GOAL ONE, COMMUNICATION STANDARDS FOR LEARNING SPANISH

AND LEVEL ONE SPANISH TEXTBOOK ACTIVITIES:

A CONTENT ANALYSIS

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Graduate Faculty of The University of Akron

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Taryn Ferch

August, 2005

GOAL ONE, COMMUNICATION STANDARDS FOR LEARNING SPANISH

AND LEVEL ONE SPANISH TEXTBOOK ACTIVITIES:

A CONTENT ANALYSIS

Taryn Ferch

Dissertation

Approved: Accepted:

_____   _____
Advisor   Department Chair
Susan Kushner Benson   Walter Yoder, Jr.

_____   _____
Committee Member   Dean of the College
Susan Colville-Hall   Patricia Nelson

_____   _____
Committee Member   Dean of the Graduate School
Catharine Knight   George Newkome

_____   _____
Committee Member   Date
Lynn Smolen

_____
Committee Member
Matt Wyszynski

ABSTRACT

This study was a content analysis of nine chapters in three level one Spanish textbooks and their alignment with Goal One of the *Standards for Learning Spanish*. The researcher examined 251 communicative activities to determine how well they aligned with Communication Standards 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 and what skill areas the activities required. Moreover, the amount of Spanish the activities required of students was examined.

Four research questions were developed for this study. Research Questions 1-3 were directly aligned with Communication Standards 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. Research Questions 1-3 were designed to answer to what extent the communicative activities met the standards and what communicative paths or skill areas the activities required. Research Question 4 was designed to answer how much Spanish the activities' components required.

Each research question had a corresponding coding form. The coding forms were evaluated and the researcher then conducted a pilot test of the forms. As a result of the evaluations and the pilot test, the forms were revised. The content analysis of the 251 communicative activities yielded 1,004 coding forms. Frequency counts and percentages were the basis of the data analysis.

The findings from the study indicate that overall, the communicative activities did not meet Goal One, as defined by the three communication standards. Research Questions 1-3 focused on the standards and the communicative paths or skill areas aligned with each standard. More activities met Standard 1.1 than Standards 1.2 or 1.3. Thirty-five activities partially met Standard 1.2. and 24 activities partially met Standard 1.3. Zero activities fully met Standards 1.2 and 1.3. The analysis highlighted that the communicative paths used most frequently were receptive rather than productive. Reading and listening were used more frequently than other communicative paths.

Research Question 4 (divided into three parts) was concerned with the amount of Spanish required in the directions, in the activities, and in the responses. Overall, later textbook chapters required more Spanish than beginning chapters. The directions shifted from English to Spanish as students progressed through the book. About 90% of the activities and the responses to the activities required Spanish.

DEDICATION

To the Portland Roses: Clifford, Mary, Palmer, and Bertha.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who contributed directly and indirectly to the completion of this work. The first group of people is my family. The person to whom I am truly grateful is my husband Dave. His patience and support were critical to the success of my academic studies. I would also like to acknowledge the continued support of my educational endeavors from my parents, Doug and Karen.

My extended family, friends, colleagues, classmates, and students deserve credit for their assistance and understanding throughout this whole process. I would like to thank Sarah V., Cindy B., Tammie A., Amy V., Laura K., Dorothy B., Barb H., Leslie G., Erika J., Valerie B., and Cindy F. They have all helped me to get where I am today. I also thank my research assistants, Lola and Emma.

Lastly I would like to thank my committee for their hard work and valuable insight. They gave me a multitude of suggestions for strengthening this body of research. I would like to thank them for their continued service throughout my program. Special mention goes to my advisor, Dr. Kushner Benson, for examining every word for clarity, scholarship, and purpose.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

viii

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

More students are studying foreign languages than ever before, and more students

are studying Spanish. The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages

(ACTFL) reported that in 2000, about 44% of high school students were taking a foreign

language. That same year approximately seven million junior high school and senior

high school students were studying foreign languages. Enrollment data indicate that

Spanish is the most popular foreign language in American secondary schools.

Enrollments in Spanish account for about 69% of all foreign language enrollments for

students in grades 7-12 (Draper & Hicks, 2002).

There are four reasons why Spanish is of interest to this dissertation. First, the

ability to communicate in Spanish is important because it is spoken throughout the world

by millions of people. The United States borders a Spanish speaking country and this

close proximity strengthens the need for communicating in Spanish on both sides of the

border. The second reason is the free trade agreement with Mexico, which allows the

import and export of goods and services. The international free trade system creates

opportunities for American workers who can communicate effectively in Spanish. Third,

Latinos are the largest minority group in the United States (U.S. Census, 2003). Lastly,

because Spanish is the most common foreign language taught in American schools, there

1

are many Spanish language resources readily available. Therefore, it is important to

examine the quality of those resources. For the aforementioned reasons, the study of

Spanish is important, and the need for individuals who can communicate in Spanish is

greatly increasing.

The study of Spanish or any other language requires careful attention to

terminology. It is important to distinguish between four related but different terms that

appear frequently in the literature: (a) second language acquisition, (b) foreign languages

or world languages, (c) learning and acquisition, and (d) bilingual education. Second

language acquisition encompasses learner centered aspects of strategies, interlanguage,

interference, and transitional phases (Freed, 1991). The word "second" in second

language acquisition is sometimes problematic for two reasons. First, some of the

research conducted under the heading of second language acquisition fails to account for

individuals who have acquired already more than two languages. Therefore, it should be

called third, fourth, or fifth language acquisition. Second, there is disagreement among

some scholars as to what constitutes a second language. Spanish, for example, can be

considered a second language in the United States because it is widely spoken within the

country. Labeling Spanish a second language becomes confusing because Spanish is also

referred to in the literature as a foreign language or a world language.

Foreign languages and/or world languages, are those languages that are spoken

outside of the United States. Therefore, Spanish can be considered second language, a

foreign language, or a world language, because it is spoken within the United States and

in other countries around the world. Berns (1990) suggested that the way to clarify

terminology is to focus on the learner's perspective, because it is the learner who

determines the purpose of language study. For example, in the United States many students consider the Spanish language to be foreign rather than second because the only opportunity they have to develop communicative competence in Spanish is within the classroom environment (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001).

Learning and acquisition are two other terms that are frequently used in the literature in contradictory ways. Some scholars define learning as a conscious process whereas acquisition is a subconscious process (Krashen, 1981; 1982; 2003). In contrast, other scholars use the terms acquisition and learning interchangeably (Brown, 2000). In the literature it is typical to see the terms second language acquisition and foreign language learning. The former refers to how individuals acquire languages naturally whereas the latter refers to the study of languages spoken outside the United States. Therefore, both the purpose behind language study and the context in which it is studied determine the terminology.

Bilingual education is another common term in the literature, and it refers to the study of two languages simultaneously. There are many bilingual education programs (Brisk, 1998), and the defining characteristics of these programs is what percentage of instruction is conducted in the first language (Ovando & Collier, 1998). Bilingual education and Spanish are often linked together in the literature because many Latino students in the United States learn English and Spanish together. Most secondary students in the United States enrolled in level one Spanish courses study Spanish as a foreign language, not as part of a bilingual education program. Therefore, for the purposes of this dissertation, the acquisition of Spanish and foreign language education are reviewed.

Second Language Acquisition and Communicative Competence

Second language acquisition is a highly variable process. Some of the variables that account for differences in second language acquisition include the quantity and the quality of input and output, interference from the first language, age, the rate of acquisition, and individual differences. Individuals process language differently, and both the processing speed and how people process language affect the rate of language acquisition (Collier, 1989; Ellis, 1985c; Huebner, 1998; VanPatten, 2003).

The focus of foreign language instruction has shifted over the last fifty years, much like the theories and models of second language acquisition evolved during that time period. In the 1950s and the 1960s, foreign language educators employed Grammar Translation Methods and the Audiolingual Method. The goals of these methods were to produce grammatically correct sentences and dialogues that students memorized and recited with few errors. These methods fell out of favor in later years because students lacked the ability to communicate in natural contexts. Contemporary foreign language education or Communicative Language Teaching centers on developing students' levels of communicative competence.

Communicative competence in a second language involves "knowing how, when, and why to say what to whom" (*Standards for Foreign Language Learning*, 1996). As the term suggests, communicative competence focuses on all aspects of communication. Communicatively competent foreign language learners have knowledge of culture, interpersonal relations, purposeful communication, discourse conventions, the language system, and the format of texts (*Standards for Foreign Language Learning*, 1999).

One way to integrate communicative competence into foreign language education and to evaluate students' ability to communicate competently is by using foreign language standards. The *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* (1996) and the *Standards for Learning Spanish* (1999) are two important resources for foreign language educators. The documents outline goals and standards that define each goal. A description of the foreign language standards follows.

Foreign Language Standards

The national standards movement influenced curricular change in many disciplines, and foreign languages or world languages are no exception. *The Standards for Foreign Language Learning* were developed in a similar manner as the other disciplines. In the 1996 publication *National Standards: A Catalyst for Reform,* editor and author Robert C. Lafayette, along with Jamie B. Draper from the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, outlined the history of the foreign language standards. Lafayette and Draper reported that the national reform effort first began at the 1989 *Education Summit* in Charlottesville, Virginia. It was at this summit that state governors and President George H.W. Bush approved *National Education Goals,* in which foreign languages were not included. In 1991 the National Goals Panel recommended national standards and assessments. In 1992 the United States Department of Education showed an interest in funding the development of foreign language standards. Consequently, foreign language professional organizations such as the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) in conjunction with the American Associations of the Teachers of French, German, Spanish and Portuguese received federal funding to collaborate and produce national standards encompassing

5

kindergarten through twelfth grade. This partnership led to an eleven person task force

selected from the National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project and in 1995

the document entitled *The Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the*

21st Century was presented.

Specifically, the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*: *Preparing for the*

21st Century offer a tool for best practices and a way to measure improvement (National

Standards, 1999). They are designed to be used in conjunction with curriculum

frameworks and local and state standards. The document is divided into five goal areas,

also known as the Five Cs of Foreign Language Education: Communication, Cultures,

Connections, Comparisons, and Communities. Within these five goal areas, there are

specific content related standards that correlate with the goal, and there are examples of

how each standard can be identified in practice. In addition, there are sample progress

indicators at grade 4, grade 8, grade 12, and grade 16 which give educators and

administrators an idea of what students should know and what they should be able to do

at each respective age. At the end of the document there are learning scenarios that

describe a unit of study, which standards the unit meets, and the intended grade level.

Table 1 lists the Goals and the Standards from the *Standards for Learning Spanish*.

Table 1

The Standards for Learning Spanish

Goals	Standards
Communication : Communicate in Spanish	1.1: Students engage in conversations, provide and obtain information, express feelings and emotions, and exchange opinions.
	1.2: Students understand and interpret written and spoken Spanish on a variety of topics.
	1.3: Students present information, concepts, and ideas in Spanish to an audience of listeners or readers on a variety of topics.
Cultures : Gain Knowledge and Understanding of the Cultures of the World	2.1: Students demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the practices and perspectives of Hispanic cultures.
	2.2: Students demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between the products and perspectives of Hispanic cultures.
Connections: Connect with Other Disciplines and Acquire Information	3.1: Students reinforce and further their knowledge of other disciplines through Spanish.
	3.2: Students acquire information and recognize the distinctive viewpoints that are only available through Spanish language and its cultures.
Comparisons: Develop Insight into the Nature of Language and Culture	4.1: Students demonstrate understanding of the nature of language through comparisons between Spanish and English.
	4.2: Students demonstrate understanding of the concept of culture through comparisons between Hispanic cultures and their own.
Communities: Participate in Communities at Home and Around the World	5.1: Students use Spanish both within and beyond the school setting.
	5.2: Students show evidence of becoming life-long learners by using Spanish for personal enjoyment and enrichment.

As a result of the increasing numbers of Spanish speakers and the need to communicate effectively in Spanish, communities have responded to new needs created by language and cultural differences. One such way to bridge communication is through foreign language education. Schulz (2002) reiterated the importance of studying Spanish in the schools for several reasons: (a) the close proximity to Mexico, (b) the numerous countries in which Spanish is spoken world wide, (c) the reality that Spanish is the second most commonly spoken language in the United States, (d) and the pragmatic value of learning a language in which students can use readily and have extensive opportunities to practice their skills while living in the United States.

Standards and textbooks are valuable tools for foreign language education. Bartz and Keefe Singer (1996) addressed the role of standards in "The Programmatic Implications of Foreign Language Standards". They agreed that higher standards can influence the publishers to produce better quality texts. They continued, "… textbooks and tests have a significant influence on what is taught and learned…" (p. 142). The growing interest and adoption of national foreign language standards means that curricular change is inevitable. "Textbooks must be re-written and updated. It is an established fact that textbooks often define local curriculum. Therefore, publishers have a responsibility to produce basal materials that lead students to attain the national standards" (Bartz & Keefe Singer, 1996, p. 166). Distributing the content into meaningful chunks of information linked to the foreign language standards is beneficial. It allows not only students and teachers to transform the guidelines from theory to practice, but it also helps administrators, textbook review committees, and curriculum planners to select textbooks aligned with their educational goals.

Teachers rely on textbooks to guide their lesson plans and to select what content they teach in the classroom (Biemer, 1992; Dow, 1992; Eisner, 1987; Woodward & Elliott, 1990). It is estimated that 75% to 90% of classroom instruction is based on textbooks (Stein, Stuen, Carnine, & Long, 2001). In many cases, textbooks serve to define the curriculum. Therefore, it is important to evaluate the quality of textbooks because teachers and students depend on textbooks. One way to evaluate the quality of textbooks is to compare their alignment with the standards. *The Standards for Learning Spanish* (1999) provide a template for evaluating the quality of Spanish textbooks. Moreover, content analysis methods serve as an objective and systematic way to evaluate the alignment of the standards and level one Spanish textbooks.

<div align="center">Purpose of the Study and Research Questions</div>

The purpose of the study was to conduct a content analysis of level one secondary Spanish textbooks and their alignment with Goal One of the *Standards for Learning Spanish* (1999). Level one textbooks are those that are used generally in the first year of foreign language study and most commonly they are the first textbook in a series of four levels. Textbook programs with levels one, two, three, and four correspond to the ninth grade, tenth grade, eleventh grade and twelfth grade, respectively. Of interest to this dissertation were level one high school Spanish textbooks because during the first year of language study students begin to develop communicative competence in Spanish. There were three level one Spanish textbooks in this dissertation, and within each textbook there were three chapters. The communicative activities within the chapters were the focus of this dissertation. Communicative activities are the activities that encourage students to speak, to read, to listen, and to write in Spanish. Students usually complete

communicative activities in class, and they may be completed individually, with a conversation partner, or in small groups. Communicative activities are physically distinct units within a chapter. Communicative activities can be identified by some of all of the following: (a) titles or headings, (b) icons such as pens, headphones, or people (c) directions for students, (d) numbered sentences, questions or dialogues, (e) color coded boxes or numbers. Boxes and colors physically define the coded activities, and they are sequentially numbered. There were 251 communicative activities across the three textbooks. They were coded and evaluated on the extent to which they aligned with Goal One and its encompassing three standards. Goal One and the three related standards are listed in Table 1.

This study focused on the following four research questions.

1. To what extent do the activities in the textbook meet Standard 1.1 and in what skill areas does the activity require students to engage?

2. To what extent do the activities in the textbook meet Standard 1.2 and in what skill areas does the activity require students to engage?

3. To what extent do the activities in the textbook meet Standard 1.3 and in what skill areas does the activity require students to engage?

4. To what extent do the components of the activities (e.g., directions, responses) in the textbook require students to communicate in Spanish?

Limitations

There were two limitations to this study. First, this research was limited to level one textbooks. It was expected that the higher the level of the textbook, the more communicatively competent the students would be. Second, this research was limited to

10

the presentation of the activities within the textbook, not the classroom implications of the activities. The researcher did not examine, for example, how the teacher implements the activities, how the activities can be modified, or how the students complete the activities. The researcher only examined the extent to which the activities in each chapter met the first three standards of Goal One.

<div align="center">Definition of Terms</div>

The following terms were directly related to this study.

1. Acquisition. A subconscious process (Krashen, 1981) or the ability to pick up languages in natural contexts, much like children do with their first language.

2. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Also known as ACTFL, a professional organization dedicated to the promotion and the education of all aspects of foreign languages.

3. Audiolingual Method (ALM). It was popular in the 1960s after the Armed forces received funding for expanding foreign language education and it emphasized accuracy and grammar rules by habit formation and structured drills.

4. Bilingual education. Program of study where students receive instruction in one language while maintaining or fostering the other language. Research in bilingual education has primarily focused on Spanish/English and French/English.

5. Communicative activities. The sequentially numbered, physically delineated units or exercises in the textbook. Generally they have titles, directions, and numbered items or questions that direct students to respond.

6. Communicative competence. Developing communicative target language skills in areas related to culture, grammar, society, and learning strategies.

7. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). A contemporary approach to language teaching where learning goals are centered on developing students' levels of communicative competence.

8. Content analysis. A systematic and objective research method used in the examination of texts, documents, and communication.

9. Five Cs. Also known as the goal areas of the foreign language standards. They are Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities.

10. Foreign languages. Languages other than English.

11. Goal One. Communication, the first goal of the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*.

1. Grammar Translation method. A methodology used previously in foreign language education whereby grammar, accuracy, and translation were the focus.

2. Interlanguage. The emerging language that combines elements of the first language with elements of the second language.

3. Learning. It is a conscious process (Krashen, 1981) that requires careful attention and study. Learning typically takes place in foreign language classrooms as a result of practice, study, memorization, and time.

4. Learning scenarios. Sample lessons of units or activities that meet the standards. They are included in the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*.

5. Level one Spanish textbooks. Textbooks that are used typically during the first year of secondary language study.

6. National standards. Educational reform measures designed to promote accountability and awareness in the public schools. They serve as a way to equalize educational opportunities.

7. Sample progress indicators. Evaluation tools included in the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* and the *Standards for Learning Spanish* that provide examples of what students should know and what they should be able to do at grades 4, 8, 12, and 16.

8. Second languages. Sometimes used interchangeably with foreign languages. They refer to any language studied or acquired after the first language.

9. Second language acquisition. The study of how individuals pick up or acquire a second language. It is different from how individuals acquire their first language.

10. *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*. A document developed by ACTFL and other foreign language professional organizations, published in 1996. It includes the Five Cs, standards, sample progress indicators, and learning scenarios.

11. *Standards for Learning Spanish*. A language specific document with the same information as in the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*, but published in 1999. It elaborates upon and provides resources for students in post-secondary programs.

12. Target languages. Often used interchangeably with foreign languages or second languages. The target language is the language educators want their students to use or to speak in class.

13. World languages. Often used interchangeably with foreign languages. The name

implies that the languages are spoken throughout the world and the term is less

pejorative than "foreign".

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Of interest to this dissertation of level one Spanish textbooks were the following research topics: foreign language education, second language acquisition, communicative competence, textbooks, national standards, foreign language standards, and content analysis. Within each section are issues, themes, and brief explanations of the research topics listed above. The chapter begins with how foreign language programs have responded to various changes.

More students are studying foreign languages than ever before, and these students are studying Spanish. However, the level of interest in foreign languages has not always been this great. Historical events and the political climate throughout the United States have shaped foreign language education. For example, World Wars I and II impacted foreign language education in American schools for various reasons. For instance, after the outbreak of World War I, Americans' view became more isolationist in nature (Lantolf, 2001). The isolationist attitude meant that Americans considered foreign languages unpatriotic or un-American. Anti-foreign language sentiments continued for many years throughout the United States and consequently, foreign language enrollments in American schools declined steadily. Foreign languages were unpopular in the United States until the Soviet Union launched Sputnik and fears of a Cold War spread (VanPatten, 2003).

After the launch of Sputnik, the Armed Forces prioritized, funded, and provided training for the study of certain foreign languages. The National Defense Education Act earmarked money for education of Russian, Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, and Portuguese (Freeman, 1963). Both military servicemen and American civilians recognized the need for trained employees who could speak the target language proficiently. Therefore, the previously taught grammar translation language method was obsolete and the demand for communication in the foreign language generated a new communicatively focused methodology. In particular, the Army preferred a more pragmatic approach that centered on the ability to speak a language with demonstrable skill (Lantolf, 2001). It became more important to study one language for several years than to study several languages for one year.

Another development that influenced the trend toward communicative foreign language teaching in the United States was the creation of the functional-notional syllabus. This syllabus design originated from the 1971 meeting of The Council for Cultural Cooperation, an agency of the Council of Europe (Matthies, 1982). The committee conducted surveys of European adults about how formal instruction could best meet their foreign language needs. The committee identified the "T-level" or "Threshold level" as the beginning level of foreign language learning. The "T-level" corresponds to the level of proficiency after 250 instructional hours. Responses from the European adult language learners were categorized into five language items: (a) semantic notions, (b) communicative functions, (c) topics, (d) situations, and (e) language activities. This meeting led to the development of the functional-notional syllabus, whereby content is organized around the learner's communicative needs. Functions are what the learner

wants to do with the language and notions are the meanings the learner wants to communicate (Center for Applied Linguistics, 1982; Finocchiaro & Brumfit, 1983; Harlow, 1978; Matthies, 1982). In addition, the syllabus is constructed from numerous categories of communication; when the student masters the communicative categories outlined on the syllabus, the student has acquired a "communicative competence" (Peck, 1976). The adoption of functional-notional syllabus in American schools parallels the current need for developing communicatively competent foreign language speakers.

More American students are taking foreign languages than in the past. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, between 1982 and 2000 the number of students who completed three years or more of a foreign language doubled from 15% in 1982 to 30% in 2000. In 2000, nearly one half of all high school graduates in the United States had completed one or two years of a foreign language (National Center for Education Statistics). That same year there were approximately 13.5 million students grades 9-12 enrolled in foreign languages (U.S. Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 2003).

Spanish was the focus of this dissertation because it is widely spoken and widely studied. Of all the students enrolled in foreign language courses, more students were enrolled in Spanish than any other language. There were a little more than 4 million students of Spanish in 2000, up from approximately 1.8 million in 1970 (U.S. Census Bureau). The 4 million students represent about 30% of all students enrolled in modern foreign languages. It is evident that more students are studying at least one year of a foreign language than in past years, and the most populated language course is Spanish. The trend in the popularity of Spanish reflects the changing demographic of the United

States population. The Census 2000 reported that 12.5% of the population, or roughly 35

million people are Hispanic, an increase of 58% between the 1990 and 2000 Censuses.

There are approximately 28 million Spanish speakers, or 10.7% of the population (U.S.

English Foundation). The growth in the number of Spanish speakers parallels the

increase in the number of students who study Spanish.

The need to communicate with others in Spanish is growing.

> Given the rapid rise in the Spanish-speaking population of the U.S., the adult work
> options of our students are likely to be expanded and enriched if they can speak
> Spanish well enough to interact with their co-workers even at a simple level (Ballman,
> Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001, p. 4).

Even as early as high school, many students work part time in jobs that offer regular

contact with native speakers of Spanish (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell).

Furthermore, regardless of the post-secondary educational plans, all students will

eventually come into contact with Spanish speakers. This is not surprising because there

are 28 million Spanish-speaking residents over the age of five according to the Census

2000. Knowing how to communicate effectively is an essential part of citizenship.

"Participation within a community requires the use of language to exchange and negotiate

meaning of ideas among its members" (Singer, Marx, Krajcik, & Clay Chambers, 2000,

p. 166). The increased need for effective Spanish speakers parallels the need for

communicatively oriented Spanish language classrooms.

Second Language Acquisition

To understand how languages are learned, educators must examine the theories

central to language learning and development. A theory of second language acquisition

encompasses an understanding of language, learning, and teaching (Brown, 2000). Of

interest to this dissertation is how American students in level one Spanish courses acquire Spanish. First, it is necessary to distinguish between second language acquisition and bilingual education. Then, several major theoretical aspects of second language acquisition research are reviewed here. The second language acquisition section is further divided into the following subsections: the differences between acquisition and learning, the role of input and output, second language acquisition and first language acquisition, the role of transfer and learner errors, the role of age, and the role of sequence, order and rate. A brief distinction between second language acquisition and bilingual education follows.

Bilingual Education and Second Language Acquisition

Scholars cannot refer to the study of second language acquisition without also examining the role of bilingual education and how it has impacted other language programs. The most relevant points of bilingual education are presented here. There are numerous models of bilingual education (Brisk, 1998) and these models vary greatly according to the epistemological beliefs upon which they are based. The defining characteristic of these programs is what percentage of instruction is conducted in the first language (Ovando & Collier, 1998). There are dual language schools in which students are taught in their native language and their target language. There is Canadian immersion education, which provides instruction in French. There are two-way bilingual education programs and two-way bilingual immersion programs. Moreover, other programs include immersion, sheltered teaching, maintenance bilingual education, transitional bilingual education, and bilingual immersion education. Lastly, submersion with native language and English as a Second Language (ESL) support, and integrated

19

bilingual education are other programs. Bilingual education programs are different from second language programs in that bilingual education students foster or maintain their first language and their second language simultaneously. In contrast, second language students generally acquire one language before they begin to acquire or to learn a second language.

Second Language Acquisition Theories and Models

There are multiple theories and models of second language acquisition and learning rooted in psychology, sociology, anthropology, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, and neurolinguistics (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). Eight theories and/or models of second language acquisition are reviewed. The theories and/or models reviewed for this dissertation include Behaviorism, Information Processing, the Zone of Proximal Development, Connectionism, The Critical Period Hypothesis, Universal Grammar or Innatism, Variable Competence, and the Monitor hypothesis.

Behaviorism, Information Processing Theory, and The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), three well-known theories of second language acquisition, came out of studies in psychology. Behaviorism emerged during the 1940s and 1950s from psychological principles of animal learning and human learning. The researcher most associated with this theory was B.F. Skinner (1957), and his work *Verbal Behavior*. According to behaviorists, the child is seen as a blank slate, or *tabula rosa,* whose mind is devoid of special language learning programming. Languages are learned by practice, imitation, and repetition. Language in humans is a result of responses acquired by

20

training or conditioning (Lightbrown & Spada, 1999; Omaggio Hadley, 2001).

Behaviorists view errors as undesirable because they signify that learning has not taken

place (Ellis, 1985c).

Information processing theory, like behaviorism, has its roots in a branch of

psychology. Information processing theory is rooted in cognitive psychology. It is a

more recent psychological theory of second language acquisition, and it uses computers

as an analogy. Groups of systems work together to produce an accessible and automatic

knowledge base. The learner begins by processing a few words or phrases until an entire

language base is built and stored away in the brain. These patterns develop

systematically and cyclically until the learner has a vast repertoire of words and linguistic

structures that can be retrieved with little effort. Practicing and paying attention to forms

are crucial to storage and retrieval in the memory bank. One criticism of Information

Processing Theory and Behaviorism is that they reflect controlled laboratory experiments

instead of real world language situations and applications. Both theories fail to consider

the complexities of language systems.

The third theory of second language acquisition reviewed here is the Zone of

Proximal Development (ZPD) (Vygotsky, 1978). This theory also stems from the field of

psychology. Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development can be summarized and applied

to second language acquisition in the following manner. The ZPD is the distance

between what the child or learner can do independently and what the child or learner can

do with help from a more capable other (Vygotsky, 1978). The other person could be an

adult, as in the case of a teacher or tutor, or the other person could be a more capable

peer. Social interaction and collaboration are essential for the development of language.

The adult or more capable peer serves as a "scaffold" or a tool that facilitates learning. "Scaffolding" is the process by which the assisted negotiation of meaning occurs between the leaner and the peer or adult. The peer or adult then transfers the responsibility for learning to the learner. As applied to second language acquisition, the interaction between the learner and the more capable other is how, when, and where language acquisition takes place (Lantolf & Appel, 1994). That is, in the process of working together, the learner is simultaneously acquiring more of the second language than merely interacting with the more capable other (Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Vygotsky, 1978).

The computer analogy of a group of systems that work together to form one network is similar to the principles of another theory of second language acquisition-Connectionism. Connectionism is the fourth theory of second language acquisition reviewed here. Just as the name implies, Connectionism involves forming and linking connections. Language learning takes place slowly and simply by putting words together to form more complex linguistic links. These links or connections travel on neural networks and are activated by input sources. Within the learner's mind, one word might draw him to make connections to other words, phrases, or rules that lead to language production.

A fifth theory of second language acquisition takes into account biological factors, rather than environmental or psychological factors. The Critical Period Hypothesis (Lenneberg, 1967; Penfield & Roberts, 1959) (CPH) assumes that there is a language learning window accessible for a limited time. The Critical Period is a language learning window or special time period during which language can be readily acquired at native speaker proficiency levels (Brown, 2000). The CPH affects

pronunciation in both the first and second languages (Flege, 1999). After the critical

period has passed, the brain changes and the neural substrate required for language

learning is difficult to access because this window usually closes or is inaccessible during

adolescence. The CPH explains the variation in the success rates of younger and older

second language learners (Bialystok & Hakuta, 1999). It is curious that most American

schools begin second language study during adolescence or the first year of high school

when research shows that the language learning window may already be closed.

The sixth theory reviewed here is Universal Grammar, or sometimes referred to as

Innatism. They are also biologically based theories of second language acquisition, in

contrast to the aforementioned behaviorist theories. Universal Grammar was developed

by linguist Noam Chomsky (1959). He thought that language ability was determined

genetically and it was similar to other biological developments. While the environmental

circumstances could shape positively or negatively individual language learning

experiences, generally all humans would acquire language in the same biological

sequence and developmental sequence. Each human being contained a set of underlying

language rules or principles that were pre-programmed for language development. This

was housed in what he formerly termed "language acquisition device" or LAD and he

later called Universal Grammar (UG).

Chomsky's theory indicates that there is a universal capacity for language

learning in humans. What this theory fails to explain is that language learning is a highly

variable process. In Chomsky's view, all humans acquire language in a biologically

similar manner. The Variable Competence Model explains this variability in language

acquisition. The researchers most associated with Variable Competence research are

Ellis (1985a; 1985b; 1999) and Tarone (1983; 1985; 2002). Learners vary in the way

they apply the rules they have learned. This is most evident in the learner's

interlanguage. Interlanguage is the language that contains elements of the first language

and elements of the second language. Learners vary their language usage depending on

the linguistic context and the type of task they are asked to complete (Tarone, 1983;

1985; 2002). There exists both systematic variation and free variation. Systematic

variation is when the learner commits the same errors across similar situations. In

contrast, free variation is when the learner commits errors in what appears to be a random

manner (Ellis, 1985a; Ellis 1985b, Ellis & Roberts, 1987; Ellis, 1999; Tarone, 1983;

1985; 2002). The learner's ability to produce correct language varies depending on the

task and the situation. The learner may produce a correct form in one instance, which

demonstrates that the learner has learned a rule and can apply it. In other instances, the

learner can apply that same rule incorrectly, which demonstrates that the learner may

have learned the rule but can not always apply it correctly and contextually. The

variability can be explained further by examining the type of task or situation in which

the learner engages. These types of activities or exercises are sometimes referred to as

focused or planned activities and unfocused or unplanned activities. The former includes

formulaic practice in a predictable format of introducing and then practicing or drilling.

The latter refers to unrehearsed or spontaneous language usage, like language used by

native target language speakers. It is by using more spontaneous language that students

develop a greater level of communicative competence. Systematic variation is more

likely to occur in planned activities and free variation is more likely to manifest itself in

unplanned activities. This is because unplanned or unfocused activities require the

24

learner to expend more linguistic and cognitive resources, thus competing with the learner's attention resources. In contrast, in planned or focused activities, the learner is able to monitor language use and is more likely to have access to linguistic resources (Ellis, 1985a; Ellis 1985b, Ellis & Roberts, 1987; Ellis, 1999; Tarone, 1983; 1985; 2002).

The eighth and final theory of second language acquisition reviewed for this dissertation has Innatist principles. Monitor Theory or "monitor model" (Krashen, 1982) has five hypotheses. These hypotheses are as follows: (a) acquisition-learning, (b) monitor, (c) natural order, (d) input, and (e) affective filter. The first distinguishes between learning and acquisition. He defined learning as a conscious process, similar to what takes place in most schools whereas acquisition is a subconscious process. Learners are engaged in rule learning and formal study whereas acquirers are exposed to the target language in chunks that are comprehendible. For Krashen, acquisition is more important than learning because acquisition promotes fluent communication. The second hypothesis states that learners (not acquirers) of a second language are more likely to monitor or edit their speech because they are focusing on the form instead of the function of their communication. In contrast, acquirers of language (not learners) are more concerned with being understood than being correct. Natural order, the third hypothesis, states that there is a predictable sequence of language structures to be learned and even learning the rules does not change the acquisition order. The fourth hypothesis, the input hypothesis, suggests that acquisition can only take place when learners are exposed to "comprehensible input", one level beyond the learner's level of competence or "i + 1". The affective filter, the fifth hypothesis, refers to the influences on the learner's psyche

such as emotions, motivation, anxiety, and attitude. If a barrier such as anxiety surrounds the learner, the learner cannot properly receive and process the input.

Second language acquisition encompasses many components. Some of the main elements central to the study of second language acquisition are the following: the differences between acquisition and learning, the role of input and output, the differences between second language acquisition and first language acquisition, the role of errors, age, developmental sequences, and the focus on form versus the focus on function.

Acquisition Versus Learning

Acquisition and learning are two terms familiar to second language acquisition researchers. For some scholars, acquisition and learning are interchangeable terms whereas for others they are markedly different. Krashen (1981) clearly distinguished between learning, a conscious process, and acquisition, a subconscious process. These are sometimes also referred to as explicit ways and implicit ways, respectively. Learning may be totally independent from acquisition; teaching furthers learning and learning is more concerned with output than input because output provides a basis for error correction. Through error correction, accuracy increases as does the students' confidence level. On the contrary, acquisition necessitates natural and meaningful communication in the target language with emphasis on the messages and their meanings rather than the form.

Scholars define learning in many ways. Learning involves enabling the learner to master what was unattainable at the beginning of the process (Van Ek, 1979). Learning, according to Brown (2000), is permanent when stored effectively but it can be forgotten.

26

He calls it an active and conscious process referred to as acquisition or "getting", in addition to retention or storage. Brown's definition is decidedly different from that of Krashen (1981; 1982).

There are researchers who distinguish between the fields of second language acquisition and foreign languages. Second language acquisition research has investigated the following: learning strategies, interlanguage, transitional phases and acquisition orders, the effect of the first language, interference from other languages, and the impact of instruction (Freed, 1991). Freed compared research in second language acquisition, which is centered on the learner and the learning process, to foreign language learning research, which focuses on curricular materials, pedagogy, and instructional techniques.

For other scholars, there is no dichotomy between acquisition and learning but rather a view that encompasses multiple facets of language. According to Kramsch (2002), foreign language learning involves not only using the language to communicate, but to talk about the second language and to acquire cultural information about the language and the people. Foreign language learning involves analyzing all aspects of the learner including the biological, neurological, psychological, social-affective, and personal components (Kramsch, 1990).

There is an overlap between second language acquisition and foreign language learning. Successful language acquisition takes thousands of hours of contact, interaction, and in some cases, careful study (Lightbrown, 1990). Most teachers and students agree that communication is an essential component of language learning. "Communication must be the primary goal of instruction if comprehensible input and output as well as fluency in the second language are the goals" (Doughty, 1998, p. 138).

27

Classroom communication is important because it is the central goal of language learning and through communication, students learn the language (Ballman, Liskin-Gasparro, & Mandell, 2001). The ability to communicate requires sources of input and output.

The Role of Input and Output

Input processing and output processing are necessary steps in the second language acquisition process (Ovando & Collier, 1998; VanPatten, 1990; 2003). The higher the quality and the greater the quality of input, the better the output or acquisition (VanPatten, 2003). Input, divided into conversational and nonconversational categories, is what the listener hears and the message the listener extracts from the communication. This differs from intake (Corder, 1967), which is what is stored and processed in working memory after the learner has sifted through the input. Intake has several characteristics (Krashen, 1981). Intake is at the same grammatical level or just above the acquirer's grammatical competence level. Intake progresses to more complex levels. Lastly, intake is natural communication.

Input processing refers to how learners make sense out of linguistic data, which includes form (attaching meaning and making connections) and parsing (figuring out the syntactic structure of the speech). VanPatten (1990; 2003) outlined principles and corollaries for input processing. For example, learners search for meaning and content words first when processing input. Grammatical forms are processed after content is conveyed, and those more meaningful grammatical forms are processed before less meaningful ones. Form without meaning will only be processed if attention and resources are available. Beginnings of sentences are easiest to process, then endings, and lastly middle portions of sentences. Nouns or noun phrases are usually deciphered as the

subjects of the sentence. The way to promote successful acquisition and more rapid

acquisition is by providing quality communicative input or meaning-based input

(VanPatten, 1992a). However, not all communication qualifies as good input, as in the

case of Terrell's study. Terrell (1995) found that in a study of Spanish, native speakers

provided a poor quality of input to non-native speakers. There were several reasons for

why this input did not facilitate acquisition. Native speakers did not provide input just

beyond the non-native speaker's level of understanding and key words were not

emphasized unless the learner requested them. If the quality of input is poor, then the

level of output is also affected.

Output processing is based on output. Output, according to VanPatten (2003) is

language that serves a communicative purpose and ascribes meaning. Output processing

is the ability to use acquired knowledge to communicate in real time. Swain (1993)

described the role of output based on the output hypothesis (Swain, 1985) which proposes

that language acquisition occurs through written or spoken language production.

According to Swain, there are four ways that output can affect second language learning.

First, meaningful practice of the language provides the foundation for automaticity,

whereby language usage becomes automatic. Second, language production may shift

learner processing from semantic to syntactic. The learners then are forced to pay

attention to their language production capabilities, and take inventory of what they know

and what they need to know. Knowledge gaps motivate the learner to form and to test

hypotheses, the third way that output affects language learning. Lastly, after testing

hypotheses, the learner receives feedback from the conversation partner or from the

teacher. This feedback identifies for the learner if the message was understood or if it needs to be reformed or clarified.

Second Language Acquisition and First Language Acquisition

There are similarities and differences between second language acquisition and first language acquisition (VanPatten, 2003). They are similar in that they require input for successful acquisition, they have certain orders or stages, and production begins with simple utterances and progresses to more complex ones. Second language acquisition mirrors that of first language acquisition in that learners acquire rules, they generalize and overgeneralize those rules, and they proceed developmentally (Brown, 2000).

Second language acquisition and first language acquisition differ in the way in which people acquire them. For instance, first languages are acquired through social learning much like the way in which cultural values and societal norms are learned (Stern, 1981). In contrast, second languages are acquired for the most part in an unnatural or unrealistic setting like that typical of a classroom. In addition, first languages are acquired readily and rapidly due to many opportunities for input and practice. Conversely, second languages in school settings, take a long time to acquire because of the limited input available. Classroom teaching should attend to the conceptual differences between first and second languages; students learn language through comprehension and assimilation of one unified language system rather than through isolation of certain skills (Rivers, 1983).

Second language acquisition and first language acquisition differ in the facility of acquisition. They are different in that the second language input must correct the first language learners' rule formations and generalizations (VanPatten, 2003). Unlike second

language learners, first language learners have an extensive knowledge and mastery of the language that few second language learners have. This knowledge can be both useful and detrimental to the language learning process (Collier, 1989). For instance, second language learners already have achieved a higher cognitive level because they have a developed language system and prior knowledge (Huebner, 1998). Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) states that differences between the first language and the second language affect the facility or difficulty with which learners attain the second language (Ellis, 1985c). The first language will affect peripheral rules in the second language, and that first language patterns congruent with interlanguage universals can speed up or delay second language acquisition (Ellis, 1985c).

The Role of Transfer and Learner Errors

Errors are natural and predictable among second language learners. It is common when acquiring a second language that learners piece together bits from their first language and bits of their second language to form one new language, called interlanguage. Interlanguage often includes predictable errors. Three principles characterize interlanguage: systematic variation, common accuracy orders, and first language influence (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). This blending of languages can provide valuable information about what first language rules the learner has applied to the second language framework. Interlanguage stems from the learner's knowledge base and the learner's ability to carry out those procedures necessary for discourse. Although interlanguage systems may lead to errors, errors are necessary and useful for teachers and learners (Brown, 2000).

S. Pit Corder's 1967 article "The Significance of Learner's Errors" marked the beginning of contemporary research in second language acquisition (Huebner, 1998; VanPatten, 2003). Corder (1967) chronicled two popular beliefs about learner errors. One previous belief held by scholars was that if a teaching method could be perfected, there would be no errors. The existence of errors means that there are inadequacies with teaching methods. The other belief was that there is no perfection and errors are simply a reflection of the imperfect world in which we live. Corder distinguished between systematic errors, those related to competence, and unsystematic errors, those related to performance. Errors of performance are "mistakes", and they are insignificant to the language learning process. Conversely, errors are "transitional competence", or the current knowledge of the language learner. By examining learner's errors, researchers could understand the learner's language system.

Errors provide valuable feedback in three ways (Corder, 1967). First, they provide feedback to the teacher about the learner's progress in relation to the language goals. This feedback tells the teacher what the student has learned and what the student has yet to learn. Second, errors provide feedback to researchers about developmental stages or acquisition stages and the accompanying strategies or procedures that the learner employs. Finally, they offer feedback to the learner, whose errors are invaluable in the learning process. It is by making errors that the learner tests the hypotheses the learner has formed. The learner should ask if the new language systems are similar or different to the learner's native language; if they are different, how are they different? Corder viewed errors as evidence of learning strategies, not as negative interference from the first language.

Jordens and Kellerman (1981) investigated "transfer strategy" in second language learning. Transfer refers to the native language components of production and reception. Strategy of transfer is when a language learner calls upon the learner's cognitive resources to make up for gaps in the target knowledge base. Language transfer is a common occurrence in second language acquisition (Ellis, 1985c). There is positive transfer and negative transfer. Positive transfer occurs when there are similarities between the first language and the second language whereas negative transfer occurs when there are differences between the languages. The learner may benefit positively from language transfer, such as when the learner consistency and appropriately applies rules in the same fashion as in the first language. There are other benefits, such as the ability to make comparisons between languages, the ability to use idiomatic expressions and irregular conjugations, the ability to transfer sociolinguistic and cultural competence, and cognitive abilities from the first language. Transfer is constrained by the learner's view of the differences between the native and target language, the learner's perceptions of markedness, and the learner's prior knowledge about language. Gass (1988) observed the following phenomena about language transfer: avoidance, overgeneralization and overproduction, different routes of acquisition, organizational transfer, and increased attention to the target language.

The Role of Age

Age is a contributing factor in second language acquisition, although scholars disagree to what extent age influences acquisition. Among those scholars who agree that there are differences in rate of acquisition due to age, there is disagreement about why

33

these differences exist (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). The four most common

explanations are social-psychological, cognitive, input, and neurological.

Adults and children acquire second languages differently. Differences in second

language acquisition can be attributed to maturity; adults are formal learners, or

grammatically focused, whereas children are mostly functional learners in that they focus

on conveying meaning (Stern, 1981). It is interesting that although adults and children

approach language learning differently, their success rate is similar. Older second

language learners are as successful as younger language learners (Freed, 1991). Adults

are advantageous for two reasons. One, they can learn material in a shorter time than

their younger counterparts because of their greater cognitive ability. Heightened

cognitive awareness allows adults to apply skills such as abstract thinking, generalization,

and classification (Swain & Lapkin, 1989). Another advantage is better second language

literacy skills, most likely due to the ability to transfer skills and strategies developed in

their first language (Swain & Lapkin, 1989). In contrast, children have the advantage

when they are immersed in the second language. They can reach proficiency levels

comparable to native speakers whereas foreign language learners rarely acquire the same

levels as children immersed in the second language (Freed, 1991).

The Role of Sequence, Order, and Rate of Acquisition

All second language learners acquire language patterns in a certain sequence,

although the acquisition rate of these structures varies. The acquisition order of

grammatical structures is constant -regardless of age or modality (Ellis, 1985c). There is

a natural order or developmental sequence that varies according to each learner, and a

learner's interlanguage contains a variable rule system. However, negotiated meaning

between conversational partners does affect the sequence, the order and the rate of development. Affect determines pace of acquisition and proficiency level, but is does not determine the sequence or order.

Whereas the acquisition order remains largely unchanged across learners and languages, the rate and the success of second language acquisition is highly variable. There are many factors, in addition to the first language, that influence the rate and success of second language acquisition. For instance, social and cultural factors can affect both positively and negatively the instructional context. Some of these factors include: (a) economic resources of the student and family, (b) social class, (c) past educational experiences, (d) the reasons for communicating in the first and second languages, (e) motivation and attitude towards the language, (f) status of the target culture, (g) social distance and psychological distance between speakers, and (h) conflict between cultures (Ovando & Collier, 1998). Parents, peers, learning situations, teachers, and ethnicity all affect attitudes and second language acquisition (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). Ellis (1985c) also cited personal factors such as group dynamics, like or dislike of the teacher and course materials, and learning styles as reasons for why students acquire language differently. In addition, Ellis noted general factors such as age, aptitude, personality, and cognitive style as factors that influence acquisition. Moreover, personality factors such as levels of self-esteem, extroversion, anxiety, tolerance for risks and ambiguity, empathy, inhibition, and sensitivity to rejection contribute to acquisition (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991).

Communicative Competence

The second area of interest to this dissertation of level one Spanish textbooks was communicative competence. According to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), one of the most important goals of second language acquisition and foreign language learning is developing communicative competence in the target language. The section on communicative competence is further divided into various subsections: The Role of Focus on Form Versus Focus on Function, Communicative Language Teaching, and Acquisition Activities. A brief explanation of communicative competence follows.

Communicative competence can be defined many ways. In the 1996 *Standards for Foreign Language Learning*, ACTFL defines communicative competence as "knowing how, when, and why to say what to whom". It encompasses many areas of language usage including forms, functions, culture, appropriateness, and context. Communicative competence involves using correctly the communicative system to achieve linguistic goals and to function according to each context (Stalker, 1989).

There have been several models of communicative competence developed by various scholars, but the researchers most associated with the term are Hymes (1971) and Savignon (1972). Other foreign language researchers have used elements of Savignon's model and added new elements. The shift towards promoting communicatively competent foreign language students began in the 1970s as a result of Savignon's model. Her model of communicative competence incorporates three dimensions of competence: sociolinguistic competence, contextual competence, and grammatical competence. Canale and Swain (1980) distinguished between competence, knowledge of grammar and

linguistic forms, and performance, usage of grammar and forms. They included

grammatical competence, discourse competence, and strategic competence in their model

of language competence. Grammatical competence requires knowledge of rules,

structure, spelling, and pronunciation whereas discourse competence refers to coherently

formed logical ideas and thoughts. Strategy use facilitates strategic competence to

achieve both verbal and non-verbal communication when there are communication

difficulties. Drawing upon the work of Savignon (1972) and Canale and Swain (1980),

Verhoeven and Vermeer (1992) developed a model for describing communicative

competence. In their model, there are five components of communicative competence:

grammatical competence, discourse fluency, sociolinguistic competence, illocutionary

force, and strategic competence. Communicative competence encompasses many other

things than just picking up grammar naturally when exposed to meaningful contexts

(Klassen, 1981). It also requires an understanding of basic conversational etiquette.

There are many dimensions of communicative competence as well as many levels

of communicative proficiency. ACTFL developed the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines*

(1986) that served as a basis for teachers to determine students' proficiency levels.

Students could be tested using the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI). However, one

problem educators faced was the difficulty in assessing the language proficiency of K-12

learners, because the *Proficiency Guidelines* were developed for adult language learners.

One solution was the development of the *ACTFL Performance Guidelines for K-12*

Learners. Along with the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning,* which are content

standards, the proficiency guidelines are a way to measure the extent to which K-12

students are mastering the content. The three communicative modes linked with

Standards 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 of the Communication Goal are divided into interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational modes. The language performance descriptors are further categorized across the three modes. They are (a) comprehensibility, (b) comprehension, (c) language control, (d) vocabulary, (e) cultural awareness, and (f) communication strategies. The *ACTFL Performance Guidelines* include K-12 benchmarks for three ranges: Novice, Intermediate, and Pre-Advanced. The Novice level is subdivided into Novice-High, Novice-Mid, and Novice-Low categories. It is expected that learners using level one textbooks are considered Novice language learners, as defined by the *ACTFL Performance Guidelines*. Foreign language teachers must consider the target language proficiency level of their students when they design and implement classroom activities, tasks, situations, and communicative exchanges.

The novice learner varies greatly in what communicative tasks the learner can complete. It is expected that level one textbooks would correspond to level one learners in the following ways. The beginning of the level one textbook would be structured according to the communicative functions of the novice low learner. The middle of the book would correspond to the novice mid learner. The end of the book would have the communicative goals of the novice high learner. According to the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines for Speaking*, the novice low foreign language speaker is characterized by some or all of the following: (a) difficulty being understood by native speakers due to poor pronunciation, (b) limited conversational abilities aside from greetings and identifying familiar vocabulary, and (c) "no real functional ability". Novice mid speakers share elements from the novice low category such as: (a) limited comprehensibility, (b) minimal communicative ability, and (c) isolated chunks of vocabulary. Furthermore,

novice mid speakers answer questions briefly, they produce rehearsed language, and they rely on a particular context. Lastly, novice high speakers are the most capable of conversing about daily routines, preferences, and their needs. They are better at answering questions than asking, but they can respond in simple phrases when the topic is familiar. Textbook writers and publishers should consider the limited communicative abilities of novice learners when they design communicative activities for level one textbooks. Publishers should also promote activities that align with the learners' progress from novice low to novice high as they progress through the level one textbook.

The Role of Focus on Form Versus Focus on Function

One of the most polemic areas of foreign language learning is the debate centered on focus on form versus focus on function. Form refers to structural language components whereas function refers to communication of meaning. The terms accuracy and fluency are sometimes used synonymously for form and function. Focus on form is concerned with how a learner allocates his attention (Long & Robinson, 1998). Although most language teachers and researchers agree that grammar is important to language study, there exists some disagreement about to what extent grammar or a focus on form affects language learning. Savignon (1991) believed the problem lay not in whether students should have opportunities for authentic communication, but rather whether attention to form should outweigh the function. A confounding problem for some educators is determining what constitutes communication. For Savignon, classrooms with communicative competence as their learning goal should focus on all communicative experiences encompassing reading and writing as well as conversational exchanges. Forms or grammatical structures are vehicles in the language learning

process for engaging students in meaningful interactions with authentic and functional

language use (Brown, 2000). Fluency and accuracy are intertwined or interconnected,

although fluency is emphasized when meaningful engagement is the goal. Fluency,

according to VanPatten (2003) involves the minimal level of effort required to

communicate freely and with few errors. Non-instrumental language teaching does not

promote fluency because language and context are separated so that attention is paid to

form without consideration of its function (Johnson, 1988). This type of language

teaching promotes accuracy, or the "get it right from the beginning" philosophy. In

contrast, task-oriented teaching, common in communicatively oriented classrooms,

promotes language fluency; students are judged according to whether they have

completed a specific task, which requires an attention to meaning.

Researchers have studied the classroom implications of focus on form and focus

on function. For instance, VanPatten (1990) investigated if learners could attend

consciously to form and to meaning while processing input. He found that beginning

language students had trouble attending to both simultaneously. Learners must focus on

meaning before they can comprehend input. In addition, VanPatten found that form must

have some relevance or purpose if students are to consciously attend to it while also

listening for meaning. Practitioners must take into account this competition between

form and meaning when incorporating listening activities into their classes; students have

difficulty listening for form if it is not relevant to what they are studying. If tasks are

suited to the content lessons, it may be possible to focus on the form without disrupting

the meaning conveyed (Doughty & Varela, 1998). When the form in focus is an

important carrier of the meaning in focus, there are benefits to attending to both form and function simultaneously (Lightbrown, 1998).

The prevalence and the acceptance of communicative competence and communicative language teaching have shifted the focus from grammatical accuracy to communicating meaning. There are conflicting opinions about the role of grammar or forms in a communicatively oriented classroom. Focus on form should be provided when multiple students are speaking, and it should be brief and timely (Doughty & Varela, 1998). Terrell's view is that explicit teaching of grammar in the second language classroom does not parallel real world language situations. Interactions with native speakers do not provide grammatical explanations or structured grammatical practice because very often native speakers do not remember the grammatical rules nor do they have access to them (Terrell, 1995). His view contradicts VanPatten's finding that second language learners in classes acquire grammar more readily and they are more accurate than second language learners who do not participate in language classes (VanPatten, 1992b).

Communicative Language Teaching

Contemporary foreign language teaching emphasizes the principles of communicative competence. Foreign language classrooms structured around communicatively oriented goals must have teachers that employ communicative language teaching methods. Several methods of teaching fall under the umbrella of communicative language teaching. For example, The Natural Approach, content-based language teaching, learning across the curriculum, immersion, task-based instruction, and interactive learning are all communicatively oriented; these methods incorporate a focus

41

on meaning, learner-centered classrooms, multiple modes of communication, and authentic and purposeful language use (VanPatten, 2002).

There are common characteristics of effective Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) in practice. First, goals are centered around developing communicative competence, not grammatical competence or linguistic competence (Brown, 2000). Byrnes (1991) added that learners also must be cross-linguistically competent and cross-culturally competent in order to be communicatively competent. Second, natural, meaningful contexts are settings that encourage reception and production in a communicative classroom environment (Omaggio Hadley, 1983). It is essential to negotiate meaning in communication by creating a logical order of relevant and interesting language functions. These functions should be varied, and they should represent situations common in the target culture. Third, students should be encouraged to express themselves in the target language and to interact with other students by participating in creative, innovative, and culturally appropriate practice opportunities. Upon completing activities or tasks, educators should offer feedback to the students regarding their accuracy and precision. Finally, teachers should understand the learner's preferences and learning needs in order to achieve communicative competence.

Communicative competence and communicative language teaching require successful input processing and successful output processing (VanPatten, 2003). The output hypothesis has several implications for language teaching. It is evident that students need opportunities for meaningful practice both orally and in writing so that they may test hypotheses, reflect on their output, and be pushed to improve their communicative abilities. Teachers can foster opportunities for input and output in the

target language in many ways. Namely, the best conditions for language learning are open or flexible situations in which the students are free to interact (Omaggio Hadley, 1983; Wong-Fillmore, 1985).

Acquisition Activities

Teachers should be aware, however, that not all input leads to successful acquisition. In particular, common activities such as free conversation at the beginning levels of second language acquisition may not be helpful (Krashen, 1981). This is because free conversation may lack the characteristics of intake. Specifically, Krashen cited comprehension difficulties, imbalance between grammatical levels and syntactical levels of the speaker and the acquirer, and lack of progression as reasons why free conversation may not be beneficial to acquisition. He also classified drills and mechanical exercises as those devoid of all the characteristics of intake.

There are several types of activities that promote second language acquisition because they provide opportunities for input and output, and they satisfy the requirements for intake. Meaningful activities and communicative activities such as role-plays are one example of quality activities (Krashen, 1981). Krashen and Terrell (1983) described four different types of acquisition activities that should be incorporated into any good foreign language textbook. They are (a) affective-humanistic activities, (b) problem- solving activities, (c) games, and (d) content activities. The first group, affective-humanistic activities, include those activities where students exchange opinions, ideas, experiences, and reactions. These are most commonly evoked using dialogues, interviewing, ranking preferences, filling out charts and tables, revealing personal information, and using imagination. The second group, problem-solving activities, uses tasks, maps and graphs,

advertisements, and specific speech situations. Games are the third type of activity,

followed by content activities. These activities have a purpose of learning something

new besides language.

Group interaction is essential to language learning (Porter, 1986), and grouping

techniques can further enhance acquisition activities. Krashen and Terrell (1983)

identified restructuring, one grouping technique where students physically relocate

around the room. Other grouping techniques include one-centered grouping, where one

volunteer is the focus but the whole class participates. This technique differs from a

unified group, where all members are any size and students form many groups.

Furthermore, there are dyads, or partners, small groups, and large groups.

Textbooks

Textbooks are an important part of the curriculum because they are widely used in

American secondary schools. Westbury (1990) called textbooks "central tools" and

"central objects of attention" in the history of education. "There is no denying that the

textbook is an essential part of the curriculum" (Ariew, 1982, p. 16). Secondary teachers

and their students use the text and its ancillaries as a resource manual or a self-study tool

and textbooks provide the main source of information, guidance, and structure. The

textbook provides practice activities, vocabulary, cultural gambits, and reading

comprehension. Textbooks are so widely used, that by the end of high school the

majority of students will have come into contact with over 32 thousand textbook pages

(Chall & Conard, 1991). Secondary core subject textbooks account for about 10 % to 15

% of industry revenue and foreign language textbook sales account for about 10 % of

secondary textbook sales. Spanish textbooks comprise almost 6 % of those sales (Squire & Morgan, 1990).

Foreign Language Textbooks

There are many foreign language textbooks available on the market, and teachers need a way to evaluate the quality of those textbooks. One way to evaluate the quality is to consider the recommendations of foreign language scholars. There is a variety of characteristics that a good communicatively oriented foreign language textbook should include (Omaggio Hadley, 2001). First, it should have multiple contextualized and personalized practice activities representative of real life target language experiences. These activities should include interesting and relevant topics that encourage students to construct their own meaning individually or in group activities. Whenever possible, the text should include realia such as pictures, photos, tickets, schedules, or other documents that include authentic language (Omaggio Hadley, 2001) and authentic texts (Byrnes, 1991). Omaggio Hadley continued that early textbook chapters should contain clear grammatical explanations that foster accurate language use. In addition, activities in the book should transition from single words to sentences and paragraphs (Richard-Amato, 2003). The text should have ample opportunities for students to practice writing and revising their work. Richard-Amato (2003) grouped foreign language textbook selection guidelines into the following categories: purpose and motivation, appropriateness, format, authenticity, and teacher resources. The purpose of the textbook should be reflected in its design and its purpose is to develop the skill areas of reading, writing, speaking, and listening. While communication should incorporate the four skill areas, beginning language textbooks rarely distinguish between the cognitive levels needed to accomplish

tasks in each area. Consequently, the activities for each modality may be cognitively inappropriate (Swaffar, 1991).

It is common that foreign language textbooks reflect the pedagogical approaches or beliefs used in contemporary language teaching. More recent foreign language textbooks include practice exercises or activities in specific contexts, rules for using the language, and communicative goals. The contemporary textbook activities are in marked contrast to the rote drills of earlier texts (Swaffar, 1991). Specifically, the three most common types of drills used in classroom teaching and seen in foreign language textbooks are mechanical drills, meaningful drills, and communicative drills (VanPatten, 2003).

Another way to evaluate the quality of foreign language textbooks and the match between theory and practice is to examine the textbook activities. Communicatively oriented textbooks should include activities that promote the development of communicative competence and second language acquisition. The *Standards for Foreign Learning Spanish* (1999) provide a template to evaluate the quality of foreign language textbook activities.

<div align="center">National Standards</div>

In "The nature of the textbook controversy" Herlihy cited the 1983 publication *A Nation at Risk* as a catalyst for the revision of American curricula because of the reported "dumbing down" of textbooks (1992). *A Nation at Risk* (1983) reported several problems with textbooks that were in use during the 1980s. One problem was the lack of qualified textbook authors. This meant that publishers were relying on inexperienced textbook writers who had "written down" to sell their textbooks to a market that they thought

wanted a lower reading level. The results were catastrophic and the lower quality texts

led to the perceived laziness of students and unchallenging atmosphere of American

public schools. Schools spent less money on textbooks as a result, and those textbooks

adopted during that time were selected without the input of practicing teachers.

Subsequently, the quality of textbooks was again questioned at a 1985 meeting of the

National Association of State Boards of Education. From this concern developed a closer

examination of textbooks and their role in curricula.

To remedy the textbook malady, the report *A Nation at Risk* (1983) called upon

professional groups such as the Modern Language Association to produce new foreign

language instructional materials and to improve existing ones. Since the publication of

the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* in 1996 and 1999, foreign language or

world language textbook publishers have taken notice and have included content

integrated with the standards. This shift in alignment confirms the importance of the

textbook in schools across the United States.

> Most teachers still agree that the textbook has the greatest influence on daily
> instruction. Although local textbook selection should be based on some form of
> curriculum guide, in reality, the opposite is often true. Teachers tend to base their
> curricular goals and instruction on the textbook they have selected (Bartz & Keefe
> Singer, 1996, p. 166).

Using materials aligned with national foreign language standards is beneficial.

Bartz and Keefe Singer (1996) argued that higher standards in turn generate better

textbooks; when publishers strive to include all five goal areas in their curricular

materials, the textbook is revised and updated constantly to reflect the pedagogical

changes. The standards ensure that textbook publishers will produce standard-specific

curricular materials because many states with statewide textbook adoption require

textbooks to be aligned with state frameworks or guidelines (Phillips & Lafayette, 1996).

Foreign Language Standards

Foreign languages are difficult to master in a high school curriculum given the

limited access to the target language. *A Nation at Risk* (1983) highlighted this difficulty.

> Achieving proficiency in a *foreign language* ordinarily requires from four to six
> years of study and should, therefore, be started in the elementary grades. We believe
> it is desirable that students achieve such proficiency because study of a foreign
> language introduces students to non-English-speaking cultures, heightens awareness
> and comprehension of one's native tongue, and serves the nation's needs in
> commerce, diplomacy, defense, and education (p. 26).

Most students do not have access to year-long foreign language courses until their first

year of high school, although there are a few programs that have offerings in junior high

school.

The 1996 publication of the *National Standards: A Catalyst for Reform* included

five sections, designed to answer a set of core questions and answers. The first section,

or philosophy statement, answered what foreign language educators believed foreign

language education should be. The standards developers defined the goals by first

examining the philosophy statement and then asking what foreign language education

should prepare students to do. Next, each goal area encompassed standards and

curricular experiences taken from the essential skills and knowledge needed to achieve

the goals. Progress indicators for grades 4, 8, and 12 answered the question of how to

assess each student's progress toward meeting the goals. Lastly, sample learning

scenarios included examples of how to integrate the content with the standards.

The rationale underlying the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* (1996) is based on communication with other peoples of other cultures. Reading, speaking, and comprehending all facets of language are important skills needed in the 21st century. Communicating appropriately in face to face interactions and interpreting correctly the messages of different cultures through media and literatures are important.

There are five goal areas and each goal has corresponding standards. The Goal areas are numbered 1 to 5 and they include Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities, respectively. The Communication goal of the 1996 *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* is explained in this manner; "… to relate in a meaningful way to another human being, one must be able to *communicate*" (p.11). In the philosophy statement, communication is described along with language as the "heart of the human experience" (p. 7). This communication can take place in person, in writing, or through literature. Communication in the standards is defined as "knowing how, when, and why, to say what to whom" (p. 11). Previously in language teaching the how focused on grammar while the what focused on vocabulary. Currently the communicative focus on the why, the whom, and the when refer to the sociolinguistic and the cultural language aspects. Communication may be verbal or non-verbal, as in gestures.

There are three communicative modes according to *The Standards for Foreign Language Learning* (1996). Standard 1.1 is the interpersonal mode. The interpersonal mode requires individuals to negotiate meaning, which leads to successful communication. This mode includes conversation, reading, and writing. Standard 1.2 is the interpretive mode. The interpretive mode refers to cultural interpretations in written

form and spoken form. Standard 1.3 is the presentational mode. The presentational

mode involves creating messages to members of other cultures without opportunity for

negotiation.

National standards offer a way to equalize foreign language educational

experiences. Richard-Amato (2003) recognized the value of standards as guidelines with

universal applications. Students have different needs, and these needs require instruction

that allows for the following: (a) maintenance of language strengths, (b) development of

thematic strengths lacking support at home, (c) language usage for reading and writing

(*Standards for Foreign Language Learning*, 1996).

According to the standards, the communicative approach used in most foreign

language classrooms today promotes genuine interaction with others. This interaction

can take place internationally, nationally, or locally. The 21st century demands good

communication skills of its citizens. "It is difficult to imagine a job, a profession, a

career, or a leisure activity in the twenty-first century which will not be enhanced by the

ability to communicate efficiently and sensitively with others" (p. 12). Communication

encompasses acquisition of communicative strategies such as circumlocution, guessing

intelligently, getting meaning from context, understanding and interpreting gestures,

asking for clarification, forming and testing hypotheses, generalizing, drawing

conclusions, and maintaining balance while communicating (*Standards for Foreign

Language Learning,* 1996).

The follow up to the 1996 publication of the *Standards for Foreign Language

Learning* was published in 1999. This document contained much of the same

information as previously explained, but it was also expanded. The new document

contained language-specific standards encompassing nine languages. Each language

provided contained background information as well as sample progress indicators and

learning scenarios pertinent to each language. This edition included examples of

applications for grades K-16.

Content Analysis

Content analysis is defined as an objective and systematic technique for analyzing

message content and message handling (Ahuvia, 2001; Budd, Thorp, & Donohew, 1967;

Holsti, 1969). The goal of content analysis is to make valid inferences from text (Weber,

1990) from essentially verbal, symbolic, or communicative data (Krippendorff, 1980;

2004). The three components of content analysis as defined by Holsti (1969) are (a)

objectivity, (b) system, and (c) generality.

Content analysts use descriptive statistical data such as raw numbers, percentages,

proportions, ratios, and frequency counts. Numbers are presented in graphs, charts,

tables, and cross tabulations (Budd, Thorp, & Donohew, 1967). Content analysts study

manifest content, which looks at the clear and obvious meaning (denotative meaning) and

latent content, which refers to the subtler and less straightforward meaning of a text

(connotative meaning) (Ahuvia, 2001; Budd, Thorp, & Donohew, 1967; Holsti, 1969,

Krippendorff, 1980; 2004).

Content analysis requires systematically following a prescribed sequence of steps

or procedures. There are six basic steps the content analyst follows. They are: (a)

identifying the sampling unit, (b) identifying the recording units, (c) developing the

coding categories and the coding forms, (d) evaluating the coding forms, (e) coding the

data and managing the recording process, and (f) analyzing the data.

After a researcher has a hypothesis, the researcher must decide which documents to examine. One process essential to any content analysis is sampling. Sampling in content analysis requires several steps. The researcher must choose content from the total available universe of documents and select a reasonable amount of content for analysis. Then, the sample of documents is further reduced into a manageable size that will still yield generalizable findings. Data are broken down into smaller pieces called units. These units are hierarchically ordered. The units are sampling units, recording units, and coding units. The recording unit is smaller than the sampling unit. The smallest unit is a coding unit, which includes a word or a lone symbol (Budd, Thorp, & Donohew, 1967; Holsti, 1969; Krippendorff, 1980; 2004; Weber, 1990).

Once the researcher has selected the content to be analyzed, the researcher must create categories to organize the data. The researcher should establish the guidelines or the indicators that determine data placement into categories. Categories must be exhaustive, mutually exclusive, independent (Holsti, 1969), and appropriate (Budd, Thorp, & Donohew, 1967). Sometimes it is necessary to create a miscellaneous category for those data that do not follow the coding rules (Budd, Thorp, & Donohew, 1967). The coders must have an understanding of coding rules to accurately determine in what categories the data belong. In addition, the categories should follow a single classification system. Lastly, the most important rule is that the categories should reflect the research problem.

Once the data have been coded, the researcher can analyze and interpret the data. Frequency counts and cross tabulations are the most common types of descriptive

statistics. Depending on the nature of the research questions, the researcher may use

simple descriptive statistics or inferential statistics. Examples of content analyses of

foreign language textbooks follow.

Content Analyses of Foreign Language Textbooks

To find studies of content analyses of foreign language textbooks, the researcher

conducted a search of the following eight electronic databases: First Search, ProQuest

Digital Dissertations, World Cat, The MLA International Bibliography, The Electronic

Journal Center, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), The Wilson Web and

EBSCO Host. The researcher conducted a broad search using various keywords and

subject heading combinations. Some of the search terms included the following

combinations: modern languages and curriculum, modern languages and study, teacher

education and standards, modern languages and aims and objectives, modern languages

and teaching, secondary education, Spanish language and teaching methods, Spanish

language and learning, Spanish language and study, conversation method and language

teaching, Spanish language and textbooks, Spanish language textbooks and evaluation,

textbooks and readability, content analysis and communication, Spanish language and

content analysis, and education standards and content analysis. The studies chosen for

this section of the literature review were included for their relevance to Spanish,

textbooks, and content analysis.

There are few content analyses of foreign language textbooks. The nine studies

that follow highlight content analyses of foreign language textbooks. The studies are

grouped into three categories: three studies focused on grammar and its presentation and

placement in the Spanish language textbook, three studies with a historical analysis of

past textbooks in comparison to contemporary textbooks, and three studies of cultural and political factors presented in foreign language textbooks. The first of three grammar content analyses follows.

Cheng (2002) looked at the effects of processing instruction and acquisition of two commonly used and commonly confused Spanish verbs, *ser* and *estar*. She continued a study that examined the role of explicit grammar instruction via processing and traditional methods. She found that while *ser* and *estar* are presented early in beginning Spanish language textbooks, students do not acquire them quickly or effectively. In fact, *ser* is the more commonly used default verb. It is only when the strategy of overusing the verb is replaced with a more effective strategy do students begin to produce the forms accurately and in the correct context. Cheng recommended that textbook authors consider two things; authors should explicitly present *ser* and *estar* and their uses or consider reordering them in congruence with the time when they are naturally acquired.

The second grammatically focused content analysis of Spanish textbooks was conducted by Terrell (1990). He described five parameters in his framework for describing methodological trends in 17 beginning college textbooks and 5 beginning high school textbooks. The parameters are (a) communication activities/grammar exercises, (b) contextualization/non-contextualization, (c) meaningful/role (sic), (d) open/closed (divergent/convergent), and (e) interactive/non-interactive. In addition, he reported the trends in textbooks from 1963 to 1987 by studying six editions of the same textbook.

Terrell found that current texts are different both quantitatively and qualitatively from the textbooks of the 1960s and 1970s. The shift in teaching towards communication was reflected in the textbooks.

In the third grammatically focused analysis reviewed here, Van Naerssen (1995) studied the structure of the future in Spanish foreign language textbooks. The perisphratic future, also known as the ir + a + infinitive structure, is easier for beginning students to use than the future tense. Despite the sequence of the book or the presentation of the future tense, students use this construction more readily. She noted, however, that some publishers of communicative texts have begun to reorganize the material around content instead of structures. This enables the student ways to communicate the student's meaning and needs using appropriate content.

The next group of content analyses are comparisons between contemporary textbooks and previous textbooks. In her content analysis of twentieth century Spanish textbooks, Pardiñas-Barnes (1998) reflected on the historical importance of the textbook. "Spanish textbooks are the central classroom literature that drives instructional scope and sequence and generates the goals and objectives of second language acquisition across American public schools" (p. 230). Her review encompassed books published between 1860 and 1998. These years were further divided into four generations: (a) Precursor Generation (1860-1898), (b) New Humanist Generation (1899-1929), (c) Progressive Generation (1930-1959), and (d) Integrated Generation (1960-1998). The Precursor Generation was marked by eclectic formats that focused on grammar, whereas the New Humanist Generation texts incorporated what to teach and how to teach it. Readers were the most popular, followed by single-author texts and anthologies. During the

55

Progressive Generation, world events such as the war and the collapse of the stock market led to cost effective minimalist texts with reduced grammar. Thus, integrated texts or integrated textbook series were born. Lastly, the Integrated Series Generation saw many changes including shifting the focus from how to teach languages to how to learn languages. Technological advances such as the language lab and the audiolingual method impacted this generation the most.

In the second historical comparison content analysis, Lally (1998) revisited past recommendations to improve foreign language textbooks to see if they were implemented. Some of the problems cited with earlier textbooks included lack of sufficient writing activities, grammar in isolation, repetitive drills, unfamiliar vocabulary, unrealistic situations, lack of cohesion and coherence, and long, drawn out activities. Lally examined textbooks for the inclusion of writing skills, the format of activities, and the inclusion of forced-choice practice exercises. She found great variety among the textbooks and she concluded that while there has been progress, many textbooks are still lagging behind current research. Namely, textbooks need to incorporate the trend toward communication and away from mechanical drills. Furthermore, while there is no formula for what percentage of activities or writing exercises to include, Lally recommended that practitioners apply current research to their textbook evaluation and their model for best practices.

The last content analysis of past textbooks and present textbooks was conducted by VanPatten (1998). VanPatten examined six popular contemporary Spanish language textbooks published by six different publishers. His purpose was to find out how each text was considered to be communicative in nature. What he found was that each lesson

starts with a list of vocabulary, each chapter contains a grammar section separated from the vocabulary section, and all but one text refer to communication as speaking. There is a possible explanation for the misunderstanding that communication is merely speaking. VanPatten suggested that the ACTFL proficiency guidelines that tested oral proficiency in the form of an interview contributed to the belief that communication is equal to oral proficiency, or speaking. Another commonly held belief is that the label "communicative" refers to a goal or intended outcome. He identified four predominant activities in those texts labeled communicative. In the communicative activities, students describe pictures, they answer structured questions, they role-play, and they interview each other. His criticism of these types of activities stems from that fact that students do not have to do anything with the information gleaned from these exercises; their use is arbitrary and it only serves to practice previous lessons without any real communicative purpose. Another finding across the six textbooks was that they were all formulaic with little variety in the manner in which they presented the concepts. He explained that the communicative label indicated applying what was previously learned by incorporating vocabulary and grammar.

The last group of content analyses of foreign language textbooks examines the influence of social factors and political factors. Sunderland, Cowley, Rahim, Leontzakou, and Shattuck (2001) researched the bias in the foreign language text and the teacher talk around the text. They highlighted the decades of the 1970s and 1980s as periods of increased examination of gender bias in foreign language textbooks. In particular, the examination of English as a Second Language (ESL) textbooks for stereotypical themes was prevalent. The themes included the overrepresentation of men

in powerful roles and occupations, the limited discourse both in participation and topic selection by women, the physical representation of women as objects, and other gender stereotypical activities. Their study divided texts into gendered categories: gender neutral categories, gender specific categories and non-gendered categories. Sunderland et al. (2001) offered practical suggestions for combating sex stereotyping. Teachers can use additional resources instead of relying solely on the text, they can point out flaws in the texts and ask students for their input, and use humor and role reversal. Moreover, they believed that talking around the text when dealing with gendered stereotypical issues could be highly productive as a means to combat sexist dialogue in society. This study highlighted the ways in which teachers can overcome the limitations of a politically incorrect textbook or a culturally insensitive textbook.

The second content analysis of social and political factors in the foreign language textbook was done by Ramírez and Hall (1990). They examined the cultural content of secondary Spanish textbooks in New York schools. They researched the cultural content from various perspectives: sociocultural, socio-linguistic, and curricular design. They recognized several areas of concern. For example, the textbook publishers and authors underrepresented many countries where Spanish is spoken and there was little mention of Spanish speakers in the United States. Moreover, authors highlighted only certain cultural aspects while the everyday events went unnoticed. Lastly, the majority of photographs portrayed middle class citizens and upper class citizens when the majority of Spanish speakers did not reflect this socioeconomic class. Ramírez and Hall reasoned

that the cultural representation did not reflect the cultural reality because textbook publishers catered to a generally conservative public audience to sell their product in a mass market.

The final content analysis of social and political issues explores sexism in foreign language textbooks. Graci (1989) reviewed and critically compared 20 studies conducted between 1975 and 1984. These studies focused mainly on biased language and under-representation of women in English textbooks and readers. Graci's purpose was to investigate four areas: (a) to review nonsexist guidelines, (b) to examine previous research on sexism, (c) to compare research on sexism in foreign language textbooks with categories of analysis that appear in the literature and (d) to conduct a cross comparison of foreign language textbook studies. One problem common to most of the studies was the imprecise definitions of sexism. Graci criticized the studies on sexism for the lack of explicit and replicable methodologies. He recommended that future research on foreign language textbooks utilize systematic, quantifiable, and replicable methodologies. In addition, he identified the need for a standardized evaluation instrument for evaluating sexual bias in textbooks as a way to eradicate bias from future textbooks.

Based on the review of the limited existing literature, there was a need for a content analysis of level one Spanish secondary textbooks and their alignment with the standards. This dissertation will contribute to the body of literature about textbooks, foreign language standards, and content analysis. Future research can examine the other goal areas with respect to their alignment with the standards. Moreover, this research can be replicated to include textbooks of other levels.

Summary and Focus of Study

Second language acquisition research and foreign language education share the same goal of communicative competence. As the number of Spanish speakers continues to increase, the need for individuals who can communicate effectively in Spanish also increases. One way to meet the demand for individuals who are communicatively competent in Spanish is through foreign language education in secondary schools. Level one textbooks are important to the study of Spanish in secondary schools because they are the first level at which language learners begin and they provide a basis for language learning. Therefore, it was important to examine the quality of level one Spanish textbooks. The *Standards for Learning Spanish* provided a template for evaluating the quality of textbooks. Moreover, content analysis provided a systematic and objective research method for evaluating the alignment of the textbooks with the standards. In particular, the content analysis of level one textbooks focused on the Communication Goal and its accompanying three standards.

Research Questions

1. To what extent do the activities in the textbook meet Standard 1.1 and in what skill areas does the activity require students to engage?

2. To what extent do the activities in the textbook meet Standard 1.2 and in what skill areas does the activity require students to engage?

3. To what extent do the activities in the textbook meet Standard 1.3 and in what skill areas does the activity require students to engage?

4. To what extent do the components of the activities (e.g., directions, responses) in the textbook require students to communicate in Spanish?

CHAPTER III

METHODS

This chapter is organized into two main sections. The first section is called Identification of the Textbooks, and this section describes the three textbooks and their components. The second section is the Procedures. The Procedures section is organized into the six major steps of content analysis. The steps are: (a) identifying the sampling unit, (b) identifying the recording units, (c) developing the coding categories and the coding forms, (d) evaluating the coding forms, (e) coding the data and managing the recording process, (f) analyzing the data.

Identification of the Textbooks

This study was a content analysis of the communicative activities in level one Spanish textbooks and to what extent the activities aligned with Communication, the first goal of the *Standards for Learning Spanish* (1999). The communicative activities were in three chapters from three different level one Spanish textbooks. The three textbooks were *¡Buen Viaje!, Paso a Paso,* and *¡Ven Conmigo!*. The textbooks were included for this study because they met the following four criteria: (a) publication date, (b) edition, (c) popularity, and (d) representation. First, the textbooks were published after the 1999 language specific standards were released. This copyright date was important for two reasons. First, because the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning* were first

published in 1996, it gave publishers at least three years to respond to the language

specific standards and address the Five Cs in the textbooks. Long before the standards

were published, there were drafts available to educators and those interested in foreign

languages. In addition, the textbooks that were selected for this study had a 2000 and a

2003 copyright date, indicating that they had additional time to revise the textbooks to

incorporate the 1996 Standards and the 1999 language specific standards. Each textbook

reviewed for this study had included information about the standards. The publishers

listed the standards in the beginning of the textbooks and there were notes to the teachers

in the margins. The second criterion for inclusion was that the textbooks were in their

second edition or higher; this indicated that they had been revised and they were widely

used in the United States. Third, the textbook titles appeared on the adoption lists of

Florida, Texas, or California, the three largest and most influential states for textbook

adoption. Several states follow the textbook recommendations of Florida, Texas, and

California. Lastly, the publishers whose textbooks were selected represent a large share

of the secondary school textbook publishing market.

The first textbook in this study was *¡Buen Viaje!,* published in 2003 by

Glencoe/McGraw-Hill. *¡Buen Viaje!* is a multi-level textbook series that has partnered

with National Geographic to include vistas or images of the Spanish speaking world. In

addition to vistas are several resources available like transparencies, audio programs,

workbooks, videos, Total Physical Response (TPR) storytelling, situation cards,

conversation activities, online activities, and an interactive CD-ROM. The assessment

resources for teachers are numerous and include the following: a game show style test

preparation video, chapter quizzes and answers, performance assessments, test booklet

encompassing reading, writing, listening, and answers, a CD-ROM test bank, and the Interactive Lesson Planner. As most teachers and students have ready access to the textbook and other aforementioned resources are optional, it is the textbook and the activities therein that were important to this study. *¡Buen Viaje!* divides the content of its 14 chapters into prioritization categories: required, recommended, and optional. This prioritization allows teachers on block schedules and traditional schedules to pace their delivery of the content. The required sections include *Vocabulario, Estructura*, and *Conversación*. The recommended sections are *Lecturas Culturales, ¡Te Toca a Ti!,* and Assessment. The optional sections are *Lectura Opcional, Conexiones* and *Tecnotur*. Each chapter (with the exception of preliminary lessons before chapter one) includes these sections: *Vocabulario, Estructura, Conversación, Pronunciación, Lecturas Culturales, Conexiones, ¡Te Toca a Ti!,* Assessment, and *Tecnotur*.

The second textbook in this study was *Paso a Paso*, published in 2000 by Prentice-Hall, Inc. *Paso a Paso* is a multi-level series and level one is divided into 14 chapters. There are several components of the *Paso a Paso* program. There are transparencies, audio, clip art, crosswords, videos, CD-ROMs, website activities, take home videos, workbooks, written, audio and video activities, situation cards, and a work text. Teachers have assessment tools such as vocabulary quizzes, chapter quizzes, chapter proficiency tests, an idea bank for additional testing, video quizzes, a test generator, a Teacher's Resource File, and a Resource Pro CD-ROM. Each of the 14 chapters shares the following sections: *¡Piensa en la cultura!, Vocabulario para conversar, Perspectiva cultural, Gramática en contexto, Todo junto, Repaso*, and *Resumen del vocabulario*. These sections are also labeled pedagogically according to

which of the five steps of the pedagogical model they address. The five steps of Prentice

Hall's model are: (a) Introducing/Previewing, (b) Presenting, (c) Practicing, (d)

Applying, and (e) Summarizing/Assessing.

The third and final textbook, *¡Ven Conmigo!,* published in 2003 by Holt, Rinehart

and Winston, is a multi-level textbook program. There are several technological

resources that accompany the textbook, including a video program, DVD tutor, CD-ROM

tutor, Internet support, and a planner/CD-ROM test generator for teachers. The ancillary

materials are voluminous: workbooks, lesson plans, make-up assignments, TPR

storytelling, grammar tutor, audio activities, practice activities, transparencies, testing

program, native speaker activity guide, exploratory guide, and alternative assessments.

The textbook offers lesson plans for traditional schedules and block schedules, although

it does not distinguish between material that is required, recommended, or optional.

¡Ven Conmigo! has 12 chapters and each chapter is divided into three *pasos*, or steps.

Within each *paso*, there are always the sections called *Así se dice, Vocabulario*, and

Gramática. Other sections within most chapters are *Panorama Cultural, Encuentro*

Cultural, Vamos a leer, Más práctica gramatical, Repaso, and *A ver si puedo*.

<div align="center">Procedures</div>

Content analysis was the methodology for this study. Content analysis is an

objective and systematic method for analyzing communication (Ahuvia, 2001; Budd,

Thorp, & Donohew, 1967; Holsti, 1969, Krippendorff, 1980; 2004). Three components

of content analysis are (a) objectivity, (b) system, and (c) generality (Holsti, 1969).

There are six steps or procedures the researcher must follow when conducting a content

analysis (Ahuvia, 2001; Budd, Thorp, & Donohew, 1967; Holsti, 1969, Krippendorff,

1980; 2004). The six steps are as follows: (a) identifying the sampling unit, (b) identifying the recording units, (c) developing the coding categories and the coding forms, (d) evaluating the coding forms, (e) coding the data and managing the recording process, and (f) analyzing the data. A description of the content analysis steps and their application to this study follows.

Step 1: Identifying the Sampling Unit

The first step or procedure in content analysis is to identify the sampling unit. Sampling requires a sampling plan to limit the content to a quantity that is manageable yet representative of the universe (Ahuvia, 2001; Budd, Thorp, & Donohew, 1967; Holsti, 1969, Krippendorff, 1980, 2004). Selecting the sampling unit may require several sub steps. The content analyst determines what content exists in the universe of documents and then samples a portion of content from the universe. If the data are voluminous, the analyst may need to conduct multiple stages of sampling.

For this dissertation, the researcher used a two-step process to select the sampling unit for this study. The first step in identifying the sampling unit was selecting the level one Spanish textbooks based on the publication date, the edition, the popularity, and the representation. The second step in identifying the sampling unit was selecting the chapters from each textbook. Two textbooks had 14 chapters and one textbook had 12 chapters, for a total of 40 chapters. The researcher selected three chapters out of each of the three textbooks, for a total of nine chapters. The researcher selected these nine chapters based on two criteria: chapter themes and placement of the chapter within the textbook. First, the chapters had a thematic continuity. The nine chapters were divided into three similar themes. The themes were school, family, and celebrations. The second

criterion is that they represented the beginning, the middle, and the end of the book, to allow for a continuum of instruction. Moreover, it was expected that the communicative tasks represented in the later chapters would require more interaction and higher levels of communicative competence. The themes of the final chapters allowed students to talk about their individual experiences using more complex grammatical constructions and more variety in their responses. Table 2 lists the chapter numbers, the chapter titles, and the chapter themes.

Table 2

The Chapter Numbers, Chapter Titles, and Chapter Themes

Textbooks	Chapter Number and Chapter Title	Chapter Theme
¡Buen Viaje!	3-Las compras para la escuela 6-La familia y su casa 10-Diversiones culturales	School Family Cultural events
Paso a Paso	2-¿Qué clases tienes? 5-¿Cómo es tu familia? 14-¡Vamos a una fiesta!	School Family Parties and celebrations
¡Ven Conmigo!	3 -Nuevas clases, nuevos amigos 6 -Entre familia 10- Celebraciones	School Family Celebrations

The three chapters from textbook 1, *¡Buen Viaje!* were Chapters 3, 6, and 10. They are titled *Las compras para la escuela*, *La familia y su casa*, and *Diversiones culturales*. The first theme was school, the second theme was family, and the third theme was cultural events. The three chapters from textbook 2, *Paso a Paso,* were Chapters 2, 5, and 14. They were titled *¿Qué clases tienes?, ¿Cómo es tu familia?,* and *¡Vamos a una fiesta!*. The first theme was school, the second theme was family, and the third

66

theme was parties and celebrations. The three chapters from textbook 3, *¡Ven Conmigo!,* were Chapters 3, 6, and 10. They were titled *Nuevas clases, nuevos amigos, Entre familia*, and *Celebraciones*. The first theme was school, the second theme was family, and the third theme was celebrations.

Step 2: Identifying the Recording Units

The second step in content analysis is identifying the recording units. The recording units are smaller pieces of content derived from the sampling unit. Recording units are what the content analyst will analyze. Recording units can be further divided into five categories: (a) physical units, (b) syntactical units, (c) referential units, (d) propositional units, and (e) thematic units. These recording units vary across media (Krippendorff, 1980; 2004).

This study used physical units as its recording units. Physical units are those units that have physical boundaries, where the message is contained within a physical boundary (Krippendorff, 1980; 2004). The recording units in this study were the communicative activities within the nine chapters. One or all of the following physically defined them: colors, boxes, icons, headings, chapter placement, and sequential numbering. The communicative activities were designed to be used in the classroom as a means to practice students' Spanish. The accompanying directions instructed students to work individually, to work with a partner, or to work in small groups. The communicative activities required students to communicate using any or all of the four skills: listening, reading, writing, and speaking. There were 251 recording units, or communicative activities in the nine chapters. Table 3 identifies the recording units.

Table 3

Recording Units in Textbook 1, Textbook 2 and Textbook 3

Textbook	Chapter Number and Chapter Title	Number of activities	Number of coding forms
¡Buen Viaje!	3-Las compras para la escuela	22	88
	6-La familia y su casa	29	116
	10-Diversiones culturales	22	88
Paso a Paso	2-¿Qué clases tienes?	25	100
	5-¿Cómo es tu familia?	21	84
	14-¡Vamos a una fiesta!	22	88
¡Ven Conmigo!	3-Nuevas clases, nuevos amigos	35	140
	6-Entre familia	37	148
	10-Celebraciones	38	152
	Totals for all 3 books:	251	1004

There were 73 recording units in textbook 1, *¡Buen Viaje!*. The communicative activities were identified in the following manner. They had green, numbered boxes and the numbering of the activities was sequential.

There were 68 communicative activities in textbook 2, *Paso a Paso*. They were identified in the following manner. They had multicolored, numbered boxes. The numbering of the activities was sequential, but it was divided into two groups. The first group of color coded, numbered activities began with the number one and continued to the teens. The second group of color coded, numbered activities began with the number one and ended with a number below ten. There were 68 activities coded in *Paso a Paso*.

There were 110 communicative activities in textbook 3, *¡Ven Conmigo!*. They were identified in the following manner. They were numbered activities with sequenced boxes that were color-coded in blue, purple, teal and orange.

Step 3: Developing the Coding Categories and the Coding Forms

The third step in content analysis is developing the coding categories and the coding forms. Content analysis involves creating a set of categories linked to the research problem and the research questions. Content analysis requires careful attention to coding categories, so coders can reliably code the data. The three most important criteria of coding categories are the following: coding categories must be (a) exhaustive, (b) mutually exclusive and independent, and (c) appropriate (Budd, Thorp, & Donohew, 1967, Holsti, 1969; Krippendorff, 1980; 2004). Exhaustive coding categories means that there are enough categories for the coder to determine where the data belong. A miscellaneous coding category is often used to ensure that the categories are exhaustive. In this study, there is an unsure coding category for when there is not enough information provided to determine if the coding decision is yes or no. Mutually exclusive categories are categories such as yes/no or true/false where placement in one category excludes the other categories. Data cannot be placed in more than one category when the categories are mutually exclusive, as in the case of dichotomous categories. In this study, the researcher had mutual exclusivity in the coding decisions because the choices yes and no signified a presence or absence of qualities. The last criterion is that the coding categories are appropriate. Appropriate categories are directly linked to the research problem. The researcher developed appropriate coding categories, because they were explicitly linked to the three Spanish communication standards.

The content analyst uses the coding categories to develop the coding forms. Coding forms are paper and pencil tools or data sheets the content analyst uses to code the data. The most important part of the coding forms or data sheets is the coding

69

categories. There is other important information on the form including the research questions, the recording units, the coding categories, and responses or choices. The content analyst provides directions, definitions, or examples on the coding forms to assist the coders in making decisions. Similar to survey design, in content analysis there are issues of face validity, formatting, readability, and ease of use. To have face validity the coding form must appear to measure what the content analyst wants to know. In this study, the coding forms had face validity because they were explicitly linked to the wording in the foreign language standards. One glance revealed the connection between the coding form and the standards. In addition, issues such as spacing, font, size, orientation, and readability are important considerations when developing coding forms. An explanation of the development process of the coding categories and the coding forms for this study follows.

The researcher developed four coding forms for this dissertation. Each form corresponded to a research question. Each communicative textbook activity or recording unit had four forms: Coding Form A, Coding Form B, Coding Form C, and Coding Form D. Coding Forms A-D are found in Appendices A-D. Coding Forms A-D corresponded to Research Questions 1-4, respectively. Each coding form contained information taken from the Communication Goal in the *Standards for Learning Spanish (1999)*. Form A aligned with Standard 1.1, Form B aligned with Standard 1.2, and Form C aligned with Standard 1.3. In contrast, form D addressed general characteristics about the activities. The data collected from each form allowed the researcher to make a judgment about the extent to which the communicative activities met Goal One. A brief description of each coding form follows.

Coding Form A: Standard 1.1

Form A aligned with Standard 1.1 of the *Standards for Learning Spanish*.

Standard 1.1 states that "students engage in conversations, provide and obtain

information, express feelings and emotions, and exchange opinions" (p. 440). The format

of each coding form was relatively similar. Each of the four coding forms was vertically

oriented and it had demographic information at the top left side of the form. The forms

included space for the book title, the chapter number, the page number of the activity, and

the number of the activity. Each form had the corresponding standard printed underneath

the demographic data. There were five rows of questions on Form A and each row was

divided into two columns. In the left column of the form there were questions and

examples of sample progress indicators and on the right column of the form there were

coding response categories. Rows one through four aligned directly with Standard 1.1

and row five aligned with the Framework of Communicative Modes, also taken from the

Standards for Foreign Language Learning. There were three responses for questions 1

through 4: Yes, No, and Unsure. There were corresponding boxes underneath the

responses Yes, No, and Unsure for the coder to select. Question 5 asked the coder to

select skills such as Speaking, Writing, Listening, and Reading. There were boxes below

each skill area or communicative path. In each coding form, there were two sections that

followed the questions. The first section, notes, allowed the coder to record any extra

information and the second section allowed the researcher to record or to tabulate data.

These sections were not divided into columns, rather they extended across the width of

the form.

Coding Form B: Standard 1.2

Form B had the same format as Form A. Form B aligned with Standard 1.2, "students understand and interpret spoken and written Spanish on a variety of topics" (p. 441). For the purposes of this dissertation, it was assumed that thematically selected chapters of a level one Spanish textbook limited the range of topics. Therefore, the selected phrase "on a variety of topics" was excluded from the coding forms and analysis. In addition to the demographic data and Standard 1.2, there were three rows of questions divided into two columns. Rows one and two included questions and examples that directly aligned with Standard 1.2. In contrast, Question 3 in row three asked what communicative mode or skill area the activity required students to use. Responses for Questions 1 and 2 were the same as the responses for Form A (Yes, No, and Unsure) and responses for Question 3 were Listening, Reading , Viewing, or None/Not Applicable. The responses were located on the right side of the form and the coder checked a box underneath each response. Form B also contained a section for notes and a space for the researcher to record additional data.

Coding Form C: Standard 1.3

Form C had the same format as Forms A and B. There were spaces for demographic data at the top, followed by Standard 1.3. Form C aligned with Standard 1.3, "Students present information, concepts, and ideas to an audience of listeners or readers on a variety of topics in Spanish" (p. 443). The phrase "on a variety of topics" was omitted again because there was little variety in the level one chapters selected for analysis. On the left side of the coding form there were three rows of questions. Questions 1 and 2 corresponded to Standard 1.3 and Question 3 corresponded to the skill

areas or communicative paths each activity required students to use. There were examples from the sample progress indicators beneath Questions 1 and 2. In the right column of the form were the responses of Yes, No, and Unsure, with corresponding boxes. The responses for Question 3 were Speaking, Writing, Showing, and None/Not Applicable. The notes section was repeated along with the space for the researcher to analyze data.

Coding Form D: Other Activity Characteristics

The last coding form, Form D, was not directly aligned with Standards 1.1, 1.2, or 1.3, although the format was similar to Forms A, B, and C. It contained a section for demographic data at the top of the form. This coding form was designed to measure to what extent the activities required students to use Spanish. On the left hand side of the form there were three rows and each row had one question about the activities. On the right side of the form there were response options. Questions 1 and 2 had four response options, with a box to check underneath each option. Question 1 was concerned with the language of the written directions that accompanied each activity whereas Question 2 was concerned with the language in which students were directed to respond. The choices for Question 1 were Primarily English, Primarily Spanish, About Equal Amounts of English and Spanish, and an Interpretation/Translation. Question 2 choices were English, Spanish, Either Language, or Not Specified. The last question, Question 3, asked in what language was the activity. The responses for question three were Primarily English, Primarily Spanish, or About Equal amounts of English and Spanish. There were boxes

underneath each response category. Directly after Questions 1 through 3, there were

sections for notes and a section for the researcher. The researcher's section was the last

part of each coding form.

Step 4: Evaluating the Coding Forms

The fourth step in content analysis is evaluating the coding forms. The

purpose of evaluating the coding forms is to establish the validity and the reliability of

the forms. If there are problems in using or interpreting the forms, the data collection

process may be unreliable. The content analyst should design the forms in such a way

that anyone who reads the directions, follows the coding rules, and is trained can

accurately and reliably code the data.

Content analysts need to evaluate the coding forms for readability, reliability, face

validity, and content validity. Readability refers to the extent to which the form is easily

and clearly written for readers. Reliability refers to the ability to produce the same results

from the same data, regardless of application (Krippendorff, 1980; 2004). Face validity

is how the form appears to measure the concept being studied (Weber, 1990) and content

validity is how the form correctly measures the content of the study.

The researcher used a three-step process to evaluate the coding forms for this

dissertation. The first two steps involved a one on one evaluation with expert evaluators.

The expert evaluator can assist the content analyst in determining the quality of the

coding forms. Areas such as readability, spacing, structure, and format can be assessed.

Assessment provides valuable feedback to the content analyst. For this dissertation, the

researcher conducted the first one on one evaluation with a content analysis expert.

There were four significant changes proposed and later implemented as a result of the

74

evaluation. The first recommendation was to change the orientation of the forms from horizontal to vertical. The horizontal forms were originally designed as matrices, with the standards on the left side and the communicative modes (interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational) on the top. The second recommendation involved formatting the statements into numbered questions and providing examples of each standard below the questions. The researcher used the examples from the sample progress indicators highlighted in the standards. The third recommendation required changing the form from two columns with yes and no responses into one column with yes, no, and unsure categories. In addition, the content analysis expert suggested boxes underneath the yes, no, and unsure choices. The last recommendation was to add a fourth coding form. The first three coding forms corresponded to Standards 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. The researcher and the content analysis expert were interested in the amount of Spanish students were using to communicate, because the Communication Goal is that students communicate in Spanish. Therefore, the researcher designed a fourth form to collect general characteristics about the amount of Spanish used in the communicative activities.

The second one on one evaluation occurred between the researcher and the Chair of the Department of Languages of a small, private, liberal arts college. The researcher chose the second expert evaluator for her knowledge of Spanish and her vast teaching experience. The evaluation took place after the preliminary evaluation of the coding forms by the content analysis expert. Some of the same changes were mentioned, such as the spacing and the orientation of the forms. The veteran teacher and the researcher studied the foreign language standards and sample progress indicators to select the most concrete and clearly worded examples. For instance, Standard 1.1 encompasses four

components: (a) engaging in conversations, (b) providing and obtaining information, (c) expressing feelings and emotions, and (d) exchanging opinions. In the sample progress indicators section of the standards, however, Standard 1.1 is not separated into four components. There are sample indicators that overlap some of the parts. For the coding forms, the researcher needed concrete examples for each component of Standard 1.1 (e.g. what words convey feelings and emotions) to help the coder determine if the activity fulfilled each of the four parts. In addition, because the sample progress indicators listed in the foreign language standards are for grade 8 and grade 12, the foreign language expert evaluator identified the progress indicators relevant to level one Spanish courses. Level one Spanish courses are those typically offered in the first year of high school, but they may be offered during grades 7-12. No other changes to the coding forms were recommended.

The third step in evaluating the coding forms for validity and reliability is to conduct a trial coding. The purpose of conducting a trial coding is twofold. First, the trial coding allows the researcher and the coder to test the forms. This trial coding process is one way for the researcher to check whether the coding categories and the coding forms are objective and clearly written. Second, the reliability can be measured by the amount of agreement reached in the coding decisions.

The researcher and an additional coder conducted the pilot test of the coding process for this dissertation. The researcher and a trained second coder coded a sample from one textbook. The second coder is an educator who has extensive knowledge of the Spanish language. The researcher and the second coder examined 15 communicative activities from one randomly selected chapter from *¡Ven Conmigo!*. The selected chapter

was not one of the nine chapters previously selected for the study. The 15 activities generated 60 coding forms. This amount of data required the researcher and the second coder to make enough coding decisions to check the quality and clarity of the forms. During the pilot test process, the researcher examined any discrepancies or systematic errors in the coding forms and coding decisions, and the researcher changed the forms accordingly.

The researcher and the second coder examined 15 activities from *¡Ven Conmigo!* in the same manner. The researcher gave the second coder a binder with 60 coding forms photocopied on colored paper, and included one extra form of Coding Forms A-D in case the coder made a mistake. Each of the four Coding Forms A-D was a different color, and the activities from the textbook were photocopied on white paper. Each section of the binder was separated by tabs, and the forms were arranged in the following order: 16 Coding Forms A, 16 Coding Forms B, 16 Coding Forms C, and 16 Coding Forms D. In the binder were detailed instructions to the second coder about how and where to mark each form and what to do if the coder had trouble placing data. The pilot coding process took place during one week. The researcher instructed the second coder to keep the photocopied activities for discussion and to return all the Coding Forms A-D to the researcher. The researcher created a table to record the response patterns from the researcher and the second coder. The researcher marked her response patterns first, and added the response patterns from the second coder once the second coder returned her binder. For every coding decision, the researcher tabulated each response, and whether the researcher and the second coder agreed or disagreed on that decision. If the researcher and the second coder disagreed, the researcher highlighted that particular

question on the coding form in order to follow up with the second coder. Once the

response patterns were tabulated, the researcher and the second coder had an appointment

to discuss any discrepancies.

When the researcher and the second coder first discussed the pilot coding process,

the discussion began with Form A. The main finding that emerged was that Question 2

on Form A would almost always be answered affirmatively in every communicative

activity across all textbooks. The reason for answering yes was that the researcher and

the second coder considered that the phrase "provide and obtain information" included

very basic tasks common to all activities, such as answering questions, responding yes or

no, and filling in blanks. Most of the activities in the pilot coding asked the students to

do at least one of those things. The other finding about Form A was that almost every

activity would require students to read in Spanish, either by reading the directions,

reading the questions in the activity, or reading responses the students had written.

The pilot coding process also revealed the following about Coding Forms B and

C. First, the second coder had difficulty coding correctly the activities using Coding

Forms B and C, for similar reasons. According to the *Standards for Learning Spanish*,

the standards addressed in Forms B and C reflect interpretive and presentational modes.

Standard 1.2 refers to the interpretation of authentic texts and literary works, as well as

oral and listening comprehension from multiple authentic media sources. Therefore, on

Coding Form B, the communicative paths listed were listening, reading, and viewing.

The second coder understood reading on Form B as reading the directions of an activity,

or listening as in the case of listening during conversation with a partner. These

communicative modes referred to the modes already listed on Form A, the interpersonal

mode. The second coder had a similar problem with Form C. The presentational mode

encompasses a one to many format, as in the case of listening to presentations or giving

presentations to an audience. The skill areas are speaking, writing, and showing.

Speaking and writing as specified in Standard 1.3 refer to writing speeches, stories,

letters, etc. and presenting them to others. However, speaking and writing are also listed

on Form A as communicative paths for the Interpersonal mode. The repeated use of

communicative paths or skills (speaking, writing, reading, listening) confused the second

coder into marking the same choice on multiple forms, when the communicative path had

already been addressed on Form A. The researcher read the exact language used in the

explanation of each standard along with some sample progress indicators to the second

coder. It then became clear to the second coder that the yes answers she had marked on

Coding Forms B and C did not apply to Standards 1.2 and 1.3, as explained in the

Standards for Learning Spanish. The original discrepancies in the researcher's and the

second coder's coding response patterns were not disagreements in coding decisions.

The coding decisions were very clear once the second coder understood the language of

each standard and the examples. Once the second coder realized that she had incorrectly

coded some of the activities, she changed her affirmative responses to negative responses

when appropriate. The researcher and the second coder reached a consensus on each

coding decision during the pilot coding process.

Another important finding emerged from the pilot coding process. When the

researcher and the second coder agreed that the interpretive and the presentational modes

were not frequently met in the activities, the response patterns on Forms B and C became

all negative. The negative response patterns indicated that a change was necessary to

Coding Forms B and C. If the answers to each question were no, it became impossible to check which of the communicative paths was used. The researcher and the second coder decided it was necessary to include another response category on the forms. The new category indicated that no communicative paths (or none of the above) were used in the activity, because the coding decisions were negative. This no or none of the above category was not necessary for Form A, because in the pilot coding process there was never an activity that generated all negative response patterns. Thus, one of the four communicative paths (speaking, writing, listening, reading) on Form A would always be checked.

Step 5: Coding the Data and Managing the Recording Process

The fifth step in content analysis is coding the data. Coders may be the content analyst or someone who is trained by the content analyst. Content analysts who code their own data usually do so when it is not necessary to have multiple coders. If the content analyst trains a coder, it is imperative that the coder follow the directions of the analyst to ensure proper coding. If there are multiple coders, the coders should reach a high inter-rater agreement. The coders should be able to record the data essentially the same way, and the results should be replicable (Krippendorff, 1980; 2004).

In this dissertation, the researcher was the coder. There were two reasons for this decision. First, the coding categories and the coding forms were well defined and the coding decisions were objective. Second, the pilot test coding revealed any unanticipated problems with the coding forms, and these problems were resolved by the researcher prior to coding the actual data. Consequently, the need for a second coder was greatly reduced.

The multi-step coding process was as follows. First, the researcher photocopied the selected nine chapters from the three textbooks. This allowed the researcher to number the activities from 1-251 so that they aligned with the numbering system of the coding forms. The 251 recording units or communicative activities generated 1,004 coding forms. Coding Forms A-D were photocopied onto colored paper, to distinguish between each form. Form A was pink, Form B was yellow, Form C was green, and Form D was blue. The researcher used three binders to organize the data collection process. Each textbook had a separate binder, divided into three sections. The three sections corresponded to the three chapters. The researcher coded each chapter separately. First, the researcher coded the three chapters of textbook 1, then the three chapters of textbook 2, and finally the three chapters of textbook 3. All Coding Forms A were completed across the three books, then all Coding Forms B, all Coding Forms C, and Coding Forms D. Once the data were collected, the researcher reduced the data from 1,004 coding forms to 251 forms. This made the data entry and the data analysis more manageable. (The data summary form titled Summary Coding Forms A-D is located in Appendix E.) Each form represented one activity, and the paper was divided into four columns. Each column summarized the response patterns from Form A, Form B, Form C, and Form D. By checking the data again, the researcher was able to verify that each original coding form had been properly and completely filled out. Lastly, the new 251 summary sheets provided an easy method for transforming the yes, no, and unsure responses into the numerical codes necessary for data analysis. Finally, the researcher entered 251 lines or observations of data and imported the data file into Statistical Analysis Software for frequency counts.

Step 6: Analyzing the Data

The sixth and final step of content analysis is analyzing the data. Data analysis is the step where the content analyst makes inferences and generalizations about the data. Data analysis in quantitative content analysis usually involves descriptive statistical data such as raw numbers, percentages, proportions, ratios, and frequency counts. Rather than describe the findings with words, numbers are presented in graphs, charts, tables, and cross tabulations (Budd, Thorp, & Donohew, 1967).

In this dissertation, the data analysis was a multi-step process. First, the researcher entered the data and calculated descriptive statistics such as frequency counts and percentages for each coding form. Each of the four coding forms was tabulated separately. Second, the researcher summarized the coding form response patterns that emerged. The response patterns were summarized by book and by chapters. These patterns allowed the researcher to summarize the findings about Research Questions 1-4. For Standards 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3, the researcher was able to report to what extent the communicative activities in the textbooks met Goal One. There were three evaluation decisions for evaluating the extent to which the standards had been met: (a) met, (b) partially met, (c) not met. The researcher decided the extent to which a standard had been met, based on the number of components met within each standard. The guidelines for making the evaluation decisions are listed in Table 4.

Table 4

Evaluation Criteria

Standards	Number of components present in each communicative activity		
	Standard met	Standard partially met	Standard not met
1.1	3-4	2	0-1
1.2	2	1	0
1.3	2	1	0

In Coding Form A, the standard had been met if three or four of the components of the standard were present. If two of the four of the components of the standard were present, the standard had been partially met. If one or zero of the four components was present, the standard had not been met. As there were only two questions directly taken from the standards in Coding Form B and Coding Form C, the evaluation decisions for meeting the standards were different than in Coding Form A. If two of the two components of the standard were present, the standard had been met. If one of the two components of the standard was present, the standard had been partially met. If none of the two components of the standard was present, the standard had not been met. Then, the researcher reported the skill areas or communicative paths (e.g. listening, speaking, reading, writing) that the activities required students to engage in and elaborated on the overall characteristics of each activity. Lastly, the researcher calculated frequency counts and percentages about Question 4. Question 4 addressed the amount of Spanish required by the activities.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter is divided into two main sections. In the first section the results from Research Questions 1-4 are presented. The extent to which each of the 251 activities has met the standards is identified. In addition, the frequencies for each communicative path (reading, writing, listening, speaking, showing, viewing) used in Standards 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 are presented. The second section is a chapter summary.

Overall Results

Research Question 1

Research Question 1 corresponded to Standard 1.1. Research Question 1 addressed Standard 1.1 of the *Standards for Learning Spanish* and the communicative paths used or skill areas in Standard 1.1. The first part of Research Question 1 examined if the communicative activities in the textbooks met, partially met, or did not meet the standard. The second part of the question examined what communicative paths or skill areas the activity required. There is a series of four tables (5.1-5.4) that present the results of Research Question 1. There are summaries of the data by book and by chapter. Table 5.1 presents a summary of the extent to which the 251 activities across the three textbooks met, partially met, or did not meet Standard 1.1.

Table 5.1

Summary Standard 1.1: The Extent to Which the Activities Met the Standard by Book

Textbooks	# of Activities	Standard Met		Standard Partially Met		Standard Not Met	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!	73	4	5.47	26	35.51	43	58.90
Paso a Paso	68	5	7.35	38	55.88	25	36.76
¡Ven Conmigo!	110	27	24.54	34	30.90	49	44.54
Total	251	36		98		117	

Seventy-three activities in *¡Buen Viaje!* were chosen for analysis. In *¡Buen Viaje!,* only four activities (5.47%) met the standard, twenty-six (35.51%) partially met the standard, and forty-three (58.90%) did not meet the standard. In the second textbook, *Paso a Paso*, only five of the 68 activities (7.35%) analyzed met the standard. Thirty-eight activities (55.88%) partially met the standard, and twenty-five activities (36.76%) did not meet the standard. There were 110 activities analyzed in the third book, *¡Ven Conmigo!*. Compared with the first two books, *¡Ven Conmigo!* had a higher percentage of activities that met Standard 1.1. Twenty-seven of the 110 activities (24.54%) met the standard, thirty-four (30.90%) partially met the standard, and forty-nine (44.54%) of the activities did not meet the standard.

Overall, the activities in the textbooks did not meet the standards. It was hypothesized that the location of the chapter in the textbook (beginning, middle, end) would affect the level of communicative competence required to complete the activities. To determine if later chapters in the book emphasized communicative skills more often than the beginning chapters, the data were analyzed by chapter as well as by book.

There were three chapters from each textbook analyzed. Table 5.2 lists the frequency and the percentages of the activities per chapter that met, partially met, or did not meet Standard 1.1.

Table 5.2

Standard 1.1: The Extent to Which the Activities Met the Standard by Chapter

Textbooks	# of Activities	Standard Met		Standard Partially Met		Standard Not Met	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!							
Ch. 3	22	1	4.55	9	40.91	12	54.55
Ch. 6	29	0	0.00	13	44.83	16	55.17
Ch. 10	22	3	13.64	4	18.18	15	68.18
Total	73	4		26		43	
Paso a Paso							
Ch. 2	25	2	8.00	11	44.00	12	48.00
Ch. 5	21	2	9.52	11	52.38	8	38.10
Ch. 14	22	1	4.55	16	72.73	5	22.73
Total	68	5		38		25	
¡Ven Conmigo!							
Ch. 3	35	9	25.71	9	25.71	17	48.57
Ch. 6	37	9	24.32	11	29.73	17	45.95
Ch. 10	38	9	23.68	14	36.84	15	39.47
Total	110	27		34		49	

In Chapter 3 of *¡Buen Viaje!,* one of the 22 activities (4.55%) met the standard, nine (40.91%) partially met the standard, and twelve (54.55%) did not meet the standard. In Chapter 6, none of the 29 activities met the standard. Thirteen (44.83%) partially met the standard, and sixteen (55.17%) did not meet it. The last chapter analyzed, Chapter 10, had three of 22 activities (13.64%) that met the standard. Four (18.18%) partially met Standard 1.1, and fifteen (68.18%) did not meet Standard 1.1.

In the second textbook, *Paso a Paso*, two of the 25 activities (8.00%) met the standard. Eleven activities (44.00%) partially met the standard and twelve activities (48.00%) did not meet the standard. There were also two out of 21 activities (9.52%) that met the standard in Chapter 5 of *Paso a Paso*. Eleven activities (52.38%) partially met the standard, and eight activities (38.10%) did not meet it. In Chapter 14, one of the 22 activities (4.55%) met the standard. Sixteen (72.73%) partially met it, and five (22.73%) did not meet Standard 1.1.

The last book, *¡Ven Conmigo!,* had nine activities out of 35 (25.71%) that met the standard in Chapter 3. Nine (25.71%) also partially met the standard, and seventeen (48.57%) did not meet Standard 1.1. In Chapter 6, nine of the 37 activities (24.32%) met the standard, and eleven (29.73%) partially met the standard. Seventeen activities (45.95%) did not meet it. In Chapter 10, nine of the 38 activities (23.68%) met the standard. Fourteen activities (36.84%) partially met the standard, and fifteen (39.47%) did not meet Standard 1.1.

In books one, two and three, the activities did not meet Standard 1.1. The analysis by chapter also indicated that the activities in later chapters were no better at meeting the standards than activities in the beginning chapters. In the case of these three textbooks, the alignment of the communicative activities with Standard 1.1 did not change much from the beginning of the book to the end of the book.

Communicative Paths: Standard 1.1

The second part of Research Question 1 examined the communicative paths used in the activities. Communication Standard 1.1 encompasses four communicative paths or skills: speaking, writing, listening, and reading. In the analysis of communicative paths,

it is likely that the textbook activities will overlap in the four skill areas. Thus, the

percentages will not add up to 100%. There are two tables (Tables 5.3 and 5.4) that

present the frequencies and percentages of the communicative paths used in the activities.

Table 5.3 presents a summary of the frequencies and percentages of the communicative

paths across the three textbooks.

Table 5.3

Summary Standard 1.1: The Communicative Paths Used by Book

Textbooks	# of Activities	Speaking		Writing		Listening		Reading	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!	73	29	39.72	4	5.47	30	41.09	64	87.67
Paso a Paso	68	36	52.94	29	42.64	36	52.94	67	98.52
¡Ven Conmigo!	110	40	36.36	53	48.18	62	56.36	95	86.36
Total	251	105		86		128		226	

In the first textbook, *¡Buen Viaje!,* twenty-nine activities out of 73 activities

(39.72%) required students to speak Spanish. Four activities (5.47%) required writing

and thirty (41.09%) required listening in Spanish. Sixty-four activities (87.67%) required

reading. The percentage of activities in *¡Buen Viaje!* that required speaking and reading

is about equal, whereas almost 88% of activities required reading in Spanish. Writing

was the communicative path that was emphasized the least. The second textbook, *Paso a*

Paso, required speaking and listening in 36 activities out of its 68 activities (52.94%).

Twenty-nine activities (42.64%) included writing and all but one activity (98.52%)

required reading. As in the first textbook, reading was the communicative path used most

frequently. The third textbook, ¡Ven Conmigo!, had 40 activities out of 110 activities

(36.36%) that required speaking, and 53 activities (48.18%) that required writing. Listening was part of 62 activities (56.36%) and reading was part of 95 activities (86.36%). The pattern that emerged from all three textbooks was that reading was the communicative path used most frequently, followed by listening. Speaking and writing were used less frequently, but the usage varied across the textbooks.

The last table in the series of four tables aligned with Research Question 1 is Table 5.4. The percentages of communicative paths used in Standard 1.1 will not add up to 100% because in many activities the communicative paths overlap. The communicative paths that align with Standard 1.1 are speaking, writing, listening, and reading. In Table 5.4, the frequencies and percentages of the communicative paths required in the activities is presented by chapter across the three textbooks.

A good textbook activity should incorporate multiple communicative paths. In level one, reading would be the most frequently used communicative path- especially in the beginning chapters. As students become more communicatively competent, activities should require more target language production in the form of speaking and writing. Thus, the communicative paths were analyzed by chapter, to reflect the change in communicative paths required from the beginning of instruction to the end. The data did not reflect the increased use of speaking and writing in later chapters. In the first textbook, *¡Buen Viaje!,* there were 22 activities in Chapter 3. Ten of these activities (45.45%) required speaking and two activities (9.09%) required writing. Eleven (50.00%) required listening and nineteen (86.36%) required reading. Chapter 6 had 29 activities.

Table 5.4

Standard 1.1: The Communicative Paths Used by Chapter

Textbooks	# of Activities	Speaking		Writing		Listening		Reading	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!									
Ch. 3	22	10	45.45	2	9.09	11	50.00	19	86.36
Ch. 6	29	13	44.83	0	0.00	13	44.83	24	82.76
Ch. 10	22	6	27.27	2	9.09	6	27.27	21	95.45
Total	73	29		4		30		64	
Paso a Paso									
Ch. 2	25	10	40.00	12	48.00	10	40.00	24	96.00
Ch. 5	21	12	57.14	9	42.86	12	57.14	21	100.00
Ch. 14	22	14	63.64	8	36.36	14	63.64	22	100.00
Total	68	36		29		36		67	
¡Ven Conmigo!									
Ch. 3	35	14	40.00	17	48.57	21	60.00	27	77.14
Ch. 6	37	12	32.43	19	51.35	19	51.35	34	91.89
Ch. 10	38	14	36.84	17	44.74	22	57.89	34	89.47
Total	110	40		53		62		95	

Thirteen of the 29 activities (44.83%) required speaking and none of the activities required writing. Thirteen activities (44.83%) also required listening and twenty-four (82.76%) required reading. In Chapter 10, there were six activities out of 22 activities (27.27%) that required speaking. Two (9.09%) required writing, six (27.27%) required listening, and twenty one (95.45%) required reading.

In book two, *Paso a Paso*, ten activities of the 25 activities (40.00%) in Chapter 2 required speaking. Twelve activities (48.00%) required writing, ten activities (40.00%) required listening, and twenty-four activities (96.00%) required reading. In Chapter 5, out of the 21 activities, twelve (57.14%) required speaking and nine (42.86%) required writing. Twelve activities (57.14%) required listening and all of the 21 activities required

reading. In Chapter 14, fourteen of the 22 activities (63.64%) required speaking. Eight

activities (36.36%) required writing, fourteen activities (63.64%) required listening, and

all 22 activities required reading.

In book three, *¡Ven Conmigo!,* there were 35 activities in Chapter 3. Fourteen

(40%) required speaking, seventeen (48.57%) required writing, twenty one (60.00%)

required listening, and twenty-seven (77.14%) required reading. In Chapter 6, 12 of the

37 activities (32.43%) required speaking, and nineteen (51.35%) required writing and

listening. Thirty-four of the 37 activities (91.89%) required reading. There were 38

activities in Chapter 10. Fourteen activities (36.84%) required speaking and seventeen

activities (44.74%) required writing. Twenty-two activities (57.89%) required listening

and thirty-four activities (89.47%) required reading.

Research Question 2

Research Question 2 aligned with Standard 1.2. It was divided into two parts.

The first part was designed to answer to what extent the 251 activities sampled from

¡Buen Viaje!, Paso a Paso, and *¡Ven Conmigo!* met Standard 1.2 of the *Standards for*

Learning Spanish. The second part examined the communicative paths or skill areas

used in the activities. In Standard 1.2, the communicative paths are listening, reading, or

viewing. If the standard was not met, the communicative path was none of the above or

not applicable. There is a series of four tables (Tables 6.1-6.4) that present the findings

for Research Question 2. Table 6.1 presents a summary of the extent to which the 251

activities across the three textbooks met, partially met, or did not meet Standard 1.2.

Table 6.1

Summary Standard 1.2: The Extent to Which the Activities Met the Standard by Book

Textbooks	# of Activities	Standard Met		Standard Partially Met		Standard Not Met	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!	73	0	0.00	4	5.47	69	94.52
Paso a Paso	68	0	0.00	2	2.94	66	97.05
¡Ven Conmigo!	110	0	0.00	29	26.36	81	73.63
Total	251	0		35		216	

None of the 251 activities across the three books met Standard 1.2. Of the 73 activities examined from book one, *¡Buen Viaje!,* only four activities (5.47%) partially met the standard, whereas sixty-nine activities (94.52%) did not meet the standard. Of the 68 activities examined from book two, *Paso a Paso*, only two (2.94%) partially met the standard, whereas sixty-six (97.05%) did not meet the standard. Of the 110 activities analyzed from book three, *¡Ven Conmigo!,* twenty-nine activities (26.36%) partially met Standard 1.2, whereas eighty-one activities (73.63%) did not meet the standard. In comparison to the other two textbooks, *¡Ven Conmigo!,* had the highest percentage of activities that met Standard 1.1, and the highest percentage of activities that partially met Standard 1.2.

As in the case of Standard 1.1, later chapters should have contained more activities that met Standard 1.2. Since no activities met Standard 1.2 across the three textbooks, those activities that partially met the standard should have been located in later chapters. However, the data did not reflect that a greater number of activities that

partially met standard were located in later chapters. Table 6.2 lists the frequencies and

percentages of activities that met, partially met, or did not meet standard 1.2. The data

were analyzed by chapter.

Table 6.2

Standard 1.2: The Extent to Which the Activities Met the Standard by Chapter

Textbooks	# of Activities	Standard Met		Standard Partially Met		Standard Not Met	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!							
Ch. 3	22	0	0.00	3	13.64	19	86.36
Ch. 6	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	28	96.55
Ch. 10	22	0	0.00	0	0.00	22	100.00
Total	73	0		4		69	
Paso a Paso							
Ch. 2	25	0	0.00	1	4.00	24	96.00
Ch. 5	21	0	0.00	1	4.76	20	95.24
Ch. 14	22	0	0.00	0	0.00	22	100.00
Total	68	0		2		66	
¡Ven Conmigo!							
Ch. 3	35	0	0.00	10	28.57	25	71.43
Ch. 6	37	0	0.00	10	27.03	27	72.97
Ch. 10	38	0	0.00	9	23.68	29	76.32
Total	110	0		29		81	

None of the 251 activities across the three textbooks met Standard 1.2. In the first

textbook, *¡Buen Viaje!,* there were 22 activities analyzed in Chapter 3. Three activities

(13.64%) partially met the standard and nineteen (86.36%) did not meet the standard.

Chapter 6 had one activity out of 29 activities (3.45%) that partially met the standard, and

the rest of the activities (96.55%) did not meet the standard. In Chapter 10, all 22

activities (100.00%) did not meet the standard.

Paso a Paso, the second textbook, had 25 activities in Chapter 2. Only one activity (4.00%) partially met the standard, and the rest of the activities (96.00%) did not meet the standard. Chapter 5 had 21 activities. Only one (4.76%) partially met Standard 1.2, and the other twenty (95.24%) did not meet it. There were 22 activities in Chapter 14, and all 22 activities (100%) did not meet the standard.

The third textbook, *¡Ven Conmigo!,* had 35 activities in Chapter 3. Ten (28.57%) partially met Standard 1.2, and twenty-five (71.43%) did not meet it. Chapter 6 had 37 activities. Ten (27.03%) partially met the standard and twenty-seven (72.97%) did not meet the standard. There were 38 activities in Chapter 10. Nine (23.68%) partially met the standard, and twenty-nine (76.32%) did not meet it.

Communicative Paths: Standard 1.2

The second part of Research Question 2 examined the communicative paths associated with Standard 1.2. The three communicative paths associated with Standard 1.2 are listening, reading, and viewing. In addition, there was a category called none of the above or not applicable, for those activities that did not require listening, reading, or viewing as described in Standard 1.2. As in the communicative paths for Standard 1.1, it is possible to communicate using more than one path simultaneously. Therefore, the percentages may not add up to 100% in some cases. If an activity did not meet the standard, there were no communicative paths used. Table 6.3 presents a summary of the frequencies and percentages of the communicative paths used by textbook.

Table 6.3

Summary Standard 1.2: The Communicative Paths Used by Book

Textbooks	# of Activities	Listening		Reading		Viewing		None N/A	
		<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>f</u>	<u>%</u>
¡Buen Viaje!	73	4	5.47	0	0.00	0	0.00	69	94.52
Paso a Paso	68	0	0.00	2	2.94	0	0.00	66	97.05
¡Ven Conmigo!	110	23	20.90	5	4.54	9	8.18	81	73.63
Total	251	27		7		9		216	

¡Buen Viaje!, the first textbook, had four activities out of 73 activities (5.47%) that required listening, and 69 activities (94.52%) did not require any of the communicative paths (listening, reading, or viewing). *Paso a Paso*, the second book, had two activities out of 68 activities (2.94%) that required reading. Sixty-six activities (97.05%) did not require any of the communicative paths. *¡Ven Conmigo!,* the third book, had the highest percentage of communicative paths used, and it also had each communicative path represented. Listening was used in 23 of the 110 activities (20.90%). Reading was used in five activities (4.54%), and viewing was used in nine activities (8.18%). Eighty-one activities (73.63%) did not require listening, reading, or viewing. *¡Ven Conmigo!* had a higher percentage of activities that required listening, reading, and viewing than the other two books combined. Moreover, of the three communicative paths, listening was the communicative path most frequently used.

The communicative paths for Standard 1.2 were analyzed by chapter. No strong pattern developed to indicate that the activities in later chapters used more

communicative paths than in beginning chapters. Table 6.4 lists the frequencies and

percentages of activities by chapter that required listening, reading, viewing, or none of

the above.

Table 6.4

Standard 1.2: The Communicative Paths Used by Chapter

Textbooks	# of Activities	Listening		Reading		Viewing		None N/A	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!									
Ch. 3	22	3	13.64	0	0.00	0	0.00	19	86.36
Ch. 6	29	1	3.45	0	0.00	0	0.00	28	96.55
Ch. 10	22	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	22	100.00
Total	73	4		0		0		69	
Paso a Paso									
Ch. 2	25	0	0.00	1	4.00	0	0.00	24	96.00
Ch. 5	21	0	0.00	1	4.76	0	0.00	20	95.24
Ch. 14	22	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	22	100.00
Total	68	0		2		0		66	
¡Ven Conmigo!									
Ch. 3	35	8	22.86	2	5.71	3	8.57	25	71.43
Ch. 6	37	7	18.92	2	5.41	3	8.11	27	72.97
Ch. 10	38	8	21.05	1	2.63	3	7.89	29	76.32
Total	110	23		5		9		81	

In the first textbook, *¡Buen Viaje!,* there were 22 activities in Chapter 3. Only one

communicative path was used in this chapter. Three activities (13.64%) required

listening and nineteen (86.36%) required no communicative paths. Chapter 6 had 29

activities. Listening was used in one activity (3.45%) and the other twenty-eight

activities (96.55%) required no communicative path. There were 22 activities in Chapter

10, and none of them required any communicative paths.

Paso a Paso, book two, had 25 activities in Chapter 3. Reading was the only communicative path used. One activity (4.00%) required reading and the other 24 activities (96.00%) did not require any communicative paths. In Chapter 5, one activity out of 21 activities (4.76%) required reading. Twenty (95.24%) required no communicative paths. Of the 22 activities in Chapter 14, no communicative paths were required.

In the third book, *¡Ven Conmigo!,* there were 35 activities in Chapter 3. Eight (22.86%) required listening, two (5.71%) required reading, and three (8.57%) required viewing. Twenty-five (71.43%) required no communicative paths. Chapter 6 had 37 activities. Seven of the 37 activities (18.92%) required listening, two (5.41%) required reading, and three (8.11%) required viewing. Twenty-seven activities (72.97%) did not require any communicative paths. In Chapter 10, there were 38 activities. Eight (21.05%) required listening and one (2.63%) required reading. Three (7.89%) required viewing and twenty-nine (76.32%) did not require any communicative paths.

Book three, *¡Ven Conmigo!* utilized the most communicative paths, and the communicative paths varied across the activities. It was the book that had the most number of partially met standards, and the communicative paths are aligned with the standards. It divided the communicative paths proportionately across chapters.

Research Question 3

The third research question was aligned with Standard 1.3. It was divided into two parts. The first part was designed to answer to what extent the 251 activities sampled from *¡Buen Viaje!, Paso a Paso,* and *¡Ven Conmigo!* met Standard 1.3 of the *Standards for Learning Spanish*. The second part examined the communicative paths or skill areas

required in the activities. The communicative paths for Standard 1.3 are speaking, writing, or showing. In addition, there was a category called none of the above or not applicable, for those activities that did not require speaking, writing, or showing as described in Standard 1.3. As in the communicative paths for Standard 1.1 and 1.2, it is possible to communicate using more than one path simultaneously. Therefore, the percentages may not add up to 100% in some cases. If an activity did not meet the standard, there were no communicative paths used. Table 7.1 lists a summary of the frequencies and percentages of activities that met, partially met, or did not meet Standard 1.3 by book.

Table 7.1

Summary Standard 1.3: The Extent to Which the Activities Met the Standard by Book

Textbooks	# of Activities	Standard Met		Standard Partially Met		Standard Not Met	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!	73	0	0.00	3	4.10	70	95.89
Paso a Paso	68	0	0.00	1	1.47	67	98.52
¡Ven Conmigo!	110	0	0.00	20	18.18	90	81.81
Total	251	0		24		227	

None of the 251 activities across the three textbooks met Standard 1.3. Book one, *¡Buen Viaje!,* had three activities out of 73 activities (4.10%) that partially met the standard, and seventy activities (95.89%) that did not meet the standard. Book two, *Paso a Paso*, had only one activity out of 68 (1.47%) that partially met the standard. The remaining 67 activities (98.52%) did not meet the standard. Book three, *¡Ven Conmigo!,* had 20 activities out of 110 (18.18%) that partially met the standard and 90 activities

(81.81%) that did not. As in the case of the Standards 1.1 and 1.2, *¡Ven Conmigo!,* had

the highest percentage of partially met standards when compared to books one and two.

While none of the three books had activities that met Standard 1.3, and the first two

books had low percentages of partially met standards, *¡Ven Conmigo!,* is the book that

came the closest to meeting the standards.

As in the first two standards, the frequencies and percentages of activities that

met, partially met, or did not meet Standard 1.3 were reported by book and also by

chapter. The frequencies and percentages for Standard 1.3 are listed in Table 7.2.

Table 7.2

Standard 1.3: The Extent to Which the Activities Met the Standard by Chapter

Textbooks	# of Activities	Standard Met		Standard Partially Met		Standard Not Met	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!							
Ch. 3	22	0	0.00	1	4.55	21	95.45
Ch. 6	29	0	0.00	1	3.45	28	96.55
Ch. 10	22	0	0.00	1	4.55	21	95.45
Total	73	0		3		70	
Paso a Paso							
Ch. 2	25	0	0.00	0	0.00	25	100.00
Ch. 5	21	0	0.00	1	4.76	20	95.24
Ch. 14	22	0	0.00	0	0.00	22	100.00
Total	68	0		1		67	
¡Ven Conmigo!							
Ch. 3	35	0	0.00	4	11.43	31	88.57
Ch. 6	37	0	0.00	9	24.32	28	75.68
Ch. 10	38	0	0.00	7	18.42	31	81.58
Total	110	0		20		90	

As previously stated, none of the 251 activities across the three textbooks met Standard 1.3. The first textbook, *¡Buen Viaje!,* had 22 activities in Chapter 3. Only one activity (4.55%) partially met the standard, and the remaining activities (95.45%) did not meet the standard. In Chapter 6, one of the 29 activities (3.45%) partially met the standard. The other 28 activities (96.55%) did not meet the standard. Of the twenty-two activities in Chapter 10, one (4.55%) partially met the standard and twenty one (95.45%) did not.

In *Paso a Paso*, book two, none of the 25 activities (100.00%) in Chapter 2 met the standard. One activity (4.76%) out of 21 activities in Chapter 5 partially met the standard. The other twenty activities (95.24%) in Chapter 5 did not meet Standard 1.1. In Chapter 14, none of the 22 activities (100.00%) met the standard.

¡Ven Conmigo! had 35 activities in Chapter 3. Four activities (11.43%) partially met the standard and thirty one (88.57%) did not meet Standard 1.3. In Chapter 6, nine of the 37 activities (24.32%) partially met the standard and twenty-eight (75.68%) did not meet the standard. Chapter 10 had 38 activities. Seven (18.42%) partially met the standard and thirty one (81.58%) did not meet it.

Communicative Paths: Standard 1.3

The second part of Research Question 3 examined which communicative paths or skill areas were used in the activities. The three communicative paths associated with Standard 1.3 are speaking, writing, and showing. There was another category called none of the above or not applicable, for the activities that did not require speaking, writing or showing as defined in Standard 1.3. It is possible that communicative paths will overlap. Table 7.3 lists a summary of the communicative paths by book.

Across the three books, none of the 251 activities required showing.

In textbook one, *¡Buen Viaje!,* three of the 73 activities (4.10%) required speaking and seventy (95.89%) of the 73 activities did not require any communicative paths. In textbook two, *Paso a Paso*, one activity (1.47%) of the 68 activities required speaking and sixty-seven (98.22%) activities did not require any communicative paths.

Table 7.3

Summary Standard 1.3: The Communicative Paths Used by Book

Textbooks	# of Activities	Speaking		Writing		Showing		None N/A	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!	73	3	4.10	0	0.00	0	0.00	70	95.89
Paso a Paso	68	1	1.47	0	0.00	0	0.00	67	98.52
¡Ven Conmigo!	110	2	1.81	18	16.36	0	0.00	90	81.81
Total	251	6		18		0		227	

In textbook three, *¡Ven Conmigo!,* two activities (1.81%) required speaking and 18 activities (16.36%) required writing. Ninety of the 110 activities (81.81%) did not require any communicative paths. Across the three textbooks, speaking was the only communicative path in common. However, there were only six activities across all three textbooks that required speaking. The other communicative path used was writing, but only *¡Ven Conmigo!* had any activities that required writing. It had 18 activities that required writing, compared to only two activities that required speaking.

In a similar manner to the communicative paths from Standards 1.1 and 1.2, the communicative paths from Standard 1.3 were analyzed by chapter. The data did not

support that the level of communication in the target language increased in the later chapters. Table 7.4 lists the communicative paths of Standard 1.3 by chapter.

Table 7.4

Standard 1.3: The Communicative Paths Used by Chapter

Textbooks	# of Activities	Speaking		Writing		Showing		None N/A	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!									
Ch. 3	22	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	21	95.45
Ch. 6	29	1	3.45	0	0.00	0	0.00	28	96.55
Ch. 10	22	1	4.55	0	0.00	0	0.00	21	95.45
Total	73	3		0		0		70	
Paso a Paso									
Ch. 2	25	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	25	100.00
Ch. 5	21	1	4.76	0	0.00	0	0.00	20	95.24
Ch. 14	22	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	22	100.00
Total	68	1		0		0		67	
¡Ven Conmigo!									
Ch. 3	35	1	2.86	3	8.57	0	0.00	31	88.57
Ch. 6	37	0	0.00	9	24.32	0	0.00	28	75.68
Ch. 10	38	1	2.63	6	15.79	0	0.00	31	81.58
Total	110	2		18		0		90	

The first textbook, *¡Buen Viaje!,* had only one out of the 22 activities (4.55%) in Chapter 3 that required speaking. The other 21 activities (95.45%) did not require any communicative paths. In Chapter 6, one of the 29 activities (3.45%) required speaking. The other 28 activities (96.55%) did not require any communicative paths. Chapter 10 also had one activity (4.55%) that required speaking. Twenty-one of the 22 activities (95.45%) did not require any communicative paths.

In the second textbook, *Paso a Paso*, zero of the 25 activities in Chapter 2 required speaking, writing, or showing. In Chapter 5, one of the 21 activities (4.76%) required speaking. Twenty (95.24%) did not require any communicative paths. There were zero activities of the 22 activities in Chapter 14 that required speaking, writing, or showing.

In *¡Ven Conmigo!,* there were 35 activities in Chapter 3. One (2.86%) required speaking and three (8.57%) required writing. Thirty one (88.57%) required no communicative paths. Chapter 6 had 37 activities, nine (24.32%) of which required writing. The other twenty-eight (75.68%) did not require any communicative paths. In Chapter 10, one of the 38 activities (2.63%) required speaking. Six (15.79%) required writing, and thirty one (88.57%) did not require any communicative paths.

Research Question 4

In contrast to Research Questions 1, 2, and 3, Research Question 4 was not directly linked to a standard or a communicative path. Research Question 4 was designed to answer the amount of Spanish the activities required. Research Question 4 was divided into three parts. The first part of Research Question 4 examined the written directions. The directions that accompanied each activity were divided into primarily English, primarily Spanish, about equal amounts of English and Spanish, and a translation/interpretation. The frequencies and percentages of English and Spanish were calculated for all three parts. The second part of Research Question 4 examined the language in which students were directed to respond. The third part of Research Question 4 examined the language that composed the activities. Table 8.1 lists a summary of the frequencies and percentages of the language used by book.

103

Table 8.1

Summary: The Language Used in the Written Directions by Book

Textbooks	# of Activities	Primarily English		Primarily Spanish		About Equal Amounts		Translation/ Interpretation	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!	73	22	30.13	17	23.28	0	0.00	34	46.57
Paso a Paso	68	46	64.64	22	32.35	0	0.00	0	0.00
¡Ven Conmigo!	110	78	70.90	32	29.09	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	251	146		71		0		34	

Written Directions

The written directions that accompanied the 251 communicative activities were written primarily in English, Spanish, or a translation of English to Spanish/Spanish to English. None of the directions accompanying the 251 activities were written in equal amounts of Spanish and English. The directions for the 73 activities in *¡Buen Viaje!* were divided in the following manner: twenty-two (30.13%) were written primarily in English, seventeen (23.28%) were written primarily in Spanish, and thirty-four (46.57%) were written as a direct translation or interpretation of the two languages. The directions for the 68 activities from *Paso a Paso* were divided in the following manner: forty-six (67.64%) were written primarily in English and twenty-two (32.35%) were written primarily in Spanish. None of the directions was translated or interpreted. The directions for the 110 activities from *¡Ven Conmigo!* were divided in the following manner: seventy-eight (70.90%) were written primarily in English and thirty-two (29.09%) were written primarily in Spanish. There were no directions that were translated or interpreted.

104

One important consideration was the amount of Spanish used in the activities. As students became more communicatively competent in Spanish, the directions accompanying the activities should have shifted from English (in the beginning chapters) to Spanish (in the end chapters). The data supported this assumption. Table 8.2 lists the frequencies and percentages of language used in the directions as reported by chapter.

Table 8.2

The Language Used in the Written Directions by Chapter

Textbooks	# of Activities	Primarily English		Primarily Spanish		About Equal Amounts		Translation/ Interpretation	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!									
Ch. 3	22	9	40.91	0	0.00	0	0.00	13	59.09
Ch. 6	29	8	27.59	0	0.00	0	0.00	21	72.41
Ch. 10	22	5	22.73	17	77.27	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	73	22		17		0		34	
Paso a Paso									
Ch. 2	25	25	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Ch. 5	21	21	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Ch. 14	22	0	0.00	22	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	68	46		22		0		0	
¡Ven Conmigo!									
Ch. 3	35	29	82.86	6	17.14	0	0.00	0	0.00
Ch. 6	37	27	72.97	10	27.03	0	0.00	0	0.00
Ch. 10	38	22	57.89	16	42.11	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	110	78		32		0		0	

In book one, *¡Buen Viaje!,* the language of the directions used in Chapter 3 was distributed in the following manner: the directions of nine of the 22 activities (40.91%) were written primarily in English, and thirteen (59.09%) were a direct translation or an interpretation from English/Spanish or Spanish/English. In Chapter 6, the directions accompanying the 29 activities were distributed in the following manner: eight (27.59%)

were written primarily in English, and twenty-one (72.41%) were a translation or interpretation. In Chapter 10, the 22 activities were distributed in the following manner: five (22.73%) were written primarily in English, and seventeen (77.27%) were written in Spanish. This reflects a change from beginning chapters in the amount of Spanish to which students were exposed. The directions accompanying the activity were no longer translated as the students progressed throughout the book.

In *Paso a Paso*, twenty-five of the 25 (100.00%) of the activities in Chapter 2 had written directions primarily in English. Similarly, the directions for all 21 activities (100.00%) in Chapter 5 were written primarily in English. In Chapter 14, all 22 (100.00%) of the directions accompanying the activities written in Spanish. As in the case of the first textbook, the second textbook shifted the use of primarily English to primarily Spanish in the later chapters. By the end of the book, it was assumed that students would have a better understanding of Spanish and would therefore be able to read the directions in the target language.

The third book, *¡Ven Conmigo!,* had 35 activities in Chapter 3. Twenty-nine (82.86%) of the activities had written directions primarily in English. Six (17.14%) used primarily Spanish. In Chapter 6, twenty-nine of the 35 activities (82.86%) had written directions using primarily English. Ten (27.03%) had directions written primarily in Spanish. Chapter 10 used primarily English in the directions of 22 of its 38 activities (57.89%). There were 16 activities (42.11%) whose directions were written primarily in Spanish. The third textbook met more standards than the other two textbooks, but the directions accompanying the activities did not require more Spanish than the other books.

Language of the Responses

The second part of Research Question 4 addressed the language in which students were directed to respond. The choices were English, Spanish, either language, or not specified. Table 8.3 lists the summary of response patterns for languages used across the three texts.

Table 8.3

Summary: The Language Used in the Responses by Book

Textbooks	# of Activities	English		Spanish		Either Language		Not Specified	
		f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!	73	0	0.00	73	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Paso a Paso	68	0	0.00	68	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
¡Ven Conmigo!	110	0	0.00	103	93.63	6	5.45	1	0.90
Total	251	0		244		6		1	

There were no activities across the three textbooks that directed students to respond in English. All 73 of the activities (100.00%) in *¡Buen Viaje!* and all 68 of the activities (100.00%) in *Paso a Paso* directed students to respond in Spanish. The 110 activities of *¡Ven Conmigo!* were distributed in the following manner: one hundred three (93.63%) directed students to respond in Spanish, six (5.45%) directed students to respond in either language, and one (0.90%) did not specify in what language students were directed to respond. Across the three textbooks, one pattern emerged; the activities clearly directed students to respond in Spanish in almost all of the activities.

The data for the languages of responses were also analyzed by chapter. Each book was analyzed by chapter because the presumption was that later chapters would

107

require students to respond more frequently in Spanish. The use of Spanish was for the most part similar across chapters. The three textbooks required students to respond in Spanish from the beginning chapters. Table 8.4 lists the languages used in student responses by chapter.

Table 8.4

The Language Used in the Responses by Chapter

Textbooks	# of Activities	English		Spanish		Either Language		Not Specified	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!									
Ch. 3	22	0	0.00	22	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Ch. 6	29	0	0.00	29	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Ch. 10	22	0	0.00	22	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	73	0		73		0		0	
Paso a Paso									
Ch. 2	25	0	0.00	25	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Ch. 5	21	0	0.00	21	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Ch. 14	22	0	0.00	22	100.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	68	0		68		0		0	
¡Ven Conmigo!									
Ch. 3	35	0	0.00	34	97.14	0	0.00	1	2.86
Ch. 6	37	0	0.00	34	91.89	3	8.11	0	0.00
Ch. 10	38	0	0.00	35	92.11	3	7.89	0	0.00
Total	110	0		103		6		1	

In the first textbook, *¡Buen Viaje!,* all 22 activities (100.00%) in Chapter 3 required students to respond in Spanish. In Chapter 6, all 29 activities (100.00%) required responses in Spanish. In Chapter 10, all 22 activities (100.00%) required students to respond in Spanish.

Paso a Paso, the second textbook, also required the use of Spanish in the responses. Each chapter required 100% of its responses in Spanish. All 25 activities in Chapter 2 required Spanish, all 21 activities in Chapter 5 required Spanish, and all 22 activities in Chapter 14 required Spanish.

Ven Conmigo! had 35 activities in Chapter 3. Thirty-four (97.14%) required Spanish, whereas one activity (2.86%) did not specify in which language students should respond. Chapter 6 had 37 activities. Thirty-four (91.89%) required Spanish, and three activities (8.11%) could have been answered in either Spanish or English. Chapter 10 had 38 activities. Thirty-five (92.11%) required responses in Spanish and for three activities (7.89%) it was possible to respond in either language.

Language of the Activities

The third part of Research Question 4 was concerned with the language that composed the actual textbook activities. The responses were primarily English, primarily Spanish, and about equal amounts. Table 8.5 lists a summary of the languages used in the activities. The frequencies and percentages of language usage are presented by book.

Table 8.5

Summary: The Language Used in the Activities by Book

Textbooks	# of Activities	Primarily English		Primarily Spanish		About Equal Amounts	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!	73	0	0.00	71	97.26	2	2.73
Paso a Paso	68	8	11.76	54	79.41	6	8.82
¡Ven Conmigo!	110	7	6.36	101	91.81	2	1.81
Total	251	15		226		10	

¡Buen Viaje!, textbook one, had no activities that were written primarily in English. Seventy-one of the 73 activities (92.26%) were written primarily in Spanish and two of the activities (2.73%) used about equal amounts of English and Spanish. *Paso a Paso*, textbook two, had eight activities of 68 activities (11.76%) written primarily in English. Fifty-four activities (79.41%) were written primarily in Spanish, and six (8.82%) were written using equal amounts of Spanish and English.

¡Ven Conmigo!, book three, had seven activities of 110 activities (6.36%) written primarily in English. One hundred one of the activities (91.81%) were written primarily in Spanish, and only two of the activities (1.81%) were written in equal amounts of Spanish and English. At least three fourths of the activities from all three textbooks were written primarily in Spanish.

Of interest to this study was the amount of Spanish required of students. As the students gained more skills in Spanish, the activities in later chapters would have used more Spanish. The activities were written for the most part in Spanish in the beginning chapters. However, *Paso a Paso* decreased the use of English and increased the use of Spanish as students progressed throughout the book. Table 8.6 lists the frequencies and percentages of languages used in the activities by chapter.

In the first textbook, *¡Buen Viaje!,* Chapter 3 had 22 activities. Twenty (90.91%) were written using primarily Spanish and two (9.09%) had about equal amounts of Spanish and English. Of the 29 activities in Chapter 6, all 29 activities (100.00%) were written primarily in Spanish. The 22 activities (100.00%) in Chapter 10 were written primarily in Spanish.

Table 8.6

The Language Used in the Activities by Chapter

Textbooks	# of Activities	Primarily English		Primarily Spanish		About Equal Amounts	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
¡Buen Viaje!							
Ch. 3	22	0	0.00	20	90.91	2	9.09
Ch. 6	29	0	0.00	29	100.00	0	0.00
Ch. 10	22	0	0.00	22	100.00	0	0.00
Total	73	0		71		2	
Paso a Paso							
Ch. 2	25	6	24.00	16	64.00	3	12.00
Ch. 5	21	2	9.52	16	76.19	3	14.29
Ch. 14	22	0	0.00	22	100.00	0	0.00
Total	68	8		54		6	
¡Ven Conmigo!							
Ch. 3	35	3	8.57	32	91.43	0	0.00
Ch. 6	37	2	5.41	34	91.89	1	2.70
Ch. 10	38	2	5.26	35	92.11	1	2.63
Total	110	7		101		2	

The second textbook, *Paso a Paso*, had 25 activities in Chapter 2. Six activities (24.00%) were written primarily in English. Sixteen activities (64.00%) were written primarily in Spanish, and three (12.00%) used about equal amounts of Spanish and English. Of the 21 activities in Chapter 5, two (9.52%) were written primarily in English. Sixteen (76.19%) were written primarily in Spanish, and three (14.29%) used about equal amounts of Spanish and English. Chapter 14 had 22 activities. All twenty-two (100.00%) were written primarily in Spanish.

¡Ven Conmigo!, the third textbook, had 35 activities in Chapter 3. Three (8.57%) used primarily English, and thirty-two (91.43%) used primarily Spanish. Of the 37 activities in Chapter 6, two (5.41%) were written primarily in English, and thirty-four

(91.89%) were written primarily in Spanish. One (2.70%) used about equal amounts of

English and Spanish. Chapter 10 had 38 activities. Two (5.26%) were written primarily

in English, and thirty-five (92.11%) were written primarily in Spanish. One (2.63%)

activity used about equal amounts of English and Spanish.

Chapter Summary

This study had four research questions. The data for each research question were

analyzed by chapter and by book. The first three research questions were aligned with

the first three communication standards of the Communication Goal. Research Question

1 was designed to answer to what extent the activities in the textbook met Standard 1.1

and in what skill areas the activity required students to engage. The skill areas or

communicative paths for Standard 1.1 are speaking, writing, listening, and reading.

Overall, the communicative activities did not meet Standard 1.1. Almost half of the 251

activities did not meet the standard. The remaining activities were more likely to have

partially met the standard than to have met it. Two communicative paths had higher

frequencies than the other paths, but the activities required all communicative paths. The

activities required reading most frequently, followed by listening.

The second research question aligned with Standard 1.2 of the *Standards for

Learning Spanish*. It was designed to answer to what extent the activities in the textbook

met Standard 1.2 and in what skill areas the activity required students to engage. The

skill areas or communicative paths for Standard 1.2 are listening, reading, or viewing.

The categories were expanded to include none of the above, for those activities that

required no communicative paths. The overall pattern was that the activities did not meet

Standard 1.2, and only about 14 % of activities partially met the standard. Of the

activities that partially met the standard, listening was the communicative path used most frequently. Two of the three books required reading and one book required viewing.

The third research question was aligned with Standard 1.3. It was designed to answer to what extent the activities in the textbook met Standard 1.3 and in what skill areas the activity required students to engage. Standard 1.3 has three communicative paths or skill areas. They are speaking, writing, and showing. A none of the above category was added for those activities that did not require any communicative paths. The overall pattern is that the communicative activities did not meet Standard 1.3. About 90% of the activities did not meet the standard, and the other 10% partially met the standard. All three textbooks used speaking, but the communicative path with the highest percentage was writing. Table 9 lists a summary of the frequencies and percentages of activities that met, partially met, and did not meet Standards 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3.

Table 9

Summary: The Extent to Which the Activities Met Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3

	Standard 1.1 (n= 251)		Standard 1.2 (n= 251)		Standard 1.3 (n= 251)	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Activities that Met the Standard	36	14.34	0	0.00	0	0.00
Activities that Partially Met the Standard	98	39.04	35	13.94	24	9.56
Activities that Did Not Meet the Standard	117	46.61	216	86.05	227	90.43

The fourth research question was not aligned with any particular standard. The fourth research question was concerned with the amount of Spanish used in the activities. The research question was designed to answer to what extent the components of the

activities in the textbook required students to communicate in Spanish. Each

communicative activity was coded for the amount of Spanish required in the written

directions, the responses, and the activity itself. Overall, the use of Spanish was highest

in the responses. At least 90% of the activities required responses in Spanish. The

activities had the second highest usage of Spanish. The directions used the least amount

of Spanish, but the amount of Spanish increased as the students progressed through the

book.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This study was a content analysis of the extent to which three level one Spanish textbooks met Goal One of the *Standards for Learning Spanish*. Two hundred fifty one communicative activities were the recording units. The communicative activities analyzed for this study were from nine chapters in three beginning Spanish textbooks: *¡Buen Viaje!, Paso a Paso,* and *¡Ven Conmigo!*. The first goal of the *Standards for Learning Spanish* is divided into three accompanying communication standards: Standard 1.1, Standard 1.2, and Standard 1.3. Goal One corresponds to Communication. Standard 1.1 requires communication in the interpersonal mode. Standard 1.2 requires communication in the interpretive mode. Standard 1.3 requires communication in the presentational mode. Each standard has three or four corresponding communicative paths. The communicative paths used in the three communication standards are as follows: speaking, writing, listening, reading, viewing, and presenting. This study addressed all three Communication standards of Goal One and the communicative paths or skill areas required of each standard. In addition to the three communication standards, the researcher analyzed the amount of Spanish the communicative activities required. The researcher examined the manifest content of the activities using three criteria: (a) the degree to which the activities met the standards, (b) which communicative paths the activities required, and (c) the amount of Spanish the activities required. There

were four research questions developed for this study. Research Questions 1, 2, and 3 corresponded to Standards 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3, respectively. Research Question 4 aligned with the amount of Spanish required in the activities. The amount of Spanish used in the directions, the activities, and the responses was reported.

The chapter is divided into three main sections. The first section presents the limitations of the study. The second section introduces the three major findings from the study and the implications of the findings. The third section includes suggestions for future research.

<center>Limitations of the Study</center>

There were two main limitations of this study. The first limitation is that the recording units were limited to the communicative activities in each chapter. In this study, communicative activities were identified as those activities that were sequentially numbered, color-coded, physically delineated, discrete units. The researcher did not examine any other parts or sections of the chapters. Each textbook has different components or sections within each chapter. Some components or sections were review exercises, pronunciation practice, supplemental videos, cultural readings, and listening comprehension. These sections within the chapters were not examined because the recording units for this study were not located in these sections. It is possible that examining other sections of the chapter would have yielded different results. The second limitation is that the study did not address how foreign language educators use the activities in the classroom.

Major Findings and Implications

Three major findings evolved from this study. These findings are directly linked to Research Questions 1, 2, 3, and 4. The first finding addresses the extent to which the communicative activities met Goal One and its accompanying three standards. The second finding addresses the frequencies and percentages of the communicative paths or skill areas associated with the standards. The third finding addresses the amount of Spanish the communicative activities required. The findings are discussed below.

Primary Finding # 1: The Activities Did Not Meet Goal One, Communication

A primary emphasis of this study was determining the degree to which the activities met Goal One. Goal One is defined by three communication standards: Standards 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. The first main finding is that overall, the 251 communicative activities did not meet Standards 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. The results of Standard 1.1 are discussed first. Of the 251 activities, 14% of the activities met Standard 1.1 and 39% of the activities partially met the standard. This finding can be interpreted in the following way. Standard 1.1 states that "Students engage in conversations, provide and obtain information, express feelings and emotions, and exchange opinions." Asking and answering questions is an example of providing or obtaining information. Since virtually all of the activities required students to answer questions or provide information, one component of the standard was fulfilled. If an activity had one other component of the standard, the activity partially met the standard. Therefore, the majority of the activities should have been able to partially meet Standard 1.1, because the activities required students to provide or obtain information. About 47% of the activities did not meet

Standard 1.1. This percentage of activities that did not meet Standard 1.1 is high

considering that by providing or obtaining information, almost every activity had one

component of the standard.

Across all three textbooks, there were zero communicative activities that met

Standards 1.2 and 1.3. Standard 1.2 is the interpretive mode and Standard 1.3 is the

presentational mode. Standard 1.2 focused on understanding and interpreting spoken and

written Spanish. Standard 1.3 focused on presenting information to an audience of

listeners and readers. For Standard 1.2, if an activity required understanding and

interpreting both spoken and written Spanish, it met the standard. If an activity required

spoken or written Spanish, it partially met Standard 1.2. For Standard 1.3, if an activity

required presenting to both an audience of listeners and readers, it met the standard. If an

activity required presenting to an audience of listeners or readers, it partially met

Standard 1.3. Only 14% of the 251 activities partially met Standard 1.2, and only 10% of

the activities partially met Standard 1.3. The results can be interpreted in the following

manner. Standards 1.2 and 1.3 require more skills of students than Standard 1.1, because

students have to interpret authentic Spanish and they have to present to an audience in

Spanish. These skills require more language production of students than Standard 1.1.

Overall, the communicative activities did not require the tasks outlined in Standards 1.2

and 1.3.

The overall pattern is that Goal One was not met. However, more activities met

Standard 1.1 than the other communication standards. Of the three standards, Standard

1.1 should have been the easiest to meet because it is the interpersonal mode of

communication. It seems likely that communicative activities would lend themselves

well to interaction with others in the target language. Level one students should be able to engage in conversations and provide and obtain information- even at a basic level. Standard 1.1 uses greetings, accepting or refusing invitations, managing conversations with expressions, and asking/answering questions as examples of what students can do. Level one students of Spanish should be able to use simple phrases as they engage in interpersonal communication.

The finding that the level one communicative activities did not meet Goal One has six implications for foreign language teachers, textbook authors, and textbook publishers. The first four implications are for foreign language teachers. The other two implications are for textbook authors and textbook publishers.

The first implication for foreign language teachers is that communicative activities may not promote communication, as defined by the communication standards. Teachers who use communicative textbooks believe that communicative textbooks facilitate and promote communication in the target language. Foreign language teachers would anticipate that communicative activities in communicative textbooks would align well with the communication standards. Teachers would also anticipate that widely used or popular contemporary textbooks would have content aligned with the standards. The results of this level one textbook study contradict the assumption that communicatively oriented textbooks are aligned with the communication standards. The lack of opportunities for students to negotiate meaning through target language interactions limits their likelihood of developing communicative competence (Omaggio Hadley, 1983; VanPatten, 2003). Level one is the foundation of language study, so it is important

119

to foster communicative competence as it develops. Students will be more successful language learners if they are exposed to the target language from the beginning of instruction.

The second implication for foreign language teachers is that they should examine carefully the instructional materials they select for class. If the textbook does not meet the communication goal, teachers should incorporate other materials as a supplement to the textbook. One reason for using supplemental materials is that they may be better aligned with Standards 1.2 and 1.3. The skills required by Standard 1.3 are better developed by supplemental projects than by using the textbook. Teachers can assign supplemental projects for students to present such as cultural reports, artwork, or posters. These types of assignments are better aligned with the tasks outlined in the standards. However, if teachers rely only on the textbook, they may need to modify the directions or the activity itself so that they meet the standards.

The third implication for foreign language teachers is that they need to examine the entire textbook for its alignment with the standards. In this study, the communicative activities did not meet Goal One; however, it is possible that other parts of the textbook chapters could have met Goal One. For instance, the textbook may provide authentic cultural readings like those outlined in Standard 1.2. The cultural readings might be located in another section throughout the chapter. The communicative activities did not meet Standard 1.2, but it is possible that a reading may have met it.

The communicative activities analyzed in this study did not meet Goal One. However, the notes in the teacher's edition suggest that the activities are aligned with the standards. The fourth implication for teachers is to pay attention to the teacher's notes in

the textbook margins. In many cases the notes indicate that certain standards have been addressed, when all the publisher has done is provide a cursory view of the standards. Textbook publishers list in the margin that a particular standard has been addressed. There are two possible explanations for saying that a standard has been met when it has not. The first explanation is that publishers or textbook authors are not reading the standards in depth. They are only looking at what the standard says, not how it is applied. The sample progress indicators and the learning scenarios are helpful for determining how each standard can be applied. Standards 1.2 and 1.3 create problems for interpretation if one looks only at the standards. For example, Standard 1.2 says that "students understand and interpret written Spanish on a variety of topics." This language can be deceiving because speaking and writing are two communicative paths or skill areas used in Standard 1.1. Sometimes the publisher states that Standard 1.2 has been addressed, when the activity actually addresses Standard 1.1. Standard 1.2, however, requires interpretation of authentic texts and Spanish spoken or written for or by native speakers. Standard 1.3 is problematic in the same way as Standard 1.2. Standard 1.3 states that "students present information, concepts, and ideas in Spanish to an audience of listeners or readers on a variety of topics." The presentation occurs in a one to many mode. Examples of Standard 1.3 are reciting a poem to a group, explaining a visual aid to the class, or preparing reports or brochures to an audience of readers. Some of the communicative textbook activities require students to get into groups, discuss a topic, and present to the class. This is not what the standard dictates. If students did any kind of speaking in front of the class, the notes to the teacher implied that the activity covered Standard 1.3. The notes to the teacher do not include why the publisher has labeled the

121

activities as having addressed the standards. Moreover, the notes to the teacher simply list the standards addressed per page. They do not specify which activity on that page is linked to the standard.

The second explanation for why publishers include the standards in the margins when the standards have not been met is because publishers want to sell textbooks. Textbook publishers know that foreign language educators expect contemporary textbooks to have current information based on pedagogically sound principles. They also know that curriculum planners and teachers want materials aligned with the standards. This is an important issue for educators and textbook selection committees. When standards are listed and incorporated into the teacher's edition of the textbook, this influences the adoption and purchasing of textbooks. School districts and educators who choose certain textbooks for their presumed alignment with the standards influence what textbooks other states and school districts choose. Some school districts rely solely on the decisions of the three most influential textbook adoption states of Florida, Texas, and California. The publishers add notes in the margin so that it is evident just by glancing through the textbook that their textbook integrates the standards. In some activities, if the activity had one component of a standard, the publisher listed the standard in the margin. Using one component of the standard and implying the standard has been met is misleading. The partial inclusion of standards is problematic because it sends a message to teachers, students, curriculum planners, and school administrators that by using the textbook, they will achieve the goals outlined in the standards. The standards as a whole need to be addressed for Goal One to be met. Therefore, teachers need to be aware of

how the standards should be implemented. Teachers should not assume that just because a standard is listed in the margin that the activities and the standards are aligned.

The fifth implication is for textbook authors and textbook publishers. They need to revise the communicative activities to better align with the standards. In some activities, the activities could have met the standards if the directions were modified to include more communicative paths or skill areas. In other activities, there were multiple communicative paths required but the directions were not specific enough. There were several nondescript directions such as answer, identify, complete, etc. that gave the teacher little direction as to how to implement the activity. The directions could have been modified using the language of the standards. The following are examples of how directions could have been stated in a more precise manner: write the answers in complete sentences, talk to a partner about your weekend plans, present a drawing of your family to the class and describe each family member.

The sixth implication is for textbook publishers. Publishers specify which parts or sections of the chapter are required, recommended, and optional. This sends the message to teachers that recommended and optional sections are less important than required sections. Communicative activities are located in the beginning of the chapter, where the recommended sections are located. The location of communicative activities tells teachers that these activities are important. The nature of communicative activities also indicates that by using these activities, students can increase their communicative competence in Spanish. If communicative activities do not meet the communication standards of Goal One, then textbook publishers need to integrate other parts or sections of the chapter that do meet the communication standards with the communicative

activities. If textbook publishers and authors do not integrate other chapter sections such as cultural readings, supplemental videos, or listening comprehension into the communicative activities, then perhaps teachers should consider reducing the number of communicative activities used in class and substituting other parts of the chapter to meet the communication standards. Using other chapter sections may also increase the frequency of communicative paths required.

Primary Finding # 2: The Communicative Paths Used Most Frequently Were Receptive

The second main finding is related to the communicative paths associated with Standards 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. The communicative paths aligned with the standards are speaking, writing, listening, reading, viewing, and showing. Speaking, writing, and showing require students to produce Spanish. In contrast, listening, reading, and viewing require students to receive Spanish. In the beginning of instruction, it is easier to receive language than it is to produce it. The study revealed that the communicative activities required the students to receive Spanish. Reception was more common than production. In Standard 1.1, the communicative paths or skill areas are speaking, writing, listening, and reading. Reading was the most frequently used communicative path across the three textbooks. This finding is supported by the high percentage of activities in Standard 1.1 that required reading. Reading is the primary communicative path of the activities because students have to be able to read the directions and their responses in Spanish. Students must be able to read in the language whether they work individually or in small groups.

The other receptive path was listening. It was the second communicative path used most frequently. Listening in Spanish is essential for the acquisition of language.

124

Second language acquisition theory supports this idea. For instance, in Krashen's

Monitor Theory (1982) of second language acquisition, students need comprehensible

input before they are capable of target language output. This finding also aligns with

Terrell's Natural Approach (1986), a communicative teaching method, whereby students

are provided with exposure in the target language before they are required to produce any

utterances in the target language. Before speech in the target language emerges, students

may respond in the native language, the target language, or a combination of both.

Teachers who use a communicative approach to teaching Spanish would provide

comprehensible input before they would require students to produce target language

output. In level one, students would be capable of comprehension before they would be

capable of production. As students progress through the textbook, the activities should

require students to produce more Spanish. Teachers should require more production by

students toward the end of the textbook. If the activities are focused on reception,

teachers should modify the activities in later chapters to require more production.

<div align="center">Primary Finding # 3: The End Chapters</div>

<div align="center">Required More Spanish Than Beginning Chapters</div>

The third main finding is related to the amount of Spanish the activities required.

This finding is related to Research Question 4. Research Question 4 was divided into

three parts. The research question investigated the language of the activities by: (a) the

directions of the activities, (b) the components of the activities, and (c) the responses.

Across all three textbooks, the language of the directions accompanying the activities

changed from beginning chapters to end chapters. Beginning chapters used primarily

English or a translation of English/Spanish or Spanish/English. The directions from end

chapters used primarily Spanish. This change occurred as students progressed from beginning chapters to later chapters. The beginning chapters offered more "scaffolding" (Vygotsky, 1978) or support to students as they began communicating in Spanish. Then, the later chapters allowed students to read the directions in Spanish, with less assistance in English. Students required less assistance as their communicative competence increased. Level one students should have developed greater levels of communicative competence by later chapters than the levels they had in beginning chapters.

The use of Spanish continued in the communicative activities. The activities were mostly composed in Spanish. Some exceptions to the use of Spanish were activities that did not include reading in Spanish. These activities had photos, drawings, clocks, maps, or realia. Students had to interpret the drawing or figure and respond in Spanish. There were other activities that inferred the use of Spanish. These activities required students to conduct an interview, ask/answer questions, or create a dialogue in Spanish. These activities were written in English so students would have to produce their own questions in Spanish. Across all three textbooks, more than 90% of the activities were in Spanish. This finding aligns with second language acquisition principles. Teachers expose students to authentic language from the beginning of instruction, but at the students' current level of communicative competence. A high percentage of activities were written in Spanish; however, the directions in beginning chapters did not require the same amount of Spanish as the activities. It would be logical that if students could complete an activity in Spanish, they could also read the directions in Spanish.

The highest frequency or percentage of Spanish used in the 251 activities was in the responses. At least 90% of the activities required students to respond in Spanish.

This finding aligns with the amount of Spanish required in the activities. The few exceptions where students were free to respond in English or Spanish were the activities that checked students' comprehension. These activities usually accompanied the supplemental videos. In these activities, students responded in either language. They put statements in chronological order by using numbers, which required writing the Arabic numeral. Another task was to name a character from the video who matched a description in Spanish. While it would be expected that students would respond in Spanish, the activity did not require it. Therefore, teachers (especially in beginning chapters) might be inclined to accept a response in either language, or a combination of the two. Foreign language teachers should expect responses in Spanish as students complete later chapters.

Overall, the use of Spanish across all three textbooks was highly frequent. This is a positive step toward fostering students' levels of communicative competence. In level one Spanish, students need numerous opportunities and varied activities. These allow students to use the language and develop their abilities in speaking, reading, writing, and listening. It is disappointing that the high frequency of Spanish in the later chapters did not align with a high percentage of activities that met Communication Standards 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. There is clearly a disconnect between the amount of Spanish required in the activities and the kinds of tasks required to meet the standards.

<div align="center">Suggestions for Future Research</div>

The content analysis of the 251 activities in *¡Buen Viaje!, Paso a Paso,* and *¡Ven Conmigo!* provided insight into the pedagogical design of contemporary level one Spanish textbooks. As a result of this research, there are ten suggestions for future

research in foreign languages. The suggestions are grouped into three broad areas. The

first area of research involves using content analysis methods and/or textbook activities.

There are five suggestions related to this area. The second area of research involves Goal

One of the *Standards for Learning Spanish*. There are three suggestions for future

research about the communication standards. The third area of research involves

language learning strategies. There are two suggestions for researching language

learning strategies. The suggestions are directed towards foreign language researchers,

foreign language educators, and content analysts. The ten suggestions listed here are

based on this study of foreign language textbooks.

The first area of research is to use the methods outlined in this study for

examining other textbooks and/or other standards. There are three suggestions for future

studies using these methods. The content analysis conducted here provides a framework

for developing coding forms and analyzing data. Researchers could use the same level

one textbooks and expand the research to include the other four Cs of foreign language

learning (Cultures, Communities, Comparisons, and Connections). The standards

provide a template for evaluating the quality of textbook activities. This study would be

especially valuable for the Culture Goal, because there are cultural readings and cultural

notes throughout the chapters.

The second suggestion related to textbooks and/or other standards is to use other

professional organizations' standards, similar to those developed by ACTFL. They could

provide a template for analyzing the content of textbooks. It would be valuable to

examine the English as a Second Language (ESL) standards and conduct a content

analysis of ESL textbook activities. There is a great number of non-native English speakers in the world. This information would be beneficial and it would contribute to the body of literature about ESL learners.

The third suggestion related to textbook activities is to consider the developmental level required by the activities. In particular, one could compare and contrast the novice learner and the novice foreign language learner as defined by ACTFL. The ACTFL novice foreign language learner may or may not be a novice learner. The novice foreign language learner is categorized into one of three levels of novice foreign language learning: novice low, novice mid, and novice high. There are different guidelines for different skills. The novice low foreign language speaker has "no real functional ability" because of poor pronunciation and a limited range of conversational topics. The novice low speaker relies on a few memorized chunks of vocabulary and greetings for communication. Novice mid speakers are similar to novice low speakers, but they can respond to questions, they have a greater repertoire of rehearsed language, and they have more vocabulary. Lastly, novice high speakers are the most communicatively competent of the three levels. They can talk about familiar topics such as daily routines, preferences, and needs in short phrases. The textbook activities are designed for novice foreign language learners, but are they designed for novice learners?

The fourth and suggestion for textbook activities is to examine the communication activities for the type of language they require. Researchers could study the amount of rehearsed language or unrehearsed language the activities require. The use of rehearsed or planned language versus the use of unrehearsed or unplanned language in the activities affects the levels of communicative competence or progress in the language.

129

Researchers could continue the work of Ellis (1985) and Tarone (1983) by examining

what type of activities (rehearsed or unrehearsed) level one textbooks promote. Another

consideration is if the type of activities varies as students progress through the book.

Teachers would expect to find more rehearsed activities than unrehearsed activities in the

textbook. Textbook activities are generally formulaic and they direct students how to

respond by using prompts or models. If the research shows that students make more

progress using unrehearsed language, do publishers include unrehearsed activities and if

so, why not?

 The fifth suggestion related to textbook activities is to research how teachers

actually implement the activities in the classroom. There is great variety in the frequency

of usage and the application of textbook activities. In the beginning pages of each

textbook there are recommendations for which sections of each chapters are required,

recommended, and optional. Foreign language researchers could examine which

activities teachers use in the classroom, which activities they assign for homework, and

how they modify the directions to accommodate the students' needs. The research could

be conducted by having the teachers self-report in a questionnaire, by direct observation,

and by conducting interviews or focus groups.

 The second area of future research is directed towards Goal One, Communication,

and its three accompanying standards: Standards 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. There are three

suggestions for future research. The first suggestion for continuing the research on

communication standards is to use the same three textbooks *(¡Buen Viaje!, Paso a Paso*,

and *¡Ven Conmigo!)* and to expand the study to include the level two or level three

textbooks. Foreign language researchers could examine if level two or level three

activities are better aligned with the communication standards than level one activities. This research could address two areas: (a) if the activities did not meet the standards because level one activities were limited by what level one students could do and/or (b) if publishers designed the level two or level three activities in the same way as the level one activities. If the level two and three activities are no better aligned with the standards, than the level one activities, the textbook authors and publishers need to change how they write the activities.

The second suggestion for research about communication standards has similar applications as the first suggestion. Instead of comparing multiple levels, researchers could use three different level one textbooks. This would provide more comparisons about level one textbooks and level one learners. Perhaps other level one communicative activities are better at meeting the three communication standards of Goal One than the three textbooks reviewed here.

The third suggestion is to select another language included in the standards and to analyze communicative activities. *The Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* have language specific standards for each language taught. It would be valuable to examine level one French, German, Russian, or Italian textbooks. The publishers of the textbooks used here also publish textbooks for other languages. One could compare the frequency of level one activities that met the standards. This research would provide insight into the level one learner and if meeting the standards is a realistic goal of level one textbooks and level one learners.

The last area for future foreign language research is to examine language learning strategies. As more students enroll in foreign language courses, teachers are more likely

131

to encounter students with different learning styles. Teachers will have to facilitate the learning of very different learners. Learning strategy research can be conducted in two ways. One way is to examine the teacher's edition of the textbook for the strategies they provide. The textbooks included tips on how to reach all students. These tips were mostly directed towards how to modify the activities for native speakers or students with learning difficulties. It would be beneficial to examine level one language learning strategies because students transfer learning strategies they acquire in beginning levels when they advance to higher levels of language study. Rebecca Oxford (1990) developed the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) that measures which strategies students use. Teachers can use this inventory in their classrooms to see what strategies students employ. What are the most commonly used strategies as reported by students and do they align with the strategies provided in the teacher's edition of the textbook?

Another avenue of learning strategy research is to ask students to use a think aloud protocol and report which strategies they use as they complete a textbook activity or task. This would provide further insight into level one learners and how they learn languages. The think aloud procedure is valuable because students are engaging in the activity. Often students do not remember what strategies they used once they finish the task. This allows the researcher to collect data while students report how they approached a particular task or activity.

The ten suggestions listed here are a starting point for directing future research about foreign languages, foreign language standards, and textbook activities. From the limited literature about foreign language textbook activities and foreign language standards, there is a need to continue this research. These suggestions offer several ways

to learn more about the following: (a) if textbook activities are cognitively and pedagogically appropriate, (b) how educators and students use the activities, and what changes if any should be implemented to textbooks.

REFERENCES

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (1986). ACTFL proficiency
    guidelines. In H. Byrnes & M. Canale (Eds.), *Defining and developing
    proficiency: Guidelines, implementations and concepts (pp. 123-124).* The
    ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series. Lincolnwood, IL: National
    Textbook Company.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (1998). *ACTFL performance
    guidelines for K-12 learners* (Report No. FL 025 634). Yonkers, NY: American
    Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (ERIC Document Reproduction
    Service No. ED 426593)

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (1999). *ACTFL proficiency
    guidelines: speaking*.   Retrieved March 10, 2005, from
    http://www.actfl.org

Ahuvia, A. (2001). Traditional interpretive and reception based content:
    Improving the ability of content analyses to address issues of pragmatic and
    theoretical concern. *Social Indicators Research, 54*, 139-172.

Ariew, R. (1982/1986). The textbook as curriculum. In T.V. Higgs (Ed.),
    Curriculum, competence, and the foreign language teacher (pp. 11-33).
    Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Ballman, T.L., Liskin-Gasparro, J.E., & Mandell, P.B. (2001). The communicative
    classroom (Vol. 3). In American Association of Teachers of Spanish and
    Portuguese, *AATSP: Professional Development Series: Handbook for teachers K-
    16.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle/Thompson Learning.

Bartz, W.H., & Keefe Singer, M. (1996). The programmatic implications of foreign
    language standards. In R.C. Lafayette (Ed.) in conjunction with ACTFL, *National
    standards: A catalyst for reform* (pp. 139-167). Lincolnwood, IL: National
    Textbook Company.

Berns, M. (1990). "Second" and "foreign" in second language acquisition/foreign language learning: A sociolinguistic perspective. In D. Sharp (Ser. Ed.). & B. VanPatten & J.F. Lee (Vol. Eds.), *Multilingual matters: Vol. 58. Second language acquisition/foreign language learning* (pp. 3-11). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Bialystok, E., & Hakuta, K. (1999). Confounded age: Linguistic and cognitive factors in age differences for second language acquisition. In D. Birdsong, *Second language acquisition and the critical period hypothesis* (pp. 161-181). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Biemer, L. (1992). The textbook controversy: The role of content. In J.G. Herlihy & M.T. Herlihy (Eds.), *The textbook controversy: Issues, aspects, and perspectives* (pp. 17-25). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.

Brisk, M.E. (1998). *Bilingual education: From compensatory to quality schooling.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.

Budd, R.W., Thorp, R.K., & Donohew, L. (1967). *Content analysis of communications.* New York: Macmillan Company.

Byrnes, H. (1991). Reflections on the development of cross-cultural communicative competence in the foreign language classroom. In B.F. Freed (Ed.)., *Series on foreign language acquisition research and instruction: Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom* (pp. 205-218). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1,* 1-47.

Center for Applied Linguistics, & Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. (1982). *Functional-notional concepts: Adapting the foreign language textbook,* May, 1982 (No. 44). Washington, D.C.:Author.

Chall, J.S., & Conard, S.S. (1991). *Should textbooks challenge students? The case for easier or harder textbooks.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Cheng, A.C. (2002). The effects of processing instruction on the acquisition of *ser* and *estar*. *Hispania, 85(2)*, 308-323.

Chomsky, N (1959). Review of *Verbal Behavior* by B.F. Skinner. *Language (35)1*, 26-58.

Collier, V.P. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. *TESOL Quarterly, 23(3),* 509-531.

Corder, S.P. (1967/1981). Error analysis and interlanguage. England: Oxford University Press. In S.P. Corder, The significance of learners' errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 5,* 161-170.

Doughty, C. (1998). Acquiring competence in a second language form and function. In H. Byrnes (Series and Vol. Ed.), Learning foreign and second languages – Perspectives in research and scholarship: Teaching languages, literatures, and cultures (pp. 128-156). New York: The Modern Language Association of America.

Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In M.H. Long & J.C. Richards (Ser. Eds.) & C. Doughty & J. Williams (Vol. Eds.), *The Cambridge applied linguistics series: Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114-138). England: Cambridge University.

Dow, P.B. (1992). Taming the textbook tyranny: Reflections of a would-be school reformer. In J.G. Herlihy & M.T. Herlihy (Eds.), *The textbook controversy: Issues, aspects, and perspectives* (pp. 33-42). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.

Draper, J.B., & Hicks, J.H. (2002). *Foreign language enrollments in public secondary schools, Fall 2000.* Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Eisner, E.W. (1987). Why the textbook influences curriculum. *Curriculum Review, 26(3),* 11-13.

Ellis, R. (1985a). A variable competence model of second language acquisition. *IRAL, 23(1),* 47-59.

Ellis, R. (1985b). Sources of variability in interlanguage. *Applied Linguistics, 6(2),* 118-131.

Ellis, R. (1985c). *Understanding second language acquisition*. England: Oxford University.

Ellis, R.(Ed.)., & Roberts, C. (1987). Two approaches for investigating second language acquisition in context. In Christopher N. Candlin (Series Ed.) *Second language acquisition in context*: Language teaching methodology series (pp. 3-29). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall International.

Ellis, R. (1999). Item versus system learning: Explaining free variation. *Applied Linguistics, 20(4),* 460-480.

Finocchiaro, M., & Brumfit, C. (1983). *The functional-notional approach: From theory to practice.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Flege, J.E. (1999). Age of learning and second language speech. In D. Birdsong, *Second language acquisition and the critical period hypothesis* (pp. 101-131). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Freed, B.F. (1991). Current realities and future prospects in foreign language acquisition research. In B.F. Freed (Ed.), *Series on foreign language acquisition research and instruction: Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom* (pp. 3-27). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.

Freeman, S.A. (1963). Modern languages for a changing world. *Colloquium on curricular change.* Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board.

Gass, S.M. (1988). Second language acquisition and linguistic theory: The role of language transfer. In S. Flynn & W. O'Neil, *Linguistic theory in second language acquisition* (pp. 384-403). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Glisan, E.W. (1985). The effect of word order on listening comprehension and pattern retention. *Language Learning, 35(3),* 443-472.

Graci, J.P. (1989). Are foreign language textbooks sexist? An exploration of modes of evaluation. *Foreign Language Annals, 22(5),* 477-486.

Harlow, L.L. (1978). An alternative to structurally oriented textbooks. *Foreign Language Annals, 11(5)*, 559-563.

Herlihy, J.G. (1992). The nature of the textbook controversy. In J.G. Herlihy & M.T. Herlihy (Eds.), *The textbook controversy: Issues, aspects, and perspectives* (pp. 3-13). Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.

Holsti, O.R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Huebner, T. (1998). Linguistics, applied linguistics, and second language acquisition theories. In H. Byrnes (Ser. and Vol. Ed.), *Learning foreign and second languages – Perspectives in research and scholarship: Teaching languages, literatures, and cultures* (pp. 58-74). New York: The Modern Language Association of America.

Humbach, N.A., & Ozete, O. (2003). *¡Ven conmigo!* Austin, TX: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Hymes, D. (1971). Competence and performance in linguistic theory. In R. Huxley & E. Ingram (Eds.) Language acquisition: models and methods. London: Academic Press. Jordens, P., & Kellerman, E. (1981). Investigations into the "transfer strategy" in second language learning. In Publications of the International Center for Research on Bilingualism, *Proceedings of the fifth Congress of l'association internationale de linguistique appliquee, Montreal, August 1978, presented by Jean-Guy Savard & Lorne Laforge* (pp. 195-215). Montreal, Canada: Les Presses de L'Universite Laval.

Klassen, B.R. (1981). Communicative competence and second language learning. In V. Froese & S.B. Straw (Eds.), *Research in the language arts: Language and schooling* (pp. 27-40). Baltimore, MD: University Park.

Kramsch, C.J. (1990). What is foreign language learning research? In D. Sharp (Ser. Ed.). & B. VanPatten & J.F. Lee (Vol. Eds.), *Vol. 58. Second language acquisition/foreign language learning* (pp. 27-33). Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Kramsch, C.J. (2002). Standard, norm, and variability in language learning: A view from foreign language research. In S. Gass, K. Bardovi-Harlig, S. Sieloff-Magnan, & J. Walz (Gen. Eds.) & B. Harley & J.H. Hulstijn (Series Eds.), *Pedagogical norms for second and foreign language learning and teaching - Studies in honour of Albert Valdman: Language learning and language teaching* (pp. 59-79). The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Krashen, S.D. (1981). Adult second language acquisition and learning: A review of theory and applications. In Publications of the International Center for Research on Bilingualism, *Proceedings of the fifth congress of l'association internationale de linguistique appliquee, Montreal, August 1978, presented by Jean-Guy Savard & Lorne Laforge* (pp. 229-260). Montreal, Canada: Les Presses de L'Universite Laval.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S.D. (2003). Principles of language acquisition. In Explorations in language acquisition and use: The Taipei lectures. (pp . 1-14.) Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Krashen, S.D., & Terrell, T.D. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lafayette, R.C., & Draper, J.B. (1996). Introduction: National standards: A catalyst for reform. In R.C. Lafayette (Ed.), *National standards: A catalyst for reform* (pp. 1-8). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook.

Lally, C. (1998). Back to the future: A look at present textbooks and past recommendations. *Foreign Language Annals, 31(3),* 307-314.

Lantolf, J.P., & Appel, G. (1994). Theoretical framework: An introduction to Vygotskian perspectives on second language research. In Elizabeth B. Bernhardt (Series Ed.) *Vygotskian approaches to second language research*: Second language learning: A series dedicated to studies in acquisition and principled language instruction (pp.1-32). Westport, CT: Ablex Publishing.

Lantolf, J.P., & Sunderman, G. (2001). The struggle for a place in the sun: Rationalizing foreign language study in the twentieth century. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*, 5-25.

Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M.H. (1991). An introduction to second language acquisition research. In C.N. Candlin (Ser. Ed.), *Applied linguistics and language study.* London: Longman.

Lenneberg, E.H. (1967). *Biological foundations of language.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Lightbrown, P.M. (1990). Process-product research on second language learning in classrooms. In B. Hailey, P. Allen, J. Cummins, & M. Swain (Eds.), *The development of second language proficiency* (pp. 82-92). England: Cambridge University Press.

Lightbrown, P.M. & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned.* Oxford: University Press.

Lightbrown, P.M. (1998). The importance of timing in focus on form. In M.H. Long & J.C. Richards (Ser. Eds.) & C. Doughty & J. Williams (Vol. Eds.), *The Cambridge applied linguistics series: Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 177-196). England: Cambridge University Press.

Long, M.H., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In M.H. Long & J.C. Richards (Series Eds.) & C. Doughty & J. Williams (Vol. Eds.), *The Cambridge applied linguistics series: Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 15-41). England: Cambridge University.

Matthies, B.F. (1982). The Threshold Level: A notional-functional syllabus. *Studies in Language Learning: An Interdisciplinary Review of Language Acquisition, Language Pedagogy, Stylistics, and Language Planning*, *4(1),* 1-13. Special Issue on the Foreign Language Syllabus- Grammar, Notions and Functions. The Language Learning Laboratory, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Met, M., Sayers, S., & Eubanks Wargin, C. (2000). *Paso a paso*. 2ⁿᵈ Ed. Glenview, IL: Prentice Hall.

National Commission of Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing.

National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project. (1996/1999). *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21ˢᵗ century.* Yonkers, NY: National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project.

O'Maggio, A.C. (1983). Methodology in transition: The new focus on proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal, 67(4),* 330-41.

O'Maggio Hadley, A. (2001). *Teaching language in context* (3rd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle/Thompson Learning.

Ovando, C.J., & Collier, V.P. (1998). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Pardiñas-Barnes, P. (1998). Twentieth-century Spanish textbooks: A generational approach. *Hispania, 81(2),* 230-247.

Peck, A.J. (1976). Functional-notional syllabuses and their importance for defining levels of linguistic proficiency. *Audio-visual Language Journal, 14(2*), 95-105.

Penfield, W., & Roberts, L. (1959). *Speech and brain mechanisms*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Phillips, J.K., & Lafayette, R.C. (1996). Reactions to the catalyst: Implications for our new professional structure. In R.C. Lafayette (Ed.) in conjunction with ACTFL, *National standards: A catalyst for reform* (pp. 197-209). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Porter, P.A. (1986). How learners talk to each other: Input and interaction in task-centered discussions. In R.R. Day, (Ed.) *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 200-228). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Ramírez, A., & Hall, J. (1990). Language and culture in secondary level Spanish textbooks. *The Modern Language Journal, 74(1),* 48-65.

Richard-Amato, P.A. (2003). *Making it happen: From interactive to participatory language teaching: A more critical view of theory and practice* (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

Rivers, W.M. (1983). Foreign language acquisition: Where the real problems lie. In W.M. River, *Communicating naturally in a second language: Theory and practice in language teaching* (pp. 155-168). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Savignon, S.J. (1991). Research on the role of communication in classroom-based foreign language acquisition: On interpretation, expression, and negotiation of meaning. In B.F. Freed (Ed.), *Series on foreign language acquisition research and instruction: Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom* (pp. 31-45). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Schmitt, C.J., & Woodford, P.E. (2003). *¡Buen viaje!*. New York: Glencoe/McGraw-Hill.

Schulz, R.A. (2002). Changing perspectives in foreign language education: Where do we come from? Where are we going? *Foreign Language Annals, 35(3),* 285-292.

Singer, J., Marx, R.W., Krajcik, J., & Clay Chambers, J. (2000). Constructing extended inquiry projects: Curriculum materials for science education reform. *Educational Psychologist, 35(3),* 165-178.

Skinner, B.F. (1957). *Verbal behavior.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Squire, J.R., & Morgan, R.T. (1990). The elementary and high school textbook market today. In D.L. Elliot & A. Woodward, *Textbooks and schooling in the United States: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (107-126). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Stalker, J.C. (1989). Communicative competence, pragmatic functions, and accommodation. *Applied Linguistics, 10(2),* 182-193.

Stein, M., Stuen, C., Carnine, D. & Long, R.M. (2001). Textbook evaluation and adoption practices. *Reading and Writing Quarterly, 17*, 5-23.

Stern, H.H. (1981). The formal-functional distinction in language pedagogy: A conceptual clarification. In Publications of the International Center for Research on Bilingualism, *Proceedings of the fifth Congress of l'association internationale de linguistique appliquee, Montreal, August 1978, presented by Jean-Guy Savard & Lorne Laforge* (pp. 425-464). Montreal, Canada: Les Presses de L'Universite Laval.

Sunderland, J., Cowley, M., Shattuck, J., Rahim, F.A., & Leontzakou, C. (2001). From bias "in the text" to "teacher talk around the text": An exploration of teacher discourse and gendered foreign language textbook texts. *Linguistics and Education, 11(3),* 251-286.

Swaffar, J.K. (1991). Language learning is more than learning language: Rethinking reading and writing tasks in textbooks for beginning language study. In B.F. Freed (Ed.), *Series on foreign language acquisition research and instruction: Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom* (pp. 252-279). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In R.C. Scarcella & M.H. Long (Ser. Eds.) & S.M. Gass & C.G. Madden (Eds.), *Issues in second language research: Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *The Canadian Modern Language Review, 50(1),* 158-164.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1989). Canadian immersion and adult second language teaching: What's the connection? *The Modern Language Journal, 73(ii),* 150-159.

Tarone, E. (1983). On the variability of interlanguage systems. *Applied Linguistics, 4(2),* 142-164.

Tarone, E. (1985). Methodologies for studying variability in second language acquisition. In Christopher N. Candlin (Series Ed.) *Second language acquisition in context*: Language teaching methodology series (pp. 34-46). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall International.

Tarone, E. (2000). Getting serious about language play: Language play, interlanguage variation, and second language acquisition. In B. Swierzbin, F. Morris, M.E. Anderson, C.A. Klee, & E. Tarone, *Social and cognitive factors in second language acquisition: Selected proceedings of the 1992 Second Language Research Forum* (pp. 31-54). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Tarone, E. (2002). Frequency effects, noticing, and creativity: Factors in a variationist interlanguage framework. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 24(2),* 287-296.

Terrell, T.D. (1986). The natural approach: The binding/access framework. *Modern Language Journal, 70*, 213-227.

Terrell, T.D. (1990). Trends in the teaching of grammar in Spanish language textbooks. *Hispania, (73)1*, 201-211.

Terrell, T.D. (1995). Foreigner talk as comprehensible input. In P. Hashemipour, R. Maldonado, & M. van Naerssen, *Studies in language learning and Spanish linguistics: In honor of Tracy D. Terrell* (pp. 233-245). New York: McGraw-Hill.

United States Census Bureau. (2002). *Facts for features.* Retrieved September 15, 2004, from http://www.census.gov/press-release/www/2002/cd02ff15.html.

United States Census Bureau. (2004). Facts for features. Retrieved January 8, 2005, from http://www.census.gov/press-release/archives/facts_for_features_special_editions/002270.html

United States Census Bureau. (n.d.). Statistical abstract of the United States, 2003. Retrieved September 15, 2004 from http://www.census.gov/prod/2004/pubs/03statab/edu.pdf

United States Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *The condition of education 2003*, NCES 2003-067, Washington, DC: USGPO, 2003.

United States English Foundation, Inc. (n.d.). *Many languages, one America*. Retrieved March 29, 2005, from http://www.us-english.org/foundation/research/lia/sort_by_language.asp

Van Ek, J.A. (1979). The threshold level. In C.J. Brumfit, & K. Johnson (Eds.), *The communicative approach to language teaching* (pp. 103-121). Oxford: University Press.

Van Naerssen, M.M. (1995). The future of the future in Spanish foreign language textbooks. In P. Hashemipour, R. Maldonado, & M. Van Naerssen, *Studies in language learning and Spanish linguistics: In honor of Tracy D. Terrell* (pp. 457-470). New York: McGraw-Hill.

VanPatten, B. (1990). Attending to form and content in the input. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 12(3),* 287-301.

VanPatten, B. (1992a). Second language acquisition research and foreign language teaching, part 1. *ADFL Bulletin, 24,* 52-56.

VanPatten, B. (1992b). Second language acquisition research and foreign language teaching, part 2. *ADFL Bulletin, 23(3),* 23-27.

VanPatten, B. (1998). Perceptions of and perspectives on the term "communicative". *Hispania (American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese), 81(4),* 925-932.

VanPatten, B. (2002). Communicative classrooms, processing instruction, and pedagogical norms. In S. Gass, K. Bardovi-Harlig, S. Sieloff-Magnan, & J. Walz (Gen. Eds.) & B. Harley & J.H. Hulstijn (Ser. Eds.), *Pedagogical norms for second and foreign language learning and teaching - Studies in honour of Albert Valdman: Language learning and language teaching* (pp. 105-118). The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

VanPatten, B. (2003). From input to output: A teacher's guide to second language acquisition. In J.F. Lee & B. VanPatten, *The McGraw-Hill second language professional series: Directions in second language learning.* Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Verhoeven, L., & Vermeer, A. (1992). Modeling communicative second language competence. In L. Verhoeven &. H.A. de Jong (Eds.), *The construct of language proficiency: Applications of psychological models to language assessment* (pp. 163-173). The Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind and Society.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Weber, R.P. (1990). *Basic content analysis.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Westbury, I. (1990). Textbooks, textbook publishers, and the quality of schooling. In D.L. Elliot & A. Woodward, *Textbooks and schooling in the United States: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 1-22). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1985). When does teacher talk work as input? In R.C. Scarcella & M.H. Long (Ser. Ed.) & S.M. Gass & C.G. Madden (Eds.), *Issues in second language research: Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 17-50). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Woodward, A., & Elliot, D.L. (1990). Textbook use and teacher professionalism. In D.L. Elliot & A. Woodward, *Textbooks and schooling in the United States: Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 178-193). Chicago: University of Chicago.

APPENDICES

CODING FORM A

Book Title: _____

Chapter #: _____ Page #: _____ Activity #: _____

Standard 1.1: Students engage in conversations, provide and obtain information, express feelings and emotions, and exchange opinions.			
1. **Does the activity require the students to <u>engage in conversations</u>?** Examples: ♦ Greetings/leave-takings; ♦ Extend, accept, refuse invitations ♦ Use expressions for managing conversations	**Yes** ☐	**No** ☐	**Unsure** ☐
2. **Does the activity require students to <u>provide and obtain information</u>?** Examples: ♦ Ask/answer questions, give directions	**Yes** ☐	**No** ☐	**Unsure** ☐
3. **Does the activity require students to <u>express feelings and emotions</u>?** Examples: ♦ Gratitude, appreciation, confusion, sadness	**Yes** ☐	**No** ☐	**Unsure** ☐
4. **Does the activity require students to <u>exchange opinions</u>?** Examples: ♦ likes/dislikes, agreement/disagreement ♦ beliefs, preferences	**Yes** ☐	**No** ☐	**Unsure** ☐
1. **In what <u>skill areas</u> (Speaking, Writing, Listening, Reading) does the activity require students to engage?**	**S** ☐ **W** ☐ **L** ☐ **R** ☐		
Notes:			
Do not write here, space reserved for researcher. M _____ P _____ N _____			

147

APPENDIX B

CODING FORM B

Book Title: _____

Chapter #: _____ Page #: _____ Activity #: _____

Standard 1.2: Students understand and interpret spoken and written Spanish on a variety of topics.			
1. Does the activity require students to understand and to interpret <u>written Spanish</u>? Examples: ♦ Comprehend the main ideas/themes in age-appropriate literary texts ♦ Understand principal elements of non-fiction articles in newspapers, magazines, and e-mails	**Yes** ☐	**No** ☐	**Unsure** ☐
2. Does the activity require students to understand and to interpret <u>spoken Spanish</u>? Examples: ♦ Use intonation, auditory clues ♦ Understand announcements and messages connected to daily activities ♦ Comprehend messages in film/television programs	**Yes** ☐	**No** ☐	**Unsure** ☐
3. In what <u>skill areas</u> (Listening, Reading, Viewing, None) does the activity require students to engage?	**L** ☐	**R** ☐	**V** **N** ☐ ☐
Notes:			
Do not write here, space reserved for researcher. **M** _____ **P** _____ **N** _____			

APPENDIX C

CODING FORM C

Book Title: _____ □

Chapter #: _____ Page #: _____ Activity #: _____

Standard 1.3: Students present information, concepts, and ideas in Spanish to an audience of listeners or readers on a variety of topics.				
1. **Does the activity require students to present Information, concepts, and ideas in Spanish To an <u>audience of listeners</u>?** Examples: ♦ Presentations, prepare tape/video messages ♦ Songs, poetry, anecdotes, skits ♦ Tell/re-tell stories	**Yes** □	**No** □	**Unsure** □	
2. **Does the activity require students to present Information, concepts, and ideas in Spanish To an <u>audience of readers</u>?** Examples: ♦ Prepare illustrated stories, make brochures ♦ Write reports, letters or e-mails to peers ♦ Summarize current events	**Yes** □	**No** □	**Unsure** □	
3. **In what <u>skill areas</u> (Speaking, Writing, Showing, None) does the activity require students to engage?**	**SP** □	**W** □	**SH** □	**N** □
Notes:				
Do not write here, space reserved for researcher. M _____ P _____ N _____				

APPENDIX D

CODING FORM D

Book Title: _____

Chapter #: _____ Page #: _____ Activity #: _____

Overall characteristics of the activity	
1. **In what language are the <u>written directions</u> accompanying the activity?**	**Primarily** **Primarily** **About Equal** **Translation/** **English** **Spanish** **Amounts** **Interpretation** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
2. **In what language are students directed to <u>respond</u>?**	**English** **Spanish** **Either language** **Not Specified** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
3. **In what language are the sentences, questions, and dialogues that compose <u>the activity</u>?**	**Primarily** **Primarily** **About Equal** **English** **Spanish** **Amounts** ☐ ☐ ☐
Notes:	
Do not write here, space reserved for researcher.	

APPENDIX E

SUMMARY CODING FORMS A-D

TEXTBOOK:									ACTIVITY #:			
CHAPTER:												
QUESTIONS	**FORM A**			**FORM B**			**FORM C**			**FORM D**			
	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	Y	N	U	PE	PS	AE	TI
1	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
										E	S	EL	NS
2	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
				L R V N			S W S N			PE	PS	AE	
3	☐	☐	☐	☐ ☐ ☐☐			☐ ☐ ☐ ☐			☐	☐	☐	
4	☐	☐	☐										
5	S W L R												
	☐ ☐ ☐ ☐												
*****	M P N			M P N			M P N						
	☐ ☐ ☐			☐ ☐ ☐			☐ ☐ ☐						