. Please place the X ON a specific point.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7

Haphazard in approach.  
Product and process learning either entirely neglected or confused. Lists items, but poorly constructed. Evaluation approach is Haphazard in approach.  
Product and process learning either entirely neglected or confused. Lists items, but poorly constructed. Evaluation approach is limited. Samples given but limited and sketchy. Teacher finds useful that which is given, but needs more examples. Evaluation is limited to product or process. Unsure on whether evaluation has ever been tested. but seems logical though limited in types of learning where appropriate. Student obtains assistance in learning through feedback evaluation. Gives attention to several kinds of learning, consistent with objectives of learning package.  

Many suggestions and helps in evaluation for the teacher. Has some examples given, range of evaluation appropriate. Student finds useful that which is given, but needs more examples. Evaluation is limited to product or process. Unsure on whether evaluation has ever been tested. but seems logical though limited in types of learning where appropriate. Student obtains assistance in learning through feedback evaluation. Gives attention to several kinds of learning, consistent with objectives of learning package.  

V. COMMENT

A. Draw up an overall statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the material as an instructional package. Prepare your statement as if it were to be addressed to your fellow classroom teachers who are going to use it to make a decision on these instructional materials.
B. Quantitative rating: overall assessment of material.

Directions: Please make an X on the rating scale below at the point that represents your best judgment on the following criteria. Please place the X on a specific point.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Poorly designed, conceptually weak and inconsistent or haphazard design. Does not appear to have been field tested; inaccurate assumptions about children who will be using material. Over-priced, underdeveloped a bad bargain.

Has strengths and weaknesses, but most teachers would find satisfactory. On the balance comes out about average, would need considerable supplementary effort by teacher. A compromise of price and availability.

Excellent, one of the best by comparison with other available materia. Theoretically strong and carefully field tested. Shows consistent instructional design. Would recommend highly; well worth the price.

THE ST. GALLEN SCHEME *

1. MEDIA (ELEMENTS) OF THE CURRICULUM

1.1 Which individual media or elements belong to the text (inventory)?

1.2 Which special characteristics do the individual media or elements possess (description)?

1.3 What was the justification for the selection and the special characteristics of the media (function)?

2. AIMS

2.1 Which general aims does the text pursue?
   - which aims are explicitly stated?
   - are there further not explicitly stated aims contained in the material?
   - is there any weighting attached to the aims?
   - are the individual aims compatible or are there conflicts?
   - what is the source?

2.2 Which subject-specific aims are followed by the text?
   - which of the following subject-specific contents are to be found in the text: logic, sets, relations, arithmetic, geometry, algebra?
   - how are the individual areas of content ordered (sequence)?
   - what significance is given to each area (for example specific to a number of teaching units)?
   - what is the sequential arrangement and weighting of the individual areas based upon (see 2.1)?
   - list sources

2.3 Are the aims described?
   - in what way are the aims described?
   - to what areas are the aims related (the areas of thinking and language, affective, and social areas...)?
   - on what level of complexity (with respect to learning processes) are the aims mostly stated?

3. SPECIAL PRE-REQUISITES OF LEARNING
   (the prerequisites for individual activities are dealt with under 4.4)

3.1 Were various pre-requisites for the children in respect of linguistic and cognitive behaviour taken into account as well as social behaviour (social class specific differentiation)?

3.2 Were specific problems of individual children taken into account: for example colour blindness, behaviour problems...etc.

4. METHOD (the following criteria are intended as examples; they should help orientation)

4.1 Is the method explicitly described?
   - where is it described and is it recognized as a hypothesis?
   - what characteristics (or principles, rationales) identify the method?
4.2 On what principles are the materials 'content wise' developed (overall structure)?
- is there linear structure or development on the principle of the spiral curriculum?
- on what basis is the development of the material founded?

4.3 On which principles are the individual teaching units (or weekly plans, lessons) developed?
- is it possible to recognise definite principles of individualising and differentiating?
- what forms of differentiation are in the materials and how are they justified?
- were the materials planned to be taught in a linear manner rather than offering alternative paths?

4.4 The following criteria are related to the forms of activity such as games and exercises:
- how large is the proportion of activities which require reproductive rather than creative learning?
- are the kinds of problems in the exercises and games varied in different areas on content (process variation)?
- has the application of various media been considered (variation of media)?
- how great is the proportion of verbal/non-verbal activities?
- are the forms of verbalisation and symbolisation fixed flexible?
- what are their prerequisites for learning and how are these assumptions justified?
- are possible difficulties in connection with individual games and exercises described and is the teacher given instructions to diagnose them and give help?
- do the forms of activity accord with the aims and proposed methods?

4.5 In the description of the activities, are certain social forms of teaching proposed and are the recommendations given some justification?
- how large is the proportion of various interaction forms? (Class teaching, group and partner work, individual work) and how are they justified?
- are necessary pre-conditions of learning for specific forms of interaction mentioned?
- which principles are offered for group development and how are they justified?
- do the materials give guidance for rules of group work and for organisational questions relating to various forms of interaction?
- are special prerequisites for learning of individual children taken into account (for example difficulties with contact, aggression)?

4.6 How is the role of the teacher described in the materials, especially with regard to the functions (organising/guiding and learning process, adviser, diagnostician of learning difficulties, controller and evaluator etc.)? Any theoretical foundation?
- in the materials are there directions about the teacher's language (scope, form, etc.)? Justification?
- are group dynamic activities of the teacher explained and justified?

4.7 In the materials are technical-organisational questions discussed (e.g. directions about school organisation, questions of school and class changes etc.)?

5. **ASSESSMENT**

5.1 Do the materials give directions for assessing learning during teaching (informal control of learning)?
- if so, which principles are considered?
- what is the function of such assessment?

5.2 Do the materials contain special exercises for testing the success of the learning (formal control of learning)? Description?
- what is the function of this assessment? (Giving marks, diagnosis of learning difficulties etc.)?
- what is the format of this assessment - is the assessment in accord with the explicit aims?

6. **SPECIAL INFORMATION IN THE MATERIALS**

6.1 Do the materials anywhere contain an overview
- to the overall structure of the materials?
- to the sequence of the individual units, such as weekly plans?
- about the aims to be achieved?
- about the media appropriate to the course?
- about the sequence (time-wise)?
- about the mathematical contents in the course (e.g. teacher notes)?
- about literature?

6.2 For each of the individual learning units is subject-specific and pedagogic information given?

6.3 Is there any information about the results of evaluation?

6.4 Is information noted as fact, hypothesis, or as normative decisions?

7. **COST AND AVAILABILITY OF THE MATERIALS**

7.1 What is the cost for minimal implementation in a class of a certain size?

7.2 Are individual elements available in the scope of the planning?

A CURRICULUM MATERIALS ANALYSIS WITH SPECIFIC APPLICATION TO SCIENCE*

1. CONTENT

1.1 Behavioural Elements

What are the intended behaviours included in the curriculum and what is the relative emphasis on the various behaviours?

1.1.1. acquiring knowledge
1.1.2. acquiring inquiry skills
1.1.3. acquiring manual skills
1.1.4. acquiring an orientation to science
1.1.5. displaying cooperative behaviour
1.1.6. acquiring self-directional behaviour

1.2 Subject Matter Elements

1.2.1. What is the subject matter included in the curriculum and what is the relative emphasis on various areas?

1.3 General Elements

1.3.1. What emphasis is given to the acquisition of knowledge as compared to inquiry behaviours in any one instructional unit?
1.3.2. What emphasis is given to stating relationships quantitatively?
1.3.3. What are the major organizing structures for the content of curriculum (subject matter and/or behavioural elements?)
1.3.4. What principles are used to coordinate and integrate the various science disciplines?

2. INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS

2.1 What degree and kinds of direction are given to the student so that he can perform in the instructional unit?
2.2 What pattern of grouping is employed in the instructional unit?
2.3 Do groups operate cooperatively or in isolation in the instructional unit?
2.4 What kinds of media are used in the instructional unit?
2.5 What devices, other than the science content are included in the student material to stimulate attention?
2.6 To what degree are the learning objects common to everyday life?
2.7 What modes of representation are used in the instructional unit?
2.8 Is inductive or deductive reasoning emphasised in the instructional unit?
3. ADAPTIVENESS

3.1 How varied is the curriculum in its approach to the:

3.1.1 grouping used

3.1.2 amount, of direction given

3.1.3 media used

3.1.4 devices of stimulating attention used

3.1.5 modes of representation used

3.1.6 reasoning style used

3.2 How adaptable is the curriculum to an individual student's learning rate?

3.3 How adaptable is the curriculum to an individual student's pre-instructional repertoire?

3.4 How adaptable is the curriculum to an individual student's interest?

3.5 How adaptable is the curriculum to an individual student's preferred learning style?

3.6 How adaptable is the curriculum to an individual teacher's style?

4. EFFECTIVENESS

4.1 On what level of specification are the objectives of the curriculum stated?

4.2 What kind of tests are provided to evaluate the attainment of the objectives of the curriculum?

4.3 What kinds of evaluation studies were carried out during field testing of the curriculum and with what results?

5. ADMINISTRATION

5.1 To what degree is the curriculum self-contained?

5.2 How demanding is curriculum in terms of teacher preparation time?

5.3 What kind and how much teacher training is provided by the curriculum developers?

5.4 What special facilities are required to operate the curriculum?

5.5 What does it cost to operate the curriculum per student per year?

* This list gives only the prime components of the analysis system. The fully elaborated version is published by Institut für die Padagogik der Naturwissenschaften an der Christian-Albrechts-Universität Kiel, Olshausenstrasse 40-60, 2300 Kiel, Germany. Peter Haussler and June Pittman (1973)
LEARNING MATERIAL DECLARATION FOR GRADE 7 MATHEMATICS* 

1. Product Assessment 

1.1 Assessment of Goal Congruence with National Curricular Guidelines (R)** 

1.1.1. Goals and guidelines in the curriculum 

Does this learning material cater, through its selection of subject matter and its work procedure, for such general, overall curricular aims as critical evaluation, independence and creativity? 

1.1.2. Questions of non subject-specific areas of content such as international issues, issues concerning sex roles. 

1.1.3. Agreement of the content of the learning material with the goals and main items of the subject. 

1.2. Assessment of accuracy (objectivity) (R)** 

1.3. Assessment of learning material in operation (T,P)** 

Tables summarizing the responses of teachers on 5-point scale to the following statements: 

1.3.1. The learning material as a whole 

The learning material contributes towards the attainment of the goal of the subject. 

1.3.2. Teacher's guide 

The suggestions regarding pedagogical disposition in teacher's guide are practically workable. The timing proposed by the teacher's guide is practically workable. 

1.3.3. Materials for the pupils 

The material relates to topical phenomena at home, at school, and in working life. 

The material satisfies your requirements concerning technical design (size of print, layout, etc.) 

The material is adjusted to suit low performers. 

The material is adjusted to suit normal performers. 

The material is adjusted to suit high performers. 

Additional tables for this sub-section summarise the responses of 75 pupils on 2-point scales to the following statements: 

The examples often refer to things I know about. 

The materials are nice/dull. 

The materials are easy/hard to read. 

The examples are usually not too difficult and not to easy/too difficult. 

There are usually enough examples/often no examples. 

1.4. Assessments (R,T,P)** 

Would you choose it again? (T)** 

5-point scales for pupils in reply to the questions: (P)**
What do you think of the material you use in mathematics?
How do you like doing mathematics?

An open-ended invitation to list merits and demerits. (R,T)**

1.5. Formative evaluation

Brief description and summary table on what was done.

2. Product description (completed by producers)

2.1. Teacher material

2.2 Pupil material

Tabulated information headed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Use*</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>year</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Marked A for necessary, B for desirable, or C for supplementary

2.3 Content description

Legend:
- 0 exhaustive - very much so
- X brief - to a certain extent
- Blank square - not at all

2.3.1. Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning covering:</th>
<th>Teacher material</th>
<th>Pupil material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The learning material offers no suggestions regarding timetable solutions or coordination with other subjects.

2.3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal description regarding:</th>
<th>Teacher material</th>
<th>Pupil material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Knowledge and skills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.3.3 Pedagogical disposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher material</th>
<th>Pupil material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division into basic and advanced courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements for low performers</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision instructions depending on answers to diagnostic tests</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-instructional design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons given for studying sections of the subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to current problems at home, work and in society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions for cooperation between pupils</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The learning material contains no special arrangements for high performers.

#### 2.3.4. Supplementary particulars

**(R)** Indicates reviewers' opinions
**(T)** Indicates teachers' opinions
**(P)** Indicates pupils' opinions

*Swedish National Board of Education (Nystrom 1974) Taken from the publication "Learning Material Declarations - a model development, by Aastrid Nystrom, Learning Aids Development Section, National Board of Education, Stockholm, 1974.*
I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Basic Facts

State briefly the author(s), date(s), publisher, and price(s). What does the material, in its own terms, state to be its aim and function? State briefly the target audience and situation (pupil's age, interests, ability range, type of school). What provision, if any, was made for testing the material in draft form and revising it prior to publication?

1.2 Author's Rationale

Summarise any explanation or justification for the materials provided by the author, either in the materials under analysis or in other publications.

1.3 Issues and Perspectives

Indicate the main issues raised by the analysis.

II. DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF THE MATERIALS

2.1 Description of Pupil Materials

Describe the content of the material. Describe presentation form of the material. Describe the pupil exercises or tasks that are included in the material and indicate how frequently each type of task occurs and how tasks are sequenced and/or repeated. List any explicit statements of pupil assessment; and note examples of tests or assessment schemes. List, summarise, or describe any statements of purpose, aim, or objectives included in the pupil material. List and estimate the frequency and significance of directions to the pupil and refer to his teacher or to use special or relatively scarce facilities. Where there is more than one physical resource, indicate the interrelationships between them in terms of cross-referencing, sequencing, and repetition, both of content and of pupil tasks.

2.2 Description of the Teacher Materials

Indicate where material for the teacher is to be found and describe the content of the teacher's materials as a whole. Describe the presentation form of the material. Describe any additional pupil roles or tasks that are mentioned or included; and indicate frequency and sequencing. List any explicit statements on pupil assessment; and note examples of tests or assessment schemes. List, summarise, or describe any statements of purpose, aim or objectives that are included in the teacher's material. Describe the teacher tasks and roles that are stated in the materials; and indicate the extent of their demands on the teacher's time. List any statements about the need for further resources of special facilities.

2.3 Structure of the Materials

How do pupil materials and teacher materials fit together, and are there any obvious points of conflict? Describe the coverage of the subject matter in terms of knowledge, skills, and attitudes. To what extent is the material explicitly concerned with the presentation of values of the development of
attitudes? Indicate the generality and the level of abstraction of the subject matter. Does it mainly consist of factual material or does it try to communicate specific concepts, general concepts or principles? What are the roles of illustrations, applications, and examples? What pre-requisite knowledge and skills are needed by the pupil? How is the subject matter organised in terms of structure, sequence, or cumulative build-up? How do the pupil tasks change? What image of the subject matter is most likely to be communicated? What are its boundaries and what are its chief concerns? What implicit values can be detected in activities related to each other and how do they vary with the subject matter? How is the assessment related to pupil tasks, and to the subject matter? Where and if there are stated objectives how do these relate to pupil tasks and to the assessment?

III. THE MATERIALS IN USE

3.1 Main Features

Summarise the main features of the materials, and the recommended pattern of use, indicating which curriculum decisions would be pre-empted by the decision to adopt the materials and which would still be the responsibility of the user group.

3.2 Possible Modifications and Additions

Describe ways in which the materials of the recommended patterns of use may be modified or supplemented when implementing a curriculum based on them. Indicate where there is no scope for alternation within the terms of the overall curriculum strategy, and note how much further curriculum planning is likely to be necessary.

3.3 Pattern of Use

Describe some possible patterns of use in the context of the overall school curriculum. Which pupils are involved and when? How does it relate to areas of the curriculum which come before and after it? What, if any, modifications and additions are to be incorporated? What form of assessment is intended?

3.4 Implications for Implementation

How much teacher time is needed prior to implementation for activities such as gaining familiarity with the curriculum, further planning, and selecting or producing further materials? How much of this time and energy is likely to be committed in the first year and subsequently? What are the implications for the school in terms of teacher provision, in-service training, special facilities, and finance? Discuss the implications for the pupil with reference to subject selection, examination focus, and future employment. What are the implications for the school in terms of school aims and the articulation of this curriculum area with those preceding, accompanying, or following it? Discuss the implications for the school district and the community in terms of attitudes, provision of in-service training, and special facilities and finance. What major problems are likely to result from implementation in probable non-ideal situations?
IV. EVALUATION

4.1 Other Sources of Evaluation

What evidence of developmental testing is available? Is there evidence that improvements resulted from the development phase? What reports are available from the author, publisher, or independent evaluator? Was the evaluation qualitative or quantitative? What was the evidence of final validation? What information about the users of the resource and their experience is available? Where has the resource been reviewed and what were the major evaluative comments? What unintended outcomes of side-effects have been reported? Is there any evaluative evidence available in terms of its relevance to users supporting differing aims and strategies? Give arguments for and against pursuing the particular aims endorsed by the material in this area of the curriculum. Give arguments for and against particular curriculum strategy assumed or advocated for achieving these aims. Evaluate the materials and their adequacy for supporting the aims and curriculum strategy. Evaluate the feasibility of using the materials in various contexts.

APPENDIX E

Questionnaires
TEXTBOOK QUESTIONNAIRE / INVENTORY FORM

DIRECTIONS: Please read carefully the instructions for Part I and Part II. Review the sample form for Part II. Then, supply the information requested for both parts.

PART I: Please complete items listed below by furnishing the information requested in the space provided at the end of each item.

A. Name of state

B. Name, position, business address, and phone number of individual completing this form.

Name __________________________________________ Position __________________________
Address __________________________________________ Phone __________________________

C. TEXTBOOK SELECTION PROCEDURES: Please check the method(s) that is (are) used in your state for textbook selection of high school foreign language texts.

1. STATEWIDE ADOPTION POLICY - Selection by the state, either through a state superintendent, a state board, or a state textbook commission, of one or more texts that may be selected for use within each individual school district.

2. ADOPTION WITHIN EACH SCHOOL SYSTEM - The superintendent of the school system, foreign language supervisor, or local textbook adoption committee selects one or more texts for use within that particular system.

3. SELECTION BY THE INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL - The principal, or foreign language staff selects one or more texts for use within that particular school.

4. SELECTION BY INDIVIDUAL TEACHER - The foreign language teacher is responsible for selecting the text(s) used in his/her class.

5. OTHER - Please explain __________________________________________

NOTE: IF YOU HAVE SELECTED #1 (STATEWIDE ADOPTION POLICY) PLEASE CONTINUE TO ITEM "D." IF YOU HAVE SELECTED #2, #3, #4, OR #5, PLEASE GO TO ITEM "F."

D. Please circle the estimated number (K=1000) of students enrolled in public high school FRENCH per level (1st, 2nd, 3rd) in your state. Add the appropriate number if it is not indicated. (Complete Section D)

NOTE: If your state does not list a breakdown of student enrollment per level (1st, 2nd, 3rd), please supply general enrollment figures for high school FRENCH. (Complete Section E)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST YEAR</th>
<th>5K</th>
<th>10K</th>
<th>15K</th>
<th>20K</th>
<th>25K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30K</td>
<td>40K</td>
<td>50K</td>
<td>60K</td>
<td>70K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80K</td>
<td>90K</td>
<td>100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHER: __________________________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5K</th>
<th>10K</th>
<th>15K</th>
<th>20K</th>
<th>25K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECOND YEAR FRENCH</strong></td>
<td>30K</td>
<td>40K</td>
<td>50K</td>
<td>60K</td>
<td>70K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80K</td>
<td>90K</td>
<td>100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5K</th>
<th>10K</th>
<th>15K</th>
<th>20K</th>
<th>25K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THIRD YEAR FRENCH</strong></td>
<td>30K</td>
<td>40K</td>
<td>50K</td>
<td>60K</td>
<td>70K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80K</td>
<td>90K</td>
<td>100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Please circle the estimated number (K = 1000) of students enrolled in public high school FRENCH classes in your state. Add the appropriate number if it is not indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5K</th>
<th>10K</th>
<th>15K</th>
<th>20K</th>
<th>25K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL ENROLLMENT</strong></td>
<td>30K</td>
<td>40K</td>
<td>50K</td>
<td>60K</td>
<td>70K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>80K</td>
<td>90K</td>
<td>100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Please circle the estimated number (K=1000) of students enrolled in public high school SPANISH classes per level (1st, 2nd, 3rd) in your state. Add the appropriate number if it is not indicated. (Complete Section F)

NOTE: If your state does not list a breakdown of student enrollment per level (1st, 2nd, 3rd), please supply general enrollment figures for high school SPANISH. (Complete Section G)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5K</th>
<th>10K</th>
<th>15K</th>
<th>20K</th>
<th>25K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FIRST YEAR SPANISH</strong></td>
<td>30K</td>
<td>40K</td>
<td>50K</td>
<td>60K</td>
<td>70K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80K</td>
<td>90K</td>
<td>100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5K</th>
<th>10K</th>
<th>15K</th>
<th>20K</th>
<th>25K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECOND YEAR SPANISH</strong></td>
<td>30K</td>
<td>40K</td>
<td>50K</td>
<td>60K</td>
<td>70K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80K</td>
<td>90K</td>
<td>100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5K</th>
<th>10K</th>
<th>15K</th>
<th>20K</th>
<th>25K</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THIRD YEAR SPANISH</strong></td>
<td>30K</td>
<td>40K</td>
<td>50K</td>
<td>60K</td>
<td>70K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80K</td>
<td>90K</td>
<td>100K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. Please circle the estimated number (K = 1000) of students enrolled in public high school SPANISH classes. Add the appropriate number if it is not indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5K</th>
<th>10K</th>
<th>15K</th>
<th>20K</th>
<th>25K</th>
<th>30K</th>
<th>40K</th>
<th>50K</th>
<th>60K</th>
<th>70K</th>
<th>80K</th>
<th>90K</th>
<th>100K</th>
<th>OTHEP:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


H. Please circle the estimated amount that your state allocated for FRENCH textbooks at the most recent date of state-wide textbook purchase ($1,000,000). Add the number if it is not indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2M</th>
<th>4M</th>
<th>6M</th>
<th>8M</th>
<th>10M</th>
<th>12M</th>
<th>14M</th>
<th>16M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18M</td>
<td>20M</td>
<td>22M</td>
<td>24M</td>
<td>26M</td>
<td>28M</td>
<td>30M</td>
<td>32M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHLP: 

I. This information is not available.

J. Date of most recent adoption: __________

K. Please circle the estimated amount that your state allocated for SPANISH textbooks at the most recent date of state-wide textbook purchase ($1,000,000). Add the number if it is not indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2M</th>
<th>4M</th>
<th>6M</th>
<th>8M</th>
<th>10M</th>
<th>12M</th>
<th>14M</th>
<th>16M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18M</td>
<td>20M</td>
<td>22M</td>
<td>24M</td>
<td>26M</td>
<td>28M</td>
<td>30M</td>
<td>32M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OTHLP: 

L. This information is not available.

M. Date of most recent adoption: __________

N. Please circle the estimated annual amount that your state spends per pupil enrolled in FRENCH. Add the number if it is not indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$50</th>
<th>$100</th>
<th>$150</th>
<th>$200</th>
<th>$250</th>
<th>$300</th>
<th>$350</th>
<th>$400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

OTHLP: 

O. This information is not available.

P. Please circle the estimated annual amount that your state spends per pupil enrolled in SPANISH. Add the number if it is not indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$50</th>
<th>$100</th>
<th>$150</th>
<th>$200</th>
<th>$250</th>
<th>$300</th>
<th>$350</th>
<th>$400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

OTHLP: 

Q. This information is not available.

P. Date __________ Send results of survey Yes ( ) No ( )
PART II: Please PRINT in Column A the complete title, author(s), and publisher of each textbook approved for use in FRENCH high school language classes. In Column B indicate the course level (first, second, and third year) of each textbook. In Column C indicate the number of classroom hours required for the level at which the text is used (example: 5 hours/week). Please use Column D should you deem it necessary to clarify a response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title, Author, Publisher of FRENCH Textbooks</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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APPENDIX F

Instrument Used for Evaluation/Description of
First- and Third-Year Spanish Textbooks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pages:</th>
<th><strong>EMOTION-PERSONALITY</strong></th>
<th>Total:</th>
<th>Pages:</th>
<th><strong>EMOTION-PERSONALITY</strong></th>
<th>Total:</th>
<th>Pages:</th>
<th><strong>EMOTION-PERSONALITY</strong></th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RICH</td>
<td><strong>DEFICIENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>RICH</td>
<td><strong>DEFICIENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>RICH</td>
<td><strong>DEFICIENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego involving or reflects positive sense of self esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ego involving or reflects positive sense of self esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ego involving or reflects positive sense of self esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflects appropriate expression of emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflects appropriate expression of emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reflects appropriate expression of emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions controlled by the learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decisions controlled by the learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decisions controlled by the learner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires student to make decisions and abide by the consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires student to make decisions and abide by the consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires student to make decisions and abide by the consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Set and unequivocal**

**Stasis-oriented**

**Non-ego involving or reflects negative sense of self esteem**

**Reflects inappropriate expression of emotion**

**Decisions controlled by others or by chance**

**Does not require student to make decisions and abide by consequences**
APPENDIX G

Survey Results - Texts Used in States with State-wide Textbook Adoption Lists
## SPANISH FIRST- AND THIRD-YEAR TEXTS USED IN STATES WITH
## TEXTBOOK ADOPTION LISTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SPANISH I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Textbook</th>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>State Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALN Spanish, Level I</td>
<td>Harcourt</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambientes Hispanicos</td>
<td>EMC</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 8, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churros y Chocolate</td>
<td>Scott/Foresman</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Espanol Al Dia</td>
<td>Turk &amp; Allen</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espanol: A Descubrirlo</td>
<td>Webster/McGraw</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation to Spanish—Ud. y Yo</td>
<td>&quot; (1975)</td>
<td>1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 14, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuestros Amigos</td>
<td>Harcourt</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nueva Vista</td>
<td>Allyn-Bacon</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persona a Persona</td>
<td>MacMillan</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish for Mastery</td>
<td>Heath</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Dictionary</td>
<td>Amsco</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Today</td>
<td>Houghton</td>
<td>2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish for Communication</td>
<td>Houghton Mifflin8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Now (8)</td>
<td>Barron's</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>State Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALM Spanish-Level III</td>
<td>HarcourtBrace</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Spanish Grammar</td>
<td>Heath</td>
<td>2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Espanol al Dia</td>
<td>Turk&amp;Allen</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMC Spanish 3</td>
<td>EMC</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caminos Peligrosos</td>
<td>EMC</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galeria Hispanica</td>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vuelo(1978)</td>
<td>Macmillan</td>
<td>1, 5, 7, 8, 14, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Fuente Hispana</td>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>3, 5, 8, 11, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multivista Cultural</td>
<td>Allyn-Bacon</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persona a Persona</td>
<td>MacMillan</td>
<td>2, 3, 5, 6, 11, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspectivas</td>
<td>D.C. Heath</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflejos</td>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salsa y Salero</td>
<td>Scott Foresman</td>
<td>2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish for Communication</td>
<td>Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>8, 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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