

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 647

FL 014 007

AUTHOR Culley, Gerald R., Ed.; Mulford, George W., Ed.
 TITLE Foreign Language Teaching Programs for
 Microcomputers: A Volume of Reviews.
 INSTITUTION Delaware Univ., Newark.
 SPONS AGENCY National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH),
 Washington, D.C.
 PUB DATE 83
 NOTE 91p.; Prepared by participants in the Summer
 Institute in Computer-Based Education for Foreign
 Language Teachers, June 28-July 23, 1982.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Computer Assisted Instruction; Computer Programs;
 High Schools; *Microcomputers; *Second Language
 Instruction; Second Language Learning
 IDENTIFIERS PF Project; *Software Reviews

ABSTRACT

Teachers and supervisors of foreign language programs from 29 high schools in six states provide reviews of foreign language microcomputer courseware. Evaluations of the 25 programs for French, German, Italian, Russian and Spanish are based on: (1) quality of content; (2) relevance to subject area; (3) suitability to computer medium; (4) appropriateness to target audience; (5) technical reliability; (6) ease of operation; (7) graphic design; (8) technical documentation; (9) content documentation; and (10) ease of content entry by instructor. Each criterion is rated on a scale of 0 to 5 (criterion not applicable to excellent). At least one, and usually two, signed narrative evaluations follow these ratings. Reviewers, while sharing a general dissatisfaction with the available courseware, feel microcomputer use is applicable to foreign language study. A list of evaluation criteria, reviewers, ordering information for the programs reviewed, and a list of organizations and resources for new materials, distributors and catalogues are provided. (JW)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED234647

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING PROGRAMS FOR MICROCOMPUTERS:
A VOLUME OF REVIEWS

by

Participants in the
Summer Institute in Computer-Based Education
for Foreign Language Teachers
June 28-July 23, 1982

Sponsored by the
National Endowment for the Humanities
and the University of Delaware

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gerald R. Culley, Ed.

George W. Mulford, Ed.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

FL014007

edited by

Gerald R. Culley
Department of Languages and Literature

and

George W. Mulford
Office of Computer-Based Instruction

Copyright © 1983
University of Delaware

C O N T E N T S

Introduction	iv
Courseware Evaluation Form (with a critique)	viii
Reviews of Programs	
General	
Astro Word Search	1
Individual Study Center	3
Foreign Language Drill I	7
Language Teacher Series	10
The Linguist	13
Teacher Utilities, Vol. I	16
(see also Italian/German Vocabulary Drill)	
French	
Conversational French	19
French Antonyms	21
French Hangman	23
French Structures	25
La Grande Aventure (Original Adventure)	29
Mystery House	32
A Sketch for Generative CAI	34
German	
Der - Die - Das	36
German I-II-III	39
German Conversation	42
Micro Deutsch	44
Italian	
Italian/German Vocabulary Drill	48
Russian	
The Russian Disk	50
Spanish	
Alicia - A Spanish Bilingual Reader	53
Developmental Spanish Tutorial Program	56
Practicando Espanol, Part I (Verb Drill)	60
Practicando Espanol, Part II (Vocabulary Drill)	62
Spanish Hangman	65
Spanish Vocabulary (see p. 25)	
List of Reviewers and Design Specialists	68
Institute Lecture Schedule	71
Catalogue of Programs, including several not reviewed	73
Sources of Information	79

I N T R O D U C T I O N

How this volume came about

The reviews in this volume were written by teachers or supervisors of foreign languages from twenty-nine high schools in six states who participated in the Summer Institute in Computer-Based Education for Foreign Language Teachers, sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities and held at the University of Delaware in the summer of 1982. Participants were selected (from a large field of applicants) on the basis of demonstrable interest in (and in many cases extensive experience with) curricular innovations in foreign language teaching.

Preparation of the reviews included here was the culmination of one of the four major activities of the institute. During their four-week stay, participants studied the theory and praxis of designing computer-based materials; designed a small program of their own; and learned enough about programming to get started, at least, on programming what they had designed. They also attended daily sessions, of up to two hours, during which the programs reviewed here were demonstrated and discussed. Each session was led by an experienced designer from the University's Office of Computer-Based Instruction, following the general format that has proved valuable for developmental critique of materials produced at the University. Session leaders were familiar with the language being taught and with the program under consideration, but they were not language teachers and did not seek to dictate any conclusions about the material. Rather, they moderated the discussion and made sure the most interesting features of the program were duly observed.

The reviews in this volume (with the exceptions noted) are in part the product of those discussions. Typically, six or more teachers were present, but only two were formally responsible for preparing a review. The courseware was available before and after the session, and in many cases the authors of the reviews worked extensively on their own to familiarize themselves with the materials. Each reviewer's contribution, then, benefitted from the group discussion, but shows personal research, reflection, and judgment as well.

Each review submitted by a participant began with answers to a standard set of questions (included at the end of this introduction). In preparing this volume, the editors took a relatively free approach to these answers; the ones printed here are excerpts or summaries. In contrast, the essays which conclude each review were edited only to assure some stylistic continuity, though they were abridged (sometimes severely) where necessary to avoid redundancy.

What courseware is included

Most of the courseware commercially available for foreign-language instruction on micro-computers was purchased or borrowed for the institute. We would like to say "all the courseware," but such a claim would be temerous. In fact, we learned of several programs

during the institute that we had overlooked, and several more have become available since. The listing at the end of this volume includes the materials we knew of in January 1983, reviewed or not; the fact that a given item was not reviewed implies nothing whatsoever about its quality. In one case, we obtained the material

too late for a review to be scheduled; that review is the only one not written by a participant.

Two of the items reviewed here are not for sale. They are the developmental Spanish materials sent to us by Robert Phillips of Miami University of Ohio (author also of the materials available through CONDUIT and reviewed separately) and the French materials sent by Henry W. Decker and Thomas Rice of the University of California at Riverside. In both cases, our reviews offer a peek at work underway but not yet ready for commercial release. We are grateful to the authors for allowing us to examine these materials in the spirit of free academic exchange. Of course, our reviews of these unfinished materials are essentially different from the others: jottings, as it were, in the margin of a draft, but in both cases, of great interest to the community of those concerned with instructional materials for foreign-language study.

General comments on
available courseware

Few of the reviews in this volume are raves. One or two programs drew more than their share of favorable comments:

Practicando Espanol fared well, as did the Teacher Utilities Disk from MECC, and reviewers were impressed by some features of Micro-Deutsch, French Structures/Spanish Vocabulary, Mystery House, and others. Still, it is probably fair to say that after four weeks spent learning about and examining microcomputer courseware, institute participants went home generally dissatisfied with what they can buy. Of course, they had also learned in minute and sometimes painful detail just how hard it is to design and produce good materials in this medium. Paradoxically, however, few or none of them seemed to believe at the end of the summer that the microcomputer has no current application to foreign-language study. They are eagerly awaiting, and in some cases setting out to produce for themselves, materials which meet their needs more closely than what they have seen or purchased so far.

Some of the features our reviewers learned to look for are found in some of the materials they reviewed. They include:

1. Clarity and accessibility. Materials which require that the teacher instruct the students in their use were downrated by our teacher-reviewers.
2. Correctness. Some of the material which can be purchased for instruction in a foreign language was not written (or proofread) by a person fluent in that language.
3. Pedagogical soundness: Although the underlying theory of instruction in foreign languages is currently in some ferment,

consensus is sometimes possible: we can agree that some activities are clearly useless to the language learner. Some of those useless activities are the object of commercially-available programs.

4. Appropriate use of the capabilities of the microcomputer. These include:

a. Bookkeeping. None of the materials reviewed here has the facility of scorekeeping and session-to-session tracking of the individual student that is displayed on larger computer systems and by a few microcomputer packages in other subjects, e.g., elementary mathematics. Such rudimentary tracking and review functions as do appear were generally applauded.

b. User options. Only a few of the available programs offer even the most obvious options: repeat, stop, review, change exercises, see an explanation or translation. This is probably the most widely-criticised shortcoming.

c. Error diagnosis. Much of the development effort in programs for big machines has gone into anticipation and diagnosis of student errors. One expects good programs to tell the student "Your third word is misspelled" or "Right stem, wrong ending." Few microcomputer programs make any comment but "right" or "wrong" (if that), though the machines' and programming languages are fully capable of such tasks.

d. Alternate right answers. Is "empezar" ok when "comenzar" was expected? How about a feminine agreement with the first person pronoun? Programs which fail to confront the less predictable features of real language frustrate students.

e. Typable accent marks. Of the programs we saw, Micro-Deutsch (for the PET) solves this problem best. Some don't even try.

5. Editability. Programs which permit the individual teacher to add to or delete from their word stock generated a good deal of excitement -- often mixed with complaints that the steps necessary to perform the editing function were hard to follow. The casual reader of this volume will need to be aware, at least, of this level of technical detail: our reviewers repeatedly use the term "database" to refer to the collection of words or sentences stored by the computer for use by the student -- the content as opposed to the form of the exercises. It is a matter of great import to the foreign-language teacher to learn whether "the database is editable" -- that is, whether the program will continue to produce meaningful exercises for the student if new words or sentences are typed in to replace the old. Of course, if "rewriting the textbook" in this way is technically possible, the demand naturally arises that the procedure for so doing be fully and clearly described.

6. Uniquely computer-dependent ideas. Our review form asks a question teachers ask with no prompting: is the computer being used to perform a task that no other, less costly medium, could perform as well? Even in a computer-mad society, it is possible that when the answer to that question is "no," the no will sooner or later be

heard. It is encouraging to note, however, how many of the programs reviewed (though not always the most "serious" or systematic ones) exploit some unique capability of the computer to meet a genuine instructional need in a new and exciting way.

C O U R S E W A R E E V A L U A T I O N F O R M

(Here are the instructions and the questions from the evaluation form used by the reviewers, followed by a critique based on our experience with it.)

Part I of the evaluation consists of completing the ten sections on the following pages. The questions are intended to suggest, not to limit, the range of your comments under each heading.

Part II is a narrative evaluation. On a separate sheet, write a review of the courseware reflecting your own professional viewpoint. Begin with a brief description of the nature and scope of the program and the application for which it is designed. If it is possible to estimate the number of student-hours of instruction, do so. Describe the outstanding virtues and flaws of the program; assess its value as an educational tool; compare it with similar programs if they exist.

Part I - Quantitative Evaluation

Listed below are a number of important criteria used in evaluating computer courseware. Each one is followed by elucidating questions. Please rate this courseware for each criterion on a scale of 0 to 5 as below:

- 0 = criterion not applicable
- 1 = poor
- 2 = fair
- 3 = average
- 4 = good
- 5 = excellent

On the lines below each criterion, you may give a brief explanation for your rating.

Quality of Content

Is the information correct? Are the explanations, if any, well written? Rating:

Relevance to Subject Area

Does the courseware treat the important topics, or is it peripheral to the central themes of the course? Rating:

Suitability to Computer Medium

Does the courseware make good use of the capability of the computer, or could this instruction be handled just as well using text or AV materials? Some points to consider are interactiveness, level of branching, use of instructor specifiable options and mastery levels, degree to which the instruction can be individualized, etc. Rating:

Appropriateness to Target Audience

Is the level too easy or too hard? Is the approach suitable for the age group of the intended users? Rating:

Technical Reliability

Rating:

Does the program run without execution errors? Does it perform as described? Does branching according to user keypresses work as stated in the on-line or off-line documentation? Are there screen overwrites?

Ease of Operation

Rating:

How easy will it be for a student in the target audience to use this courseware? Is there adequate help available on-line? Are there places where student input is required and failure to respond in the correct way makes it impossible to go on? Are the directions clear?

Graphic Design

Rating:

Does the courseware make good use of the graphic capabilities of the computer it is designed for? Are the screen displays attractive? Is text easy to read?

Technical Documentation

Rating:

Is the information adequate to get the program running? Are make and model of machine, memory size, operating system specified?

Content Documentation

Rating:

Is there an accompanying manual? Does it give all the information necessary to an instructor who wishes knowledgeably to assign the material for student use? Would it be useful to a student working independently?

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor

Rating:

Is this a documented feature of the program? If so, how easy is it? Are the directions adequate? If not, is it possible? How much skill and effort would be involved?

Comments on the Form

The courseware form, which drew on several models, was not as successful as we had hoped it would be. Our reviewers, despite their considerable skills, had various difficulties with it. The following comments are offered with the hope that they will prove helpful in assessing the reviews in this volume--and perhaps in guiding others away from some of the errors we made.

1. The numerical ratings should be read with caution. In particular, zero meant "inapplicable" only to some reviewers; to others it seems to have meant "dreadful". A more subtle trap appeared where questions about content had to be answered for a program which comes without content, e.g., The Linguist. The reviewers, sensing in varying degrees the inappropriateness of the questions on content for such lessons, tended to assign numerical ratings rather erratically.

2. "Relevance to Subject Area" to some meant, "Is the subject matter of this program (e.g., vocabulary drill) relevant to language instruction?"--and rated accordingly. Others read it as, "Are the vocabulary words in this drill relevant to the textbook used in my

school?"--and rated accordingly.

3. "Appropriateness to Target Audience" was hard to assess when the courseware did not specify a target audience. Some reviewers therefore judged the question inapplicable, while others made their own best conjecture about the target audience and rated the appropriateness in that light. We have tried to make allowances for these and all other differences in reviewer perception, but the reader should be warned.

4. Although "Ease of Operation" is intended to refer to student use, reviewers rating programs that are instructor-editable would occasionally include the latter experience under this heading. The error is not as egregious as it sounds: some teachers were thinking of assigning students to assemble lists of vocabulary words (to take one example) and insert them into the program as a project. In such a situation, it becomes rather difficult to distinguish "student use" from "instructor use".

5. When a program made no use of actual graphics, some reviewers gave a 0 to that question. Others, aware that the layout of a page of text is itself a graphic design, rated the program on how well that was accomplished. The accompanying comments should make clear what is meant in each case.

6. The narrative evaluations, despite instructions for their composition, varied widely in length, scope, and value. Were we to repeat this kind of project, we would emphasize that the narratives (1) must not be redundant with the checklist; (2) must begin with a brief statement of the nature of the program such that a reader could grasp its essentials; and (3) should normally not exceed one page.

None of this means that the editors disavow the material on the following pages; on the contrary, we believe the narrative assessments (if not the numerical ratings) are generally fair, accurate, and rich in valuable insights, both for the programs listed here and for others that have yet to be written. As the work of many hands, the volume profits from different viewpoints. By the same token, it lacks the unifying perspective that would allow a comparative evaluation of all the programs examined. The document will be most genuinely useful to the reader who bears in mind its limitations.

1

Astro Word Search
by Dr. Dean Victor
Published by Program Design, Inc.

Quality of Content: 2

Despite numerous spelling errors in English and French alike, the content is generally correct. Instructions are in the documentation rather than in the program.

Relevance to Subject Area: 1

The database of French words is not divided according to difficulty, nor do word-frequency lists seem to have been used to compile it. Its relevance is hard to assess.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 1

The program creates matrices of letters in which words are embedded and must be found. Its data-manipulation features could have been impressive, but the promise is not realized. There are no instructor-specified options or mastery levels, and no way of individualizing instruction. Once generated, a given matrix could as well be given on a ditto sheet; there is almost no interaction for the student.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 2

The word list contains all levels of difficulty without distinction, so appropriateness is not easily determined.

Technical Reliability: 2.5

The program runs as advertised without errors. However, the user waits a long while for the machine to generate a given puzzle.

Ease of Operation: 2

The task--finding words in the matrix--is easily understood; but the words may be horizontal, vertical, or diagonal and either backward or forward. The routine sometimes randomly produces real French words but of course does not recognize them as such. Finding all the words in such circumstances is a very difficult task. Most students would not tolerate it.

Graphic Design: 2

The puzzle grid is too crowded and eyestrain a genuine concern.

Technical Documentation: 3.5

Information provided was sufficient.

Content Documentation: 3.5

A short brochure and word list accompany the program. Independent work would be possible.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 0

Assessment of Reviewer #1

The program does not have much educational value. It is a word search which is unattractive, frustrating and useless as a teaching tool.

The graphics are very poorly spaced and make the search for the French word an exercise in boredom.

A student would not last very long at the computer because of the above factors.

A simple handout with a clear grid and a list of French words would do better than this program.

William Riley

Assessment of Reviewer #2

Astro-Word Search is an "educational game" for Apple computers with 32K RAM. It is sold either in cassette or diskette. This reviewer saw it on Applesoft diskette DOS 3.2.

Astro-Word Search offers 3 puzzles: 1) French I, 2) French II, 3) Challenger. Neither the program nor its accompanying booklet explains these choices. French I and French II give you the answers in both French and English and Challenger just lists the French words. This reviewer noticed no discernible differences in level of difficulty.

Once a choice is made, the computer spends several minutes putting up a display of a field of random letters, then removing them again, then showing a display of blinking asterisks on a white background and in the center of this flashing the message, "Astro-Word Search forming." This goes on needlessly long and the time to produce this field of letters for the puzzle could be much better served by showing all the possible words slowly, sequentially--or something else more constructive.

Then at last comes the puzzle itself: a matrix of letters in which the words are embedded. At the bottom of the field of letters was "Guess 9 words." If this is an educational game, "guess" is certainly not the right word to use here. Better "select" or "choose" or something else more appropriate. One good feature is that it does tell the user how many words are embedded in the puzzle and it does keep track of how many more you still have left to figure out. There is, however, no indication of which game one is doing or of the number of tries so far.

Another problem is that the matrix of words is visually unpleasant. It has fifteen letters across and thirteen letters down, and somehow the spacing was annoying to the viewer. Vertically they are much

closer together than horizontally. "V" and "U" are hard to distinguish.

Once the game is underway, much mislearning can take place. First, there are far too many editing errors: appeller (should be appeler), automme (automne), lavar (laver), ouef (oeuf), respirar (respirer), even aoeil and oest. The examples this reviewer counted at one session amounted to more than twenty-seven!

Then there is the most frustrating part: nine reviewers, all with advanced French degrees, could not find those words which were diagonally in inverted order--or at times misspelled horizontally, or vertically in inverted order! It proved to be too frustrating. One can accept the idea of perception skill drill for students to recognize new words--but what is learned by training the user to see the word horizontally, vertically or diagonally inverted?

One big oversight this reviewer saw was that if the student wants to give up he must type "?" to escape. But since this fact is mentioned only in the brochure, it is quite possible to forget it and be trapped in the program. He can of course pull the diskette out, but then he never sees the solution of the puzzle.

The fourth part, if you finally finish or know how to escape, is the score and the answers to the grid. This answer key consists of the words stripped of their surrounding matrix of letters. It is difficult to read.

Since this program cannot be edited one must live with the words in it; yet they do not seem to be keyed to any text or word-frequency list. For that matter, can one believe this to be an educational tool if even the brochure has misspellings?

Bette Keesing Sparago

Individual Study Center
Author Unknown

Published by TYC (Teach Yourself by Computer) Software

Quality of Content: 2

Information (including correct answers) was marred by typographical errors. Explanations are very few and deal with how to manipulate the six game formats rather than the content.

Relevance to Subject Area: 2

The existing content lacks rationale and coherence. Some items, intended for elementary students, include complex grammatical terms. No sequence of increasing difficulty was apparent.



Suitability to Computer Medium: 3.5

The six gaming formats make rather good use of the computer, although there is no provision for alternate correct answers, no randomization, and no handling of misspellings. In one drill, students must reproduce verbatim the question that is appropriate to a displayed answer. The formats would be much more effective with teacher-supplied content.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 3

The manual specifies the audience; the range is elementary through "any age." The format would suit first through third year provided teacher-supplied drills were used and the match drill eliminated.

Technical Reliability: 4

No errors in operation were noted apart from the fact that, when the user's name is requested, a blank input is accepted.

Ease of Operation: 2.5

Expected student behavior varies: sometimes one presses RETURN after an input, sometimes not. No help is available; a "Help" option on the index is in fact an advertisement for the publisher. Improper punctuation will cause an otherwise correct answer to be judged as wrong, and no hints are provided. Thus a student who knows the answer could be trapped at the question with no idea how to proceed.

Graphic Design: 4

Graphics are cleverly designed and generally effective. Arrangement of text on the screen, especially in matching and completion exercises, is less successful.

Technical Documentation: 4.5

The manual gives excellent instructions for implementation on TRS 80 III or Apple with cassettes or disk drive.

Content Documentation: 4

The manual includes complete listings of the data included in the programs. Despite some inaccuracies, it is adequate. Students should not have access to it.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 4

This is a vital feature of the program, and it can be done by an instructor who follows the manual carefully. Unfortunately, students can also access the data files, and the whole program can be listed.



Assessment of Reviewer #1

The Individual Study Center has several formats which run independently. The same vocabulary is used for all parts, but the student selects the section of vocabulary to be used and the number of words to be used from that section. There are four groups of words with forty words per group in both French and Spanish. There is no randomization; in order to practice word 40, the student must decide to work with all forty words. This list includes many tenses, many forms and varied grammatical aspects. The teacher can also provide a data file for student use.

The Matching Test and Drill and the Completion Test and Drill work similarly, one being a matching exercise and the other a completion exercise. Some answers on the multiple choice may appear two or three times. There is uniform negative reinforcement, with no judging of partially correct answers. With reverse completions (answer displayed, question must be supplied), the drill requires exact wording of the question. For example, the only correct wording for one exercise was: What is the d.o. pronoun plural for (us)? These exercises, some of them meaningless, are not using the capabilities of the computer medium.

Around the Ball Park is a baseball game. The manual claims that the student "learns" difficult material. However, the student cannot correct any typographical errors, and right answers are never provided. In this exercise, the student needs more control.

Beat the Clock is a timed game (drill). The student has more control in this game because he can set the time parameters. However, the index is too long and the design is not tidy. Because of the stressed time element, mistakes cannot be corrected. No reinforcement (negative or positive) is provided and some of the correct answers are not spelled correctly.

The Subject Date File Maintenance, which permits entry of new questions and answers, is accessible to both students and teachers. Though accepting blanks as questions and as answers and permitting words to be repeated, this feature makes the entire package worthwhile since an instructor can provide data.

As a professional, I would buy this package only because I can add my own data.

Beth Hallinan

Assessment of Reviewer #2

The Individual Study Center is a program comprised of several different types of drills in various disciplines. For foreign languages the student has the option of selecting side I or side II of French I, French II, Spanish I, or Spanish II. All of the drills can be accomplished on the TRS-80 III, and most of them can be used with the Apple II.

The intended audience and the minimum time required varies from segment to segment. For most of the activities the minimum time is too long. Heaven help the student who asks for forty items in the matching drill! Likewise, there does not appear to be any logical rationale for selecting the data included in the drills and games. Fortunately a virtue of the program is that it permits teachers to substitute their own data items in any of the activities, thus allowing some logical instructional sequences to be developed.

As a teacher I would throw out the second component of the program, a matching drill. In this drill the student is given an answer and must type in a lengthy question, e.g., "What is the direct object pronoun plural for (us)?" Even a single spacing error caused me to "miss" this question! Furthermore, the questions (a) do not follow any regular pattern and (b) require a student to manipulate sophisticated grammatical terms.

The gamelike quality of some of the other drills, on the other hand, provides a motivation which will attract many youngsters, but they also contain some flaws. "Puzzler," for example, is too long and does not provide any feedback until the student has filled in every blank. By the time I got the right answers, I could not remember what I had put in the blanks!

The graphics of "House on Fire"--a burning house and a ladder to which rungs are added as the student gets right answers--are clever, although some people may find the simulated crackling of the burning house annoying. It is also frustrating that all rungs of the ladder disappear when a wrong answer is given. Fortunately one does not have ultimately to place all ten rungs on the ladder to escape from the game. The game automatically stops and the occupants of the house burn up (too violent for some?) after twenty questions have been attempted.

The graphics in "Around the Ballpark" and "Beat the Clock" are quite good. In the former, a student scores homeruns, triples, doubles, etc. for right answers. There is no logic for exactly what you will score with a right answer. A question answered quickly may get you a double; a question answered right on the second try may get you a triple. The latter game, "Beat the Clock," allows the student to select his time--either number of seconds per question or number of minutes per game. The hands on the clock move at five second intervals. A continuously moving hand would be preferable and more motivational.

It should be noted that each component of this program uses the same set of forty data items. That is, the Spanish I, Side I data for the match drill are the same items included in each of the other types of games/drills. This does allow students to study specific items in various ways.

The Individual Study Center contains a number of irritating problems which make the program "untidy":

1. There is insufficient feedback when a student answers incorrectly. In at least one case I tried, the computer produced

the number of the correct item, but not the correct item itself.

2. The backspace does not work in some drills. A student's typographical error will therefore be interpreted as a wrong answer.

3. Speaking of typographical errors, at least two were seen on the program itself--"Drench" for "French" and "disao" for "disco." Also, at one point the directions told me to put in a direct object when in fact the computer wanted a direct object pronoun.

4. Spacing and readability could be improved.

In short, the Individual Study Center has some excellent features, but some obvious design and instructional problems as well. Would I purchase it to use as is? No. Would I purchase it as a base program to modify for my students? Yes. Under no circumstances would I use the match drill as it is presently structured.

James J. Ferrell

Language Drill I
by C. E. Howerton

Published by Progressive Software

Quality of Content: 1.5

This is an editor which comes without content; the instructor is to supply it. The explanations in it are filled with computer jargon and include errors of spelling and punctuation.

Relevance to Subject Area: 2.5

The format is intended for review of spelling and definition of words.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 1

Little is done here that flash cards could not do.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 1

The format is not "friendly" to anyone other than computer buffs.

Technical Reliability: 1

The program can easily be broken when an empty file is loaded accidentally or when the name of a file being loaded is misspelled.

Ease of Operation: 1

Users with and without programming experience had difficulties in operating the program. A student who had been properly briefed might succeed in running it.

Graphic Design: 2

No graphics are used. Display of text on the screen is not pleasing to the eye, though it is legible.

Technical Documentation: 2

While all needed information is present, it is poorly organized and expressed.

Content Documentation: 1.5

The manual does not explain satisfactorily how the program is to be used. It does not even make clear in what order the activities are to be done--and since the correct order is different from the order on the menu, that information would be useful.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 1.75

This is possible--indeed vital--to the program, but the arrangement of material makes it difficult.

Assessment of Reviewer #1

If the primary requisite in putting together courseware is to make directions clear and precise in language understood by the target audience then the Language Drill courseware violated the prime rule. There are two target audiences. Assuming that the first stage of the courseware usage--Content Entry-- will be followed through by the instructor, the manual and author drill instructions would be for this audience. Since the manual is crucial for understanding the running of the program, there should be information in the index about its existence. Even with the manual, there is unnecessary expenditure of time "reasoning out" the process to be followed.

The following are a sampling of problems I--and a program design specialist-- encountered as a result of faulty and incomplete documentation in the manual and the courseware:

1. It is not indicated how many words the dictionary will accept at one time; nor the number of characters which can be used for a definition.
2. If instructions are not followed properly, it is possible to lose a drill. The instructions do not show how to prevent this from occurring.
3. It was generally agreed that any student attempting to input a drill would need close instructor supervision or would have to be highly motivated and perceptive to be able to utilize this phase of the courseware program.
4. Two files listed in the catalog would not load. Probably the author put these in for his convenience, not taking into consideration the confusion their presence would cause others.

5. Other quirks in the program were too many breaks in the program, several occurring even under the touch of a design specialist.

Conclusion: There is not sufficient or explicit instruction given on use of the author mode.

The student--as target audience--will encounter difficulty doing the exercises even if he is skilled in the language. There are no examples given in the drill. Why the author called the drill Language Drill in the author mode but Spelling Drill in the student mode is unknown.

A major consideration in evaluating and writing courseware is student control, but there is little of it here. When a correct answer is given, the word quickly disappears. Missing from the program is an opportunity for the student to go over the words he missed.

There were some positive features in the program. The "Purge Dictionary" allows one to reconsider before eliminating a section. The dictionary may be enlarged by adding words from another drill to the current dictionary. The program shows throughout the drill the percent correct, although the reinforcement is not strong. If a student has 100% correct, the response is the same--That's All.

Recommendations to make courseware of this nature better:

1. Allow for more flexibility. This program is too rigid in that the answer must be exact. It does not allow for any variations or character deviations. Hints could be given as feedback, such as "it starts with a B", etc.

2. Along with the percent correct, students could be shown the number correct out of the total number tried.

Ruby Mangham

Assessment of Reviewer #2

This program has so many flaws in it that it is undeserving of a lengthy evaluation. I am able to say that it can function as an adjustable word bank which allows the user to input word lists, and make additions, deletions, or changes within them, and to drill and review the spelling and definitions of the words which are put into the program. However, a homemade set of flashcards could easily meet the same needs as this program. The program does present the items in random order--but flashcards can be shuffled.

This program is poorly organized and the directions on how to use it are not clearly written. If a teacher is able to figure out how to load it and wants to use it in the classroom, he will first have to instruct his students carefully as to how to use the program, and then hope that the students do not alter or erase any of the words, since there is no way to prevent them from having access to the word bank.

The program is written in an "unfriendly" language of computer terms and commands. In places it is improperly punctuated, and throughout the program words are poorly chosen for the context in which they are used (e.g., "modify" is used as an index heading for both the initial entry of words and meanings to the "dictionary" and for changes made to those items.)

In the program there are no graphics, the screen displays are not particularly attractive, and it is difficult to read the inverse lettering when it is used. The feedback provided by the computer is unvaried and uninspiring. It is easy for the user to become lost in the program because the general index and the "modify" index look identical, and when the user is finished with a section he is automatically returned to an index without his choosing to do so. It is also very easy to break out of the program, especially if the user accidentally loads an empty file or a file with an incorrectly spelled title.

This program is of minimal educational value as it presently exists. Perhaps with severe modifications it could become a useful tool in the classroom. The author must first consider tightening the execution of the program, revising and editing the text and manual, and adding features which make use of the uniqueness of a computer, such as the ability to recall incorrectly answered items.

Daryl M. Steel

Language Teacher Series
by Cindy and Andrew Bartorillo
Published by Acorn Software Products, Inc.

Quality of Content: 3

Reviewers for Spanish, French and Italian found few errors. Instructions for the student are not adequate.

Relevance to Subject Area: 3

This is basic vocabulary drill organized by parts of speech.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 2.75

Students may choose format (total recall or multiple choice, English to target language or the reverse), return to the index at will, and review missed items. These are good features, but some reviewers noted the absence of colors, charts, gaming, and general viewer appeal.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 2.75

The target audience is not identified, but late level I or level II seem the most likely users.

Technical Reliability: 2

The program generally ran well. One "out of memory" error occurred which necessitated a new start.

Ease of Operation: 4

Loading is a four-step operation, but once loaded the program is easy to use. No help, and few directions, are to be found. Pressing "X" returns one to the main menu, but this fact is not advertised.

Graphic Design: 3

No graphics are used. Displays are well-designed and legible overall.

Technical Documentation: 3

Though it is designed to be run on the TRS-80 model I, accompanying directions explain how to convert the program for use on a model III.

Content Documentation: 3

There is a manual for each language which lists all words and phrases. It also gives a brief description of how the program operates.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 0

Content can only be entered by listing the program (which is in BASIC) and rewriting the database.

Assessment of Reviewer #1

The French Teacher I program is part of Acorn Software's Language Teacher Series authored by Cindy and Andrew Bartorillo. (Other programs in the series are for German, Italian, and Spanish.) The program is designed to run on a TRS-80 Model I or Model III computer. Loading the program is a bit complicated since the authors do not provide an auto-load routine.

The program allows for two kinds of vocabulary drill--multiple choice and translation--from English to French or French to English. For these exercises students may select nouns, verbs, miscellaneous vocabulary, or a random selection of the above. The review option, which permits students to review missed vocabulary items only after leaving the exercise itself, does not provide the kind of immediate feedback which is desirable for reinforcing learning.

When the multiple choice option is chosen for vocabulary practice, the incorrect choices appear to come up randomly and, thus, frequently do not represent plausible answers. For the translation option the student must type in the exact word or phrase selected by

the authors for his answer to be judged correct (e.g., feminine and plural forms of adjectives are not accepted).

In the verb conjugation exercise of the program, students are given an infinitive, a tense (present, imperfect, future, or conditional), and a person and asked to provide the appropriate form of the verb. As with the vocabulary exercises, if an error of any kind is made, the student is immediately provided with the correct answer without an opportunity to try again. The student's percentage of correct answers for each exercise is computed and displayed on the screen after each item; however, he has no way of knowing how many items he has completed.

Teachers with access to a printer can use this program to generate a printed test, by going through the various drills and selecting items one-by-one to be printed. Of course the teacher has no control over which questions are generated and may feel frustrated in trying to create a meaningful quiz.

This rather ambitious program for drilling French vocabulary and verb conjugations is impressive in its scope and variety. The classroom teacher, however, is likely to be bewildered by the material, which is a pot-pourri of 748 French/English word combinations, 1600 verb forms, and 198 French/English phrase combinations.

The authors would have done well to focus the vocabulary on a particular topic or topics and then to provide an editing function to allow teachers and students to add pertinent vocabulary to the program. Concentrating on fewer items might have allowed for more interactive feedback to student answers and a better tool for teachers and students overall.

Virginia E. Layman

Assessment of Reviewer #2

The content and screen arrangement of the Italian program I thought were superb. Since I am unfamiliar with the TRS-80, it took someone else to convert the disc so I could use it. Although instructions were in the manual, I still found myself hesitant in tackling what it called a "six second job."

The varied content could keep a student busy one period per week for a semester.

Nancy A. Jeziorski

The Linguist
by Robert C. Clardy & Charles J. Fleishman
Published by Synergistic Software

Quality of Content: 2

This is an editing tool for storing instructor-supplied content in three formats. Apart from a demonstration database, it comes without content.

Relevance to Subject Area: 3.5

The program stores vocabulary (fifteen characters each in two languages), definitions (fifteen characters in one language, forty in the other), and phrases (forty characters in each language).

Suitability to Computer Medium: 3.5

As a tool for creating and editing vocabulary drills this is flexible and powerful. The student, however, has little access to branching, feedback, or individualization.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 0

The instructor supplies the content.

Technical Reliability: 2.5

The program runs properly, but an instructor will experience confusion at first; see below.

Ease of Operation: 3

Directions for the instructor are not clear. Item 3 of the main menu ("Add More Words") must be done before any other item will function, but only trial and error revealed this. An option to sort the words does not inform the user that when sorting is complete, one must inspect the list to see if anything has happened.

Directions for the student are perfectly clear, but precision in typing a response is required. The program will only reply "right" or "wrong." If "wrong," the correct answer is displayed. A running tally of correct and incorrect answers is also displayed.

Graphic Design: 1

There are two elaborate graphics pages in the "demo" section. They are very detailed, take long to plot, and add nothing to the instructional value of the program. There is effective use of large print throughout the lesson, however, and pages are legible.

Technical Documentation: 4

Documentation is explicit and should be read in advance.

Content Documentation: 3.5

There is a precise and well-organized manual but it must be studied carefully before proceeding. The instructor with only casual interest may be daunted by it. Students will find on-line instructions sufficient for their needs.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 4

A properly prepared instructor will be able to enter content with little difficulty. There are some nuisances; e.g., the awkwardness of entering words in one section, correcting misspellings in another, and inspecting the word list in yet a third.

Assessment of Reviewer #1

I have come full cycle in evaluating The Linguist. As a complete novice in using computers, I decided to run the programs as most students would without reading the documentation first. My initial reaction was one of confusion since immediately after the title page an index appeared which meant nothing to me. It had four topics from which to choose, and logically, I chose "Run Demo." This proved to be one graphic presentation which was lengthy and another from which one of the topics from the index page had to be chosen. I did make a choice and was then allowed to pick the two languages with which I wanted to work. However, nine of the languages were listed by number and ten by letter. Presumably I was to choose one from each column, but both languages that I wanted to choose were in the number column! After I chose (both from the number column), the "Main Menu" appeared; but I did not know how to proceed since I was told that "There are 0 words in Phrase Set 1." This all resulted because I had not read the documentation! Since that time I have read the thorough documentation and have realized that an additional disk had to be used in order to create the three options which the program proposes to accomplish. I also added to the file which a colleague had begun and ran the program as a drill.

It is at this point that I was in the mid portion of my cycle thinking that yes, perhaps the program does have merit. During the drill (the only activity which would be useful to a student), the student may choose to have the items displayed randomly or in fixed order. There are no hints if the student types in an incorrect answer, but he does have the opportunity to seek help for the first letter of the word or phrase if he is having difficulty with it. Where the instructor requires strict memorization and exact feedback from the student, the program may have merit.

It is possible to use seven alphabets when creating the data disks.

In coming full cycle in reviewing this program, I finally concluded that this is not an educational tool which stresses student manipulation of the target language, but an aid for the instructor in keeping accurate data disks of vocabulary and phrases. It allows for a great deal of teacher input, but the value of that input and what it finally produces is questionable.

My final comment refers to the title of the program. Since a linguist is usually considered to be one who studies the structure of language, a more appropriate title may have been The Polyglot, since the program concerns itself with the dissemination of many languages.

Ruth D. Campopiano

Assessment of Reviewer #2

My first workout with the authoring program dealing with vocabulary from the target language to English or from English to the target language was somewhat frustrating. The program would not run beyond the credit/title frame. When it finally did, I was surprised to see "Sprechen sie Deutsch?" "Parlez-vous Francais?" etc. scroll up the screen. This was somewhat distracting and too long a graphic sequence. It should be noted, however, that once engaged, the major strength of the program is that you can author vocabulary in many languages from Russian, Spanish, French, German, Italian, Swedish, ad infinitum.

The format for authoring in the Translator, Definer, and Phrasebook phases is identical and relatively easy to achieve. The author controls the levels of difficulty of the materials entered. Words may be added by topic, book chapter, and in random order if so desired. The "Sort Mode" will alphabetize the listings.

Some other sound programming features are used in this product. The program allows for random order, and keeps track of the number of correct and incorrect responses. When the student selects the correct choice, the word "Right" appears on the screen and moves from left to right and he hears a beep sound. This is a nice positive motivational device; When he makes an error, the correct answer is immediately given and he sees "Wrong" on the screen. This provided immediate feedback for the user, especially for those with low frustration levels. Also, you are never stuck in the program if you cannot supply and/or spell an answer. However, when the student has decided that he has had enough drill work after supplying a correct response, and wishes to exit, it is not stated nor obvious how to do so. By trial and error I found that two presses of "Return" achieve this.

One major flaw in the "Phrasebook Mode" is the requirement that the student's answer must be exact. Example:

Define: green (author) the color of leaves during the summer
green (student) the color of leaves in summer.

The student's answer would be marked "wrong."

Lastly, with the exception of the second frame of the title page,

the program is visually clear, uncluttered, and helps the user focus on the task at hand.

Ralph J. Miozzi

Teacher Utilities, Volume I
by MECC Staff

with special contribution by Linda Berry and Shirley Keran
Published by Minnesota Educational Computing
Consortium-Instructional Services Division

Quality of Content: 4

This is a utility lesson in which instructors supply content. On the whole the instructions in the manual and on the screen were clear, but some lapses occurred. For example, the user is told that up to ten answers may be entered per question, but the maximum character length was not stated.

Relevance to Subject Area: 5

There is no pre-supplied content, but the utilities themselves offer valuable tools for nearly any teacher.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 5

This is an excellent use of the computer. It permits teachers to produce crossword puzzles, tests, word searches, student data records, and much more.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 5

All materials are adaptable at all levels of education and may be applied to almost any course.

Technical Reliability: 4

The lesson performed properly. There are no screen overwrites and technical jargon is kept to a minimum in the well-organized, 79-page manual.

Ease of Operation: 4

Students taking the teacher-designed tests get help in reaching the correct answer and can review missed items. Teachers will find that the utilities are generally easy to use if care is given to follow the printed instructions. For some reason, no password is needed to access the questions and answers in the "review" and "test generator" sections, although crossword lists are so protected.

Graphic Design: 5

The utilities make excellent use of the graphics capability in generating hard copy materials. Moreover, screen displays are

attractive and easy to read.

Technical Documentation: 5

All necessary information is supplied clearly and fully.

Content Documentation: 5

The 79-page support booklet is splendid--thorough, precise, well thought out.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 4

Generally very good, though careful reading of the manual is necessary. It is unfortunate that no "restart" provision exists for a teacher who must stop while preparing some item. Also, an escape from the program should be available.

Assessment of Reviewer #1

The MECC courseware, Teacher Utilities, Vol. I, places a valuable tool at the disposition of the instructor. The materials consist of eleven units which become "activated" with teacher input on an Apple microcomputer with 48K. Some units require a printer for output. With Teacher Utilities, teachers may produce block letters of varying sizes to be made into posters. They may also generate crossword puzzles with up to sixty words, with words up to fifteen letters long. Clues may be as long as two lines of twenty characters. Similarly word search puzzles may be created. Puzzles are generated within moments of entering a list of words. Puzzle lists may be stored in the computer and be regenerated at another time.

Perhaps the most attractive features of the Teacher Utilities are those dealing with testing. In the "Review Load" unit, a teacher may enter up to two hundred questions of up to twenty lines in length. The format may include multiple choice and fill-in questions as well as response to questions. To anticipate student responses, the teacher may allow up to ten alternate answers. Tests may be generated on the printer on ditto masters or on single sheets. Questions are chosen by the computer at random.

In the unit entitled "Review," the student may work directly with the computer, answering the questions previously entered by the teacher in "Review Load." In this segment two of the program's most serious flaws appear. Though the crossword lists are protected by a password, no such precaution has been taken to keep the student from listing the questions and answers which the teacher has inserted into the computer. Moreover, this section supplies the student who makes an error with the correct answer. The student is requested to copy it, but the answer consistently disappears from the screen before this is possible.

Despite these drawbacks, the testing materials are valuable and have other attributes. Other units of the program keep track of all student scores, compile them and supply the teacher with data for

grades. Questions and answers may be stored, edited, deleted and added to. The program will even keep track of the objectives sought by each question.

This program makes a positive contribution to the software marketplace.

Alvin Lubiner

Assessment of Reviewer #2

The Teacher Utilities, Vol. I diskette is primarily an authoring tool designed to aid the classroom teacher. Of the eleven programs it offers, five are designed to assist the teacher in creating printed material for conventional classroom use. One program can be legitimately labelled CAI. In order to get the diskette running, one needs a 48K Apple II Plus or Applesoft in ROM, DOS 3.2 and for several programs, a printer is required.

Program IV, Frequency, enables the teacher to compute basic statistics on teacher supplied data. The manual spells out what exactly it can do. This data which is rapidly produced could be used not only by the teacher as a time saver but also to summarize data collected in a laboratory experiment, math or science classroom to study statistics or for education majors who want to learn about standard deviation and other statistical concepts used in testing.

Program V, Percent, could be used as another time saving aid to teachers in computing data on a set of test scores and compiling class standings. The displays on the video monitor were easy to read and the manual told the user what it would do with the raw scores.

Program IX, Test Generator, requires a printer to produce tests or worksheets using the file of information created in the Review Load program. The nice feature here is that if objective numbers were specified with the questions, the teacher can have an entire test printed by requesting, e.g., five questions from objective two, seven questions from objective ten, etc. If no objective numbers were specified when the file was created, then the computer will simply type the number of questions the teacher wants - all randomly selected from the file.

Program X, Word Find, creates and prints a word puzzle. The teacher enters a list of words and the computer places them in a letter matrix that hides the words. The teacher can select how the words will be printed--horizontally, vertically, diagonally, in inverted order, or any combination of the above.

As the accompanying manual states, the diskette is designed for creating creative computing software. This reviewer feels that this program certainly delivers what is set out to do. The rest depends on the teacher.

Bette Keesing Sparago

Conversational French
by L. G. Alexander and Daniel Pageon
Developed by Longman Group, Ltd.; Published by Atari

Quality of Content: 3

Although the information is correct, helpful explanations in the program itself are lacking, so that the user must read the accompanying manual for information instead of finding it through the program. The examples given for new material are often too few.

Relevance to Subject Area: 3

The objectives are clearly stated and organized. However, the material chosen for each topic is very often not the most relevant to that topic. Sometimes a student must spend a lot of time on grammatical manipulations before becoming acquainted with the new vocabulary and pronunciation. The proclaimed emphasis is on the conversational language, but since there is no control over the audio portion of the program it is ineffective.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 1.5

The goals of the program are well-suited to computer usage. However, in actual practice, such fundamental computer capabilities as frequent interaction, providing help, going back, skipping ahead, review of missed items, etc. are missing. The only way it provides for individualization is by the student's choice to replay a whole section of the lesson. Because the program does no analysis of incorrect responses, recognizes only the right answer, takes away the incorrect too soon and shows the incorrect answer for too short a time, it doesn't provide for much learning through having one's mistakes diagnosed.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 2

The program is intended for home use. One section we examined moved so slowly it was boring; another was too grammatically oriented.

Technical Reliability: 4

No problems.

Ease of Operation: 3

It is impossible to back up or skip around because the audio has only forward - stop - forward - stop capability. The possibility that a student might type 0 for a zero is not anticipated.

Graphic Design: 3.66

Graphics are impressive at the beginning, but that quality is not maintained throughout.

Technical Documentation: 5

All needed information is provided.

Content Documentation: 4

The manual is not only helpful, but necessary.

Assessment of Reviewer #1

Conversational French from Atari is designed for home use by individuals who are at least fourteen years old and who want to begin learning modern, everyday French. The course consists of ten units on five cassette tapes and in a 25-page course book. It is recommended that the user spend thirty to sixty minutes a day playing and replaying the programs until they are mastered.

The system claims to be "new and exciting," to be "your tutor and your guide...showing you where you're going wrong" and to use "many different techniques which exploit computer technology." The learner might agree that the course is "new and exciting" because he's using it on his "new and exciting" home computer; but actually, most of the learning activities involved are the same as for a non-computerized tape-plus-text format. In some ways the book and tape system would be better because it allows the student control over when to hear the material and when to look back at examples or questions.

In claiming to act as a tutor, the system states that it will perform such functions as "helping you put your mistakes right." In reality, this is one of its principal weaknesses. The program recognizes only correct answers and gives no diagnostic help with incorrect answers. The answering patterns are extremely rigid: one cannot even change a word in a sentence-length answer if he realizes his mistake before completing the sentence.

As for the "many different techniques which exploit computer technology," these are defined as "sections where you just listen or listen and repeat" and as practice sessions where the student makes choices and decisions and is told whether his answers are right or wrong. The former is traditional language lab procedure, and the latter can be done in many other ways. The learner who expects the program to be responsive and helpful on an individual basis will be disappointed.

Using clear displays and good quality audio, the system does get the user's attention and does require interaction in which the computer assumes the role of another person. It doesn't follow through, however; it puts the consumer in the position of having hired a "tutor" for private lessons only to find that much of the time the tutor doesn't repeat enough and simply assigns exercises instead of "coaching."

Carol Kirkpatrick

Assessment of Reviewer #2

Since the program is designed for use at home, rather than the classroom, its effectiveness would be defensible as homework intended to cover materials already discussed in class, or as individualized activity assigned to specific students on the basis of a perceived need, pronunciation practice for example. However, this use of the computer is limited when one weighs the cost of the software against what could be done by a teacher using traditional methods and simple A.V. materials.

Noel A. Louis

Assessment of Reviewer #3

I think an older person who has had a smattering of French in high school and not beyond might find this an effective review, especially if motivated by an impending trip. There are some individuals who would not want to take a formal course but who will get interested because of a home-oriented program like this. I am disappointed because it could have done so much more.

The designers of the program apparently thought that if you take a grammar-oriented text and put on a sound and light show with it, you will automatically have a conversational program.

Atari has cornered the games market with compelling graphics in programs demanding the participant's attention. It is a puzzlement that the company should sanction so mediocre a presentation in the educational field. What a shame! What a sham!

Sally Orr

French Antonyms
Author Unknown
Scholastic, Inc.

Quality of Content: 3

Relevance to Subject Area: 1

Since there are in vocabulary study rather few words for which antonyms can be found, the program would have limited applicability even if it were otherwise perfect.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 1

There are no options available to the student, no gradation of mastery level, no feedback beyond erasing missed items, no review, no help, no documented way a teacher could alter the vocabulary.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 1

Too easy for high school. A student could complete the drill by trial and error without knowing the vocabulary. There is no way to learn the vocabulary while doing the drill; it is totally dependent on learning which has taken place before the student comes to the computer.

Technical Reliability: 5

No problems; it's hard to imagine, with a program so simple, how there could be.

Ease of Operation: 2

Students must finish the game once they start it; there is no escape. The directions are terse ("Enter choice one") but sufficient since there is no way to go wrong.

Graphic Design: 2

Not very exciting.

Technical Documentation: 4

All necessary information is provided.

Content Documentation: 1

There is no list of words supplied for the teacher's use. Even by running the program, the instructor could not compile such a list, since the program chooses words randomly.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 0

The instructor cannot change the vocabulary list.

Assessment of Reviewer #1

French Antonyms is an inefficient review of a limited, fixed vocabulary. It uses a concentration game format, where the student is expected to find antonym pairs on a concentration board. The program is not effective as a use of the computer or even as a game, when used by a single person. No special capabilities of the computer are used which could not be duplicated by a student- or teacher-made set of cards. The game incentive is at least partially lost because a single player always gets a perfect score. There is also minimal feedback for "winning."

Since the instructor or user cannot change the vocabulary (and is not even aware beforehand of what vocabulary is available), it may or may not be appropriate to the student needs. Even if it is appropriate, it can only have limited use for any student or class - only until they have learned those words which the author has included.

Helen St. Louis

Assessment of Reviewer #2

While going through the program I found that I knew the proper response but simply could not remember where it appeared on the screen. This was very frustrating to me, and I am sure that it would be the same for student users.

Since the concentration game format as it is used in this lesson places more emphasis on remembering locations than on the target vocabulary, I feel that this instructional lesson has very little educational value.

Frank Del Favero

French Hangman
by George Earl
Published by George Earl

Quality of Content: 1

There are poor translations and misspellings of the French words. The English translations are extremely stilted and sometimes inaccurate.

Relevance to Subject Area: 1

Most high school teachers will find this material peripheral to their teaching goals.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 2

The graphics mode is used to generate accent marks on the text. Since there is no "hangman" shown on the screen, it is hard to see the point of the program's name.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 1

Much too elementary for secondary use. It is possible to guess one's way through.

Technical Reliability: 4

No problems.

Ease of Operation: 1

There are no directions for the student beyond the mention of Control-C to end the drill.

Graphic Design: 3

The accent marks work well. It is misleading to call this program "Hangman" when there is no hangman.

Technical Documentation: 1

Content Documentation: 1

There was no documentation furnished with our disk.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 0

Content is not user-modifiable.

Assessment of Reviewer #1

The French Hangman by George Earl is a computer game with four options:

- 1) French words translated to English.
- 2) English words translated to French.
- 3) French sentences translated to English.
- 4) English sentences translated to French.

The program has two virtues. The use of the graphics mode to generate French characters (accent marks and circumflex) gives a very accurate representation of the target language as it appears on the screen. Informing the student from the start that pressing Control-C will end the program is very helpful.

However, there are many flaws in the French Hangman. First is the misconception given in the title that the student will be playing "Hangman." Nowhere in the program is this game actually played. Further, there are no instructions given once the student leaves the menu so one does not know what to do. There are many content errors in the program: "quarente," "La fenetre de la sale de classe est ferme." The idioms used in the French section are not always accurate, and the English translations are often word-for-word translations of the French. Finally, there is no documentation with this version. There is neither a technical manual nor an instructional manual specifying the contents of the program. Both types of manuals would be extremely beneficial to an instructor using this program for the first time.

Educationally this program has very little value. It is not really a game; its only function is that of a translation exercise, and it does a very poor job in this capacity. Another medium could be employed to perform this task and do it much better than the computer.

This program is quite different from the Spanish Hangman, also by George Earl. The fancy graphics which distinguish the Spanish diskette are lacking in the French because of the choice of presenting text in graphics mode in order to have accent marks. The Spanish disk is more polished (the Spanish, at least, is error-free) and gives better instructions to the student (though even in the Spanish version there is room for improvement). Finally, the French version gives the correct answer after four mistakes; the Spanish



version allows six mistakes.

Dawn L. Dubinski

French Structures
Spanish Vocabulary
Author Unknown

Published by Bilingual Publications and Computer Services, Inc.

Quality of Content: 4

No errors in language were found. Recorded voices were of native speakers, though they sounded a little bored.

Relevance to Subject Area: 3

The form of the structure exercise is better than most, since material is presented in the context of a series of meaningful exchanges.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 4

Outstanding use of graphics and sound.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 3

Some parts could be used with some high school classes.

Technical Reliability: 1

Both programs failed for us less than half-way through. The publisher took some pains to rush us a sample of an updated version which solves earlier user complaints about the slowness of the light pen response; presumably the disks were "hot off the press" and not fully tested. The programs are technically among the most ambitious we reviewed, and we have no doubt of the publisher's willingness and ability to solve any user complaints.

Ease of Operation: 1

There are almost no directions on the screen, and the keyboard is altered in a bizarre fashion to achieve upper-and-lower case and accent marks. The user is totally dependent on the manual for information about program function. Some interaction points still rely on light pen input, which is cranky.

Graphic Design: 5

Good graphics and lower-case text with accent marks.

Technical Documentation: 4

There was no documentation on the installation of the required peripherals. Otherwise, program function is very thoroughly described in the manual.

Content Documentation: 3

The accompanying manual is excellent both as a guide to potential buyers and as an instructor's manual. The text of all twenty available lessons is given and every screen display is reproduced. Unfortunately, the script is in English (no documentation of the text of the French and Spanish structure exercises is provided) and there is no student guide with a compact description of key functions or instructional intent.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: n/a

The programs as listed here are not editable, but BIPACS will prepare a version using any of the existing graphics displays and your own script, complete with audio recording, for \$148. Also listed is the editing program that allows you to prepare your own programs, for \$250. (Prices are as listed in August 1982; consult the publisher for a current price.) The most unusual twist is that the publisher will distribute materials you devise within the format and pay you royalties on any sales.

Assessment of Reviewer #1

BIPACS software is available in three languages (English, French, Spanish) and two formats (vocabulary and structure). The catalog lists ten vocabulary lessons (ten two-disk packages) and ten structure drills (ten more two-disk packages). Each vocabulary lesson drills 32 words. Each structure lesson uses a dialog consisting of six exchanges (twelve sentences). We did not have the material in time for it to be reviewed by institute participants, although the group did see a demonstration of the English version. I examined the first French structure lesson and the first Spanish vocabulary lesson.

The courseware requires two disk drives, a light pen, the Mountain Computer Supertalker (available through BIPACS or locally), a microphone, and earphones. Versions are made for the standard Apple II with 48K memory and for machines with 16K and 256K additional memory. The more memory, the faster the programs execute. Our 64K version was a bit poky, but not shockingly so.

The general format of the two series is as follows:

VOCABULARY

The student first chooses one of four exercise modes. Each mode includes hearing the words in groups of four while seeing pictures of the things the words represent. The modes differ in the second stage of the exercise, which may be:

1. matching the picture to the spoken word;
2. saying the words into the microphone and having them played back;

3. matching the picture to the written word; or
4. typing the word.

Each frame of four words uses four pictures. There are eight frames (32 words) in the lesson. A version which stores the student's spoken input for later playback by the teacher can handle only five frames (20 words). The student's performance for each word is displayed at the end and can be printed (if there is a printer).

STRUCTURE

There is one graphics display per lesson. It represents two people in a conversation (the demonstration disk shows a journalist interviewing a film-maker). The characters are displayed with cartoon bubbles in which the dialog is printed, frame by frame, as the lesson proceeds.

The lesson begins with a read-through of the dialog, using the audio device and the printed text in the bubbles. Then the process repeats, but some words are left blank and the student must fill them in. (Each blank has as many character spaces as there are letters in the word, and the word is judged as soon as the last letter is struck.) If the student answers incorrectly, a choice is offered: try again or see the answer and go on to the next blank. After filling in (or failing to fill in) all the blanks, the student is prompted to speak the sentence into the microphone; it is recorded and played back immediately.

The use of the Mountain Computer Supertalker makes this courseware different from any others we examined. Sound quality is not as good as a clear tape recording, but many language teachers (I for one) would find it acceptable. Replay is almost instant, so that a sentence can be repeated, or recorded and played back, with ease. The use of computer-controlled audio allows for very rich interaction of student and material, since the written text and the audio can be synchronized. Technically, the novelty and the interest of this low-cost audio device lie in the fact that the digitized sound is treated as data and stored on the same medium (the flexible disk) where the program, the text, and the graphics reside. Unfortunately, you can't get much on one diskette: the BIPACS structure drill accomodates a total of twenty-four seconds of prerecorded audio material for the entire lesson.

Graphics are used in these lessons in a more imaginative and thoroughgoing way than in any other courseware we reviewed. Although other media (slides, videotape, print) offer much higher quality, the crudeness of the drawings is more than offset (as was the case with the audio) by the possibility of synchronizing graphics, text, and sound. The use of a cartoon format focusses attention effectively on the situational content of the lesson, thus informing the grammatical drill with meaning.

Among the shortcomings of the programs, their extremely limited scope must be mentioned first. If one purchased the entire set of both vocabulary and structure lessons (at a cost of \$1500), one

would have only the spottiest coverage of any imaginable curriculum. The vocabulary is limited to 320 concrete nouns; the structure program, with a grand total of sixty exchanges, is even more limited. How much could be done with the editing program, some native speakers, and lots of free time is another matter--one which might bear investigation by those with the resources to consider it.

The existing materials seem to have been developed in English and translated to the other two languages. Foreign-language teachers will find the vocabulary graphics, with their yard and picket fence, their cake, cookies, canoes, and horse-shoe tosses, less than ideal. The demonstration structure lesson is translated directly from an English drill of "for" and "since" in expressions of time; in the English version, the student must cope with the past progressive tense. In French, there is no difficulty except for the English speaker who tries to create a non-existent past progressive verb form; but the exercise as scripted is tangential to that difficulty. The second lesson deals with the question forms "how much" and "how many;" lesson ten uses replies like "yes, I do." What will they look like in French or Spanish, I wonder?

From the standpoint of instructional design, the programs for all their fancy graphics and audio are strangely primitive. There is no provision for review. There is no way the student can save his place (leave and come back). Indeed, there is no way into the program except through an animated title page (cute the first time) which obliges the student to wait an incredible 105 seconds for the first question in the first exercise.

There are almost no instructions anywhere in the programs. The menu page in the vocabulary lesson consists only of four pictures to represent the four drill modes (and a fifth, of a man's leg extending through a half-closed door, which means "leave the lesson"). As feedback for right or wrong answers, a smiling face or a frowning face beeps across the screen. They are nearly indistinguishable from each other (though one beeps more).

There is no partial diagnosis of a student's error, even if it involves capitalization or accent marks, both of which are typed in very un-obvious ways. It took me several tries to get through the first sentence in either drill, and I had to consult the manual repeatedly. Since there is always a "go on anyway" option for the student who has made a mistake, I assume most students (who are not renowned for their assiduity in consulting manuals) would merely "go on anyway" until they reached the end of the program, without ever knowing which replies were right and which wrong.

It may be that the use of cryptic graphics displays instead of written instructions on the screen arises from a deliberate methodology. If so, it is misguided, and the language teachers who saw the English version of the program this summer were unanimous in believing that the lack of instructions was a glaring flaw in this ambitious and expensive series of lessons.

La Grande Aventure (Original Adventure)
 by Willie Crowther, Don Woods, Jim Manning,
 Ancelme Roichel, and Harley Licht
 Published by Creative Computing Software

Quality of Content: 2.5

The French version is clearly a translation of the English. The translation is frequently awkward and occasionally incorrect.

Relevance to Subject Area: 3

Some of the vocabulary used is highly technical. The grammar is rudimentary (every input is imperative verb with direct object, and incorrect forms are accepted). However, the program places the student in a highly interactive, intensely motivating situation in which comprehension and meaningful response are required. Though not ostensibly an instructional program, it could be useful.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 4

There is a great deal of interactivity, and the individual student can pick up where he left off. There is a provision for asking for more information, or even switching to English. The latter feature, though subject to abuse, can help students through many difficult places.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 2

The text written on the screen could be understood by third or fourth-year students; the responses to be typed in are far below that level of difficulty.

Technical Reliability: 5

No problems.

Ease of Operation: 3

The student was meant to grope his way through this program. There is no documentation on how to get started, and on-screen instructions explain the very complicated set of options in a minimal way; but after that, the option of switching to English should make it fairly easy to proceed.

Graphic Design: 0

The program needs graphics and there are none. There are not even accent marks on the French.

Technical Documentation: 4

Pertinent information is included except for disk format (single-sided, single-density, IBM format 8" disk).

Content Documentation: 3

The accompanying sheet explains some options. A teacher should, however, become personally familiar with the material before having students use it.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 0

The English version is editable (with considerable difficulty) but we could not determine that this was true of the French.

Assessment of Reviewer #1

This program is a simulation/problem-solving game for upper level French students in which the computer functions as the eyes, ears, and feet of the player. The player must give the computer commands to complete actions and move from place to place in search of lost jewels hidden in a mysterious cave. Probably its most attractive features are the treasure hunt mystique and the elements of the unknown and the unexpected which motivate students to build their vocabularies in order to play the game more successfully.

The program makes effective use of some of the unique capabilities of the computer. The student must constantly interact with the computer in order to proceed step by step through the game. Effective branching permits the student to side-track in his hunt for the treasure and search out the best means to reach his goal. Objects which appear in the path of the student are randomly situated for each game, adding an element of surprise each time one plays.

There is a discrepancy between the French and English versions within this game. In the English a player is able to call up from the computer's memory an inventory of all objects he has accumulated along his search. The French version does not have this feature.

Daryl Steel

Assessment of Reviewer #2

As the computer ignores articles and prepositions and reads only the first five letters of each word typed in, it tolerates answers like "sorte maiso" for "sortez de la maison", "entre salle" for "entrez dans la salle", "prend nourr" for "prends la nourriture".

The computer understands very little--usually a command plus a noun--and its comprehension of these verbs and nouns is very limited. Yet it is capable of responding with paragraphs of information of a technical nature.

There is no manual. Instructions appear at the beginning of the program. They are few but they are complex and in French. There is a series of commands that the player must remember to use during the course of the game. Help ("aidez") is available; however, more often than not, the computer response states that there is nothing useful to tell you at this time.

The game as it presently exists contains too much vocabulary unfamiliar to most upper level students. Referring to a dictionary constantly is too much of a distraction to enjoy the game. To receive a "je ne pige pas" time and time again after typing in a logical command is enough to make anyone throw up his hands in despair.

Perhaps the teacher could prepare a handout a day or so in advance including the categories of vocabulary to be encountered in the game. This assumes, of course, that the teacher has progressed well into it. Time permitting, the teacher (or another knowledgeable in French) could play along with the students--in small or large groups--assisting with vocabulary and encouraging students to use the language in their discussions of what next to tell the computer.

As frustrating as the game is, foreign language learning does take place, if not directly from the program, then from other players. The concept is exciting and has great potential.

David E. Cox

Assessment of Reviewer #3

In spite of problems with language usage, vocabulary level, lack of instructions, etc., La Grande Aventure would be a strong motivating activity for some students and, if it were accompanied by a variety of sound teaching devices (such as discussion, in French, of the game after a session, speaking French during the game, requiring that the students draw and label the map that develops while playing, acting out scenes or situations from the game, having students compose their own branches of La Grande Aventure or their own games), could evolve into a very beneficial learning tool.

Carol Kirkpatrick

Assessment of Reviewer #4

Mystery House (see the next review) compares favorably with La Grande Aventure. Its vocabulary is even more limited, but extensive graphics are used which increase and strengthen motivation and interest. However, students cannot save their places and come back and continue; they must start over. In both packages some grammatically incorrect sentences are accepted without hesitation or explanation. Some modifications are needed in the grammatical aspects but both programs are superior in their interaction and branching. La Grande Aventure has especially extensive branching.

Beth Hallinan

Editor's note: It was my impression that the French of Mystery House was considerably better than that of La Grande Aventure,

though reviewers found things to quarrel with in both programs.

George W. Mulford

Mystery House

by Ken and Roberta Williams

Published by On-line Systems, 1980

Quality of Content: 3

Most of the French is good, but not all. Explanations use unnecessarily difficult French words. There is an occasional unacceptable flaw or stilted French expression.

Relevance to Subject Area: 5

Excellent supplementary material for vocabulary building and practice in communicating in French.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 5

Wonderful use of graphics. The game is highly interactive, since the student always has many choices.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 4

Grammatical structures are extremely simple; vocabulary is advanced. Could be used in high school, level III and up; level II with some help from the teacher.

Technical Reliability: 4

It is possible by typing in verbs not in the program's vocabulary to produce a feedback in the form "Je ne sais pas -re" when the verb typed was not an -re verb (e.g., "trouver"). Otherwise, no problems.

Ease of Operation: 2

The instructions are complicated. It is possible to get "stuck" and not know how to proceed. There is no way to get back to the original instructions.

Graphic Design: 5

Excellent drawings, used in a very clever way. Text is easy to read. Screen displays are attractive.

Technical Documentation: 0

No documentation. No problems running program.

Content Documentation: 0

None. A manual would be very useful.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 0

Inapplicable.

Assessment of Reviewers

Mystery House, Version Française, is the French translation of the English program with all the same graphics. It is a simulation in which the player enters a house where seven people have been killed and he must find the killer before the killer finds him. By using certain commands and directions explained in the introduction, the player makes his way through various rooms, encountering different situations, and discovering dead bodies.

The instructions are complicated and would be difficult to understand for lower level French students. Once the game has been played a few times, however, it becomes easier. Everything is done in French, so there is true communication in this program. The player must read and understand the instructions, tell the computer what to do next, and understand the results of his decisions. He is not only using French but is also using logic and problem-solving skills. One gets engrossed in this program.

The mystery is apparently very difficult to solve in any language, especially since many seemingly random factors are included. The random element, however, creates surprises that will delight players prepared to handle unpredictable situations. A group of four French teachers, after several hours of play, had discovered only three bodies of a total of seven. Another teacher reported much progress but never a solution after working during free moments over a period of months.

Experienced players suggest that a floor plan of the house be drawn up as play progresses, especially since if too much time elapses, one finds oneself in the dark and unable to see anything on the screen. This makes the game very frustrating but very exciting. Also noteworthy is the authors' clever anticipation of certain responses that a player might make in desperation or as a wild guess. If a player types in "merde", for example, the computer sends back an indignant message and threatens to stop playing. The program accepts synonyms for words such as "frigo" for "réfrigérateur." Both command forms and infinitives can be used. There is much flexibility.

As an educational tool this game is excellent for increasing the motivation of some students to learn and use new vocabulary in a "sink or swim" situation. It is enjoyable when played with two or more people. Students could benefit from it by playing in small groups. They could share suggestions for what to do next, all the while communicating in French. The program, however, needs much technical improvement. Even though it was not originally intended as an instructional program, the French version should have

accompanying documentation indicating the intended audience, rules for play and the learning objectives, if any. At present the only explanatory material appears on the screen and is comprised of a few instructions on how to proceed. The fact that they are in French is not the main problem. They should ideally be expanded and programmed better. On the disk used for this review one set of instructions explaining the use of certain keys did not even appear until the users had gone through the game once, were killed and then started again!

If this game is to be used in a French classroom, some kind of help should be available, even if only to point the student in the correct direction by asking such questions as the following, "Avez-vous vérifié...?", "Avez-vous essayé...?" If written in French, these questions would increase the amount of interaction, would provide another way to use the target language and would make the groping for clues, etc. a little less frustrating.

Although most of the usage is correct, certain sentences look like translations from English and are not in good idiomatic French, and there are a few examples of misspellings and obvious poor usage as well. As a computer game to be played for fun and excitement, *Mystery House* is excellent. As a game to use for supplementary work in a foreign language classroom, it should be modified.

Patricia Pullano
Barbara S. Whitney

A Sketch for Generative CAI
by Henry Decker and Tom Rice
unpublished

Quality of Content: 4.5

Verb tables are thorough and accurate (though our copy has avoir listed as the auxiliary for venir.)

Relevance to Subject Area: 4.5

Verb conjugations are generally useful both for verb drill and as part of any broader generative CAI program.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 4.5

Uses computation to simulate natural creation of verb forms from component parts. The computer's detailed knowledge of morphology could facilitate sophisticated interaction. Options for student control of complexity are provided.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 5

Formats and levels of mastery can be specified by the instructor. Usable from high school level II through college.

Technical Reliability: 0

Our unfinished version can break down (the program stops) because of complexity of material. It does not deliver instruction yet, nor does it evaluate responses and branch accordingly.

Ease of Operation: 0

Our version is not yet student-ready but worked fine for its avowed purpose of demonstrating artificial verb conjugation.

Graphic Design: 4

Nice title page. Very interesting treatment of accent marks: the cursor moves above the text which is written on every other line.

Technical Documentation: 0

Provided informally by the author.

Content Documentation: 0

Program was accompanied by a printout (written in BASIC).

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 4

Instructors may choose drill formats: sentences or subject/verb; one tense or mixed tenses (randomly selected or predetermined); negative, affirmative, and/or interrogative forms. The instructions given to the instructor by the program were fairly clear.

Assessment by Reviewer #1

Decker and Rice's disk is an excellent tool for teachers. There are four parts to it: 1) Verb Component, 2) Verb Phrase Parameters, 3) Setting up a program, and 4) Sample Verb Programs. The authors have made "Verbtibles" of a great many irregular verbs in the major tenses. These can be used for the verb drills that include tense changes, person changes, negative to interrogative, etc. As many as six formats with six verbs each can be specified for student use.

It is very easy to set up a program. The teacher must type in the verbs to be used and the tenses to be changed, and the computer randomly picks the person and number and the form of the sentence.

Virtues of the program include the number of verbs available, the variety of possibilities for drills, and the author's clever way of adding accents to letters. By putting the cursor above an answer after it has been typed, the computer gives the student a chance to place accents where they belong. Characters from the Apple's standard character set are used. A slash becomes "accent aigu" and the caret over the n key becomes "circonflexe."

There were few flaws to pick out considering that this program is in fact an unfinished product. There is no feedback on incorrect answers; the correct answer is automatically given. However, we

have been promised that judging will be added in time.

This program seems to have much more scope and flexibility than other language drill programs which only allow one way of drilling. The directions are clear and easy to follow and one cannot get "trapped" in one section of the program. Options are displayed frequently.

This material will prove to be a valuable tool in its finished form. It is already in a form which can be used now.

Patricia Pullano

Assessment of Reviewer #2

Henry Decker's experimental French formal grammar disk is a significant step toward the creation of artificial intelligence on microcomputers. There are four segments on his disk: Verb Component; Verb Phrase Parameters; Setting up a Program; and Sample Verb Programs. The instructor can choose various formats: sentences with a blank where the verb is to be filled in; subject cue, verb answer; infinitive cue, conjugated answer; one tense given as cue, another required as answer; one tense given, several tenses required as answers. The program editor writes the newly created program to disk, with access through the "Sample Verb Programs" option.

Mr. Decker might consider an alternative to giving the student the "n'" in the negative passé composé sentences. This is a dead giveaway for initial vowels in the auxiliary verb.

The experimentation with students typing accents above and below the response line with a program-positioned cursor may be a viable alternative to the creation of character sets for the French language.

In general, the program holds tremendous potential for generating language and could be utilized in a highly interactive program to create the kinds of educational materials that the computer is best at delivering.

Mrs. Danae A. Caskey

Der - Die - Das
Author Unknown
Published by Scholastic, Inc.

Quality of Content: 1.5

Explanations consist only of directions, which are clear. No umlauts are used. Three misspellings were noted: dei for die,

zahnburste for zahnbuerste, and wunder bar for wunderbar.

Relevance to Subject Area: 2

While learning the gender of nouns is important in German, the genders of frequently occurring nouns are usually learned without overemphasizing by the teacher.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 1

This is essentially a flashcard drill/without help or explanation. Interaction consists of one chance to supply the correct German article in a sentence and the computer's response of correct or incorrect. An error results in the display of the complete correct sentence.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 1

The documentation, "Grade Level: Recommended for 4-6" gives no indication of the level of language competence expected of the audience. No list of nouns, level nor number of nouns is provided.

Technical Reliability: 2.5

After the title page, the user reaches succeeding displays by pressing the space bar. There is no provision for review of past items or exit before the end of the sequence. Within these limitations, the program performs as expected.

Ease of Operation: 2

Instructions, given in inverse mode, are adequate. The student has only two choices at any point: to press the space bar to continue or to type der, die or das and the return key.

Graphic Design: 1

No graphics as such are employed. Unnumbered sentences appear in the top left-hand corner of the screen. The displays are legible and occupy less than half the screen.

Technical Documentation: 2.5

The information is brief but loading is easily accomplished.

Content Documentation: 1

A single sheet accompanies the program. It includes title, subject, objective, grade level, description and the loading procedure.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 1

This is not a documented feature of the program. The review group did observe that the program can be listed and that content entry should thus be possible; but no such entry was attempted.

Assessment of Reviewer #1

Der, Die, Das tests the student's ability to correctly give the genders of ten basic German nouns. The nouns given are all in the nominative case.

There is no written documentation for this program so it was impossible to know from the outset how many nouns were in the data bank. The program list was entered (only through the special expertise of one of the reviewers) and it was discovered that there were a total of 30 nouns. Ten of these were randomly selected for each quiz, although it does not necessarily follow that three successive quizzes would include 30 different nouns. Each quiz would take an average high school student who has studied one year of German about two to three minutes to complete.

The program does give some feedback for both correct and incorrect responses. However, I believe the material could be treated just as effectively by a workbook with the correct answers listed in the back.

John Peters

Assessment of Reviewer #2

A short sentence containing a noun in the nominative case is shown on the screen. There is a blank in front of the noun in which the student is to supply the correct gender of the article - "der", "die" or "das". Directions are given explaining to the student that he will receive ten sentences, but the sentences, which appear on the screen one at a time, are not numbered. Numbered sentences would be a good indicator to the student of his place in the program. The directions also state that the student will receive a "report" when the exercise is finished. "Report" seems to suggest something more detailed and complete than merely the number of items correct out of ten and the percentage score which the program supplies.

When the student types in the correct German article, positive feedback in the form of "Gut!", "Prima!" and "Richtig!" is given. After each set of ten sentences, if the student's score is high, the term "Wunderbar" (Which is one word in German) appears on the screen as two words - "Wunder Bar".

When the student types an incorrect answer the words "Sorry, the correct answer is...(e.g.) Der Hund ist gross." appear on the screen. The incorrect answer that the student typed in is immediately erased so that he cannot compare it to the correct answer.

The program supplies no help or explanation either semantically or linguistically as to why the noun is a certain gender. For this reason the program has little value as a teaching tool, since the student receives no information to aid his retention of the noun genders.

This lesson could be improved by providing a tutorial on German noun genders. Although the gender of many nouns must be memorized, there are some general rules that can be applied. English translation of vocabulary should also be added.

Sara Lamb

German I-II-III

Author unknown

Published by Micro Learningware

Quality of Content: 2

Information was correct, but some verbs used were uncommon ones. Explanations were sparse where present at all.

Relevance to Subject Area: 2.5

The program treats important points of grammar, but does so poorly.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 1.5

Exact answer match was required in all cases. Reinforcement for correct answers was sometimes briefly displayed, sometimes entirely absent. Little was done here that flashcards could not do.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 1

It was impossible to determine the intended users. No word list was provided. German I-II-III does not appear to refer to levels.

Technical Reliability: 1

Various syntax errors occurred during attempts to run the program. When the program failed, work done up to that point would be lost. However, the program is available on diskette; that format could be expected to be more reliable than a cassette-loaded one.

Ease of Operation: 1

Due to the limitations of cassettes the student cannot review or redo sections without difficulty. No help was available, nor could the student escape in the middle of the program. Directions were insufficient and frequently unclear.

Graphic Design: 1.5

No graphics were used. Text was always at the top left on the screen. No sense of page design was evident.

Technical Documentation: 1

Documentation was scanty but sufficient to get the program running.

Content Documentation: 1

No manual or word list was in evidence. It would be difficult for an instructor to use this program intelligently.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 1.5

More items could be entered without much difficulty, but the reviewers could not determine whether these items were in fact stored.

Assessment of Reviewer #1

I seriously doubt that this program was devised by a German teacher. It appears that a programmer or programmers were given lists of German nouns, pronouns, verbs, etc., and they developed very dry, lifeless grammar drills. Since there was no written documentation it was impossible to realize the expectations or scope of this program. This program is no more than a series of glossaries to which the student must guess the gloss on the first try. If this is not done, then the program automatically and swiftly gives the correct answer.

There is less instruction done in German I-II-III than in many mediocre German textbooks.

Because I thought this program was so bad, I am offering this account in order to document what I saw.

The section on irregular and strong verbs was chosen first. This reviewer did not know that irregular and strong verbs can be distinguished as implied. Neither directions nor the number of items to be practiced was provided. The infinitive was shown on the display, then "present tense" was listed. Subsequently, "imperfect tense" and "perfect tense" were shown. The first person singular forms were typed. The next frame showed the third person singular forms of the given verb. No directions or other feedback were given throughout this exercise. The entire list of verbs in the data bank was unobtainable. Some verbs chosen in this section were obscure, even archaic. One particular verb was unknown to the seven reviewers who knew German.

In the section on modal auxiliaries, an English sentence was given and the direction "Translate" was shown. Only one answer for the subject-noun was accepted; no synonyms. If the modal form or the main verb was wrong, a help routine was provided. However, this routine was always the same no matter what the nature of the mistake was.

The section on prepositions gave prepositional phrases in German and the student was asked to identify the case governed by the preposition. Near the end the format actually changed in that no longer were prepositions used, rather the interrogatives "Wo," and "Wohin."

The section on conjunctions displayed single conjunctions out of

context. The student had to identify the type of conjunction, i.e. coordinate/subordinate. Two sentences were then shown and were then joined automatically using the conjunction. No student interaction was required.

John Peters

Assessment of Reviewer #2

German I-II-III is a program presenting infinite possibilities that are not fully realized. The system consists of three cassettes--I, II, III-- offering approximately two hours of student instruction. Even though one would assume that the program consists of three levels, one finds that the title does not indicate the difficulty of each section. In fact the vocabulary level seems to vary within each individual section.

Because of the limitations of the cassette system, loading is slow. The format of the exercises is by design uninteresting, and this defect is compounded by the fact that students cannot choose to skip a lesson they feel is unnecessary; they must run through the entire cassette in the specified order to reach a desired exercise. Although the accompanying literature suggests that the three sections be divided further and put on separate cassettes, it would still be impossible for the student to choose to do only certain exercises within that section.

The design of one aspect of this program is particularly irritating. The German language seems to have been adapted to the computer: the German "scharfes s" must be expressed by "@" and words that contain an unlauded vowel must be preceded by an asterisk. These arbitrary rules not only cause the novice to be penalized for using perfectly correct spellings (e.g., "ss"); they also produce forms that do not in the least resemble German words.

There did exist some virtues in the design of the program. The possibility of reviewing only the questions answered incorrectly was included; this is a feature not often seen in other programs. The questions are reshuffled if the student chooses to redo an exercise. One other good point is that the student can change to the opposite language in the vocabulary if he wishes.

The use of this program as an educational tool is questionable. Since it cannot be edited, it is useless as a method for practicing vocabulary that is emphasized in individual texts. It may be marginally useful for simply practicing the /specified grammar points.

Renée S. MacDonald

German Conversation
 Language Series Design by L. G. Alexander
 German Version by Isabelle Willshaw
 Published by Atari

Quality of Content: 2.5

Few content inaccuracies were detected. One worth noting is "Könnten Sie langsamer sprechen?" translated as "Could you pay now?"

Relevance to Subject Area: 3.5

The program does offer practice in conversation as it purports to do; but choice of content topics is somewhat haphazard.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 1

The program fails to exploit the potential of the computer. The student repeats lines of conversation he hears, but he receives no evaluation. Interaction is minimal. The program's goals might have been accomplished with records or tapes.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 2.5

Home users of all ages are the intended audience. The lack of logical progression and failure to explain grammatical points in the coursebook are likely to hinder users regardless of age.

Technical Reliability: 4.5

The program ran properly.

Ease of Operation: 2.5

Cassettes took long to load and the use of this medium made review impractical. No help is available and there is little interaction.

Graphic Design: 2.5

Color graphics are attractive but primitive by comparison with other Atari programs and do little to enhance the instruction. Text is easily readable.

Technical Documentation: 4

Adequate.

Content Documentation: 2

A coursebook accompanies the package. A user unfamiliar with German grammar (as the target user surely would be) will find it not very clear.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 0

Assessment of Reviewer #1

Atari German Conversation gives the impression of being simply a glorified version of language learning records. Atari has put together an attractive package, but an important element is missing: user interaction. Although the user must repeat numbers and phrases aloud, he has no method of comparing his pronunciation to the correct version. In most sections the screens are timed, allowing no control by the individual. No choice whether to go on or not is provided. Because of other such limitations of cassette based programs, the user is stuck in any one part of the program until he finds the right answer.

The Atari program is designed mainly for the home market. For that reason, its value as an educational tool is limited; in a classroom situation the teacher could provide much better conversational practice than this offers. There is, however, a question about its usefulness even with the home audience: since no evaluation is given, practice in hearing and discrimination between sounds is forfeited.

Renée S. MacDonald

Assessment of Reviewer #2

General Description

Conversational German is a program designed for use on home computers and apparently intended for those people who wish to learn the conversational aspects of German for travel purposes. The program is designed to make use of a cassette recorder both as a means of loading the program and as a source of sound for the spoken sections of the lessons. The program consists of ten lessons somewhat randomly chosen, but with increasing levels of difficulty. Each lesson begins with a short statement of expected learning outcomes and follows a regular pattern. Material is presented (both visually and aurally), an opportunity is provided for mimicing the speakers, and questions concerning the material are offered (again both visually and aurally). Each lesson lasts approximately thirty minutes.

Accompanying materials

The program contains cassette program tapes and a small study guide. Instructions for use are included with the study guide.

Review

Atari, in attempting to incorporate spoken language with their program, has taken aim on a major failing of computer assisted language instruction, i.e. the inability of most programs to deal with the language as a medium for communication. Unfortunately, the Atari program, while taking aim at the heart of the matter, strikes significantly lower. The program makes only limited use of the spoken language, the selection and presentation of material is, at

best, eclectic, and is not only inappropriate for classroom use, it is also quite inadequate for home use. Specific shortcomings in the program design are:

1. The lack of student control once in the program. Students must proceed through each segment of the lessons. Students using the "review" prompt are led through the same material without the spoken stimulus.

2. Feedback for both correct and incorrect responses is more "cute" than helpful. Incorrect responses are greeted by a quickly flashed nein along with an annoying tone. Correct responses are rewarded with a small melody and a flashing "sehr gut."

3. No attempt at answer judging is made, further limiting the usefulness of incorrect answer feedback.

Summary

While reviewing the program, I found myself angered that so little effort had apparently been expended to organize material, to utilize the strengths of the computer or to evaluate the effectiveness of the system. It was both my opinion and the consensus of the other reviewers that the program is of little value as a home instructional course or as a classroom aid. The use of sound with computers has interesting possibilities for the future, but is neither effectively designed nor implemented in the Atari program.

Richard C. TenEyck

Micro Deutsch
by Joann Comito & John Russell
Text by John Russell
Published by Krell Software

Quality of Content: 4

Explanation of the content was brief but clear and served as a short review before drill, not as tutorial.

Relevance to Subject Area: 4.5

The important topic from beginning and intermediate German are well covered.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 3.5

Student input is judged word by word, an excellent use of the machine's capability. Branching, apart from an initial choice of a unit to work with, is not present.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 4.5

Increasing levels of difficulty make the program widely useful.

Technical Reliability: 3.5

There were some screen overwrites and some sections of the program did not load. The test record-keeping routine did not run effectively. The programmer is to be commended for disabling the RESET key.

Ease of Operation: 1.5

User must type "LOAD...MENU" to bring up the program. On-screen directions and prompts are skimpy. Once into a unit, the student must proceed to the end without help or review options. The error judging routines sometimes malfunctioned even in rather simple situations.

Graphic Design: 2

Use of upper and lower case and of inverse writing is effective, but text is sometimes awkwardly placed on the screen. Graphics are infrequent.

Technical Documentation: 2

The user is not told how to load the menu using the disk-drive code number with the correct syntax. The instructions to replace the standard PET character chip with the special one provided with this program should be referred to the user's PET distributor.

Content Documentation: 2.5

The information in the manual is probably sufficient to permit a teacher to make assignments from it, but a student working alone would have difficulty.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 0Assessment of Reviewer #1

The Krell Micro Deutsch program on disk for the PET includes 24 lessons with tests after each sixth lesson. It covers the significant grammatical structures necessary for a two year German course.

Micro Deutsch does present the user with the option of which lesson to go to, but after finishing a lesson the user had to reload "menu" unless he wishes to go on to the very next lesson.

Once into a lesson or "Unit," the student sees an attractive, but crowded, display of grammatical explanation for the structures to be practiced in the unit. This is now the only place within the unit where the student can choose when he's ready to go on within the lesson; the program uses a timer to move on to the next question after the user enters a correct response.

The answer format required varies from lesson to lesson within a unit, so it would be helpful if there were some prompts at bottom of

screen, e.g., "TYPE WHOLE SENTENCE," "TYPE ONLY ARTICLE."

This program does attempt some character judging of user input. It highlights mistakes and allows a student to redo. However, since the judging routine does not allow for words of different length, it marks out subsequent words as wrong, although they are correct. This is unfortunate since with a little more work the program could fulfil its excellent promise.

William H. Booz

Assessment of Reviewer #2

General Description

Krell's Micro Deutsch is a comprehensive program which includes the major grammar topics normally covered in the first two (or perhaps three) years of German instruction. There are 28 units including 4 test units in the package. Each of the nontest units contains five modules, all with the same format. The material is arranged in order of increasing difficulty. Each unit requires approximately one hour of student time.

Accompanying Materials

Included with the program diskette is a manual for the instructor's use. While the documentation was far lengthier than that of other programs reviewed, it was comprised mostly of scripts of the text sections with limited hints for use or explanation of the program features. For use with the PET computer, a language character chip was included along with detailed instructions for installation which, if followed, would void the machine warranty.*

*Editors' note: We checked with a PET distributor and were advised that use of this chip does not necessarily void the PET warranty, but that users would do well to contact their own distributors.

Review

The Micro Deutsch program is a cut above many of the other programs reviewed in light of the relatively ambitious scope of its content and features. It is one of the few programs written for German which attempt to cover a wide range of topics and ability levels. It is, perhaps even more importantly, one of the very few programs in any foreign language which attempt to provide the student with helpful feedback for incorrect answers. It is precisely in these attempts, however, that the program has its greatest weaknesses.

In attempting to cover a wide range of grammar topics the designers have created units which are quite lengthy and from which the student cannot easily exit. Student control is low and the potential for student frustration is, therefore, quite high. The program makes use of highlighting or "inversing" to point out

student errors and to assist the student in second and third attempts (after which the answer is quickly flashed on the screen) to answer a question. The highlighting is, unfortunately, often inaccurate in situations likely to be encountered by the average student. I feel that these two problems are severe limitations to the effective use of Micro Deutsch program.

Neither of these problems present insurmountable programming tasks and should have been "debugged" before the release of the materials.

In addition to the problems related to student frustration and feedback inaccuracy, certain aspects of the program design deserve comment:

1. Instructions for the student are not as clear or as accessible as I would prefer. In some instances the instructions are so unclear as to be quite confusing.

2. Screen format seems cramped. Items are confined to a relatively small section of the screen, while the remainder of the screen is unused.

3. Answer feedback is often flashed too quickly to be of use to the student. I would prefer more student control.

4. Students are frequently unaware of their position in the materials. Information regarding the number of items remaining would be welcomed.

5. Repetition of review items seemed random.

6. While the program is essentially student-proof, there exists no possibility for the teacher to easily enter the program for the purposes of correcting or adding material.

7. The variety of drill formats is limited in view of the number of topics covered and the amount of time the student will be spending with the program in order to complete the material.

Summary

Micro Deutsch is one of the more comprehensive programs available in foreign languages today and is, in its use of answer judging, quite noteworthy. The use of the highlighting concept is an outstanding design feature. It is unfortunate that the feature doesn't work well. A program which presents material to the student and provides meaningful practice would be a welcome addition to the curriculum materials of any teacher using microcomputers for instructional and/or review purposes. However, for the price of a program like Micro Deutsch, I believe one has the right to expect a program which is both ambitious in scope and reliable in operation. Since the information given to the student using Micro Deutsch can be both inaccurate and misleading, I would not recommend the use of the program until such problems are corrected.

Richard C. TenEyck

Italian/German Vocabulary Drill
 by Al Clark
 Published by Powersoft, Inc.

Quality of Content: 3

Content is supplied by the instructor. Explanations for the user are long (five pages!) but clear to anyone with the patience to read them thoroughly.

Relevance to Subject Area: 4

The format permits use of matching or question-and-answer drills. The specific content is provided by the instructor and so can be highly relevant.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 2.25

The lesson is easily editable, but utilizes only one mastery level. There is a low level of interaction with no branching. Only one right answer is accepted and character string judging is not employed.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 2.5

The format of the questions is all that can be judged here. It is so straightforward as to become boring rather quickly for users of most ages. Perhaps elementary through junior high could best enjoy it.

Technical Reliability: 4

Apart from one display ("Display Titles"), at which a prompt appeared but no selection was in fact possible, the lesson behaved as advertised.

Ease of Operation: 2.5

No escape is provided from an exercise before the end, nor is the length of an exercise announced beforehand. No help or hints are provided; after a third incorrect response the right answer is provided. Since blank responses are accepted, three presses of RETURN gets each answer.

Graphic Design: 1.5

No graphics were used. Reviewers generally disliked the scrolling display that produced a cluttered screen after two answers or so. In matching format, selected items continued to flash while others were being worked on--a distraction at best.

Technical Documentation: 3

Fully adequate.

Content Documentation: 4

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 4.75

Editing is very simple and efficient. There is also documentation to help a qualified user to edit the program itself--an excellent feature noted with approval by most of the reviewers.

Assessment of Reviewer #1

Italian Vocabulary Drill is an instructor editable program which drills via matching and simple translation exercises. There is no context used. This type of exercise is good for instilling the fundamentals of a language. However, overuse of this type of drill could prove boring to the student.

I have not seen students using this program. I wonder if they will find the cluttered screen displays and blinking answers as distracting as I did.

As an educational tool, this program is limited. I would hesitate to have students use it without warning them first that they must do an entire exercise before they can go back to the index. I would also tell them in advance that scoring is done at the end of the lessons. In addition, I would be sure that students know how to erase typing errors because no instructions are given.

This program seems to serve as a good vehicle for creating drills. The manual gives line numbers to help the instructor edit. For example, this program can become Spanish Vocabulary Drills very easily. However, this reviewer found no special keys for diacritical marks, which is a problem with every program I have seen so far.

Ann Marie Santoro

Assessment of Reviewer #2

The Italian Vocabulary Drill is an instructor-editable program that delivers a lesson composed of three drills. There are two translation drills, English to target language and vice versa. In addition, there is a twenty item matching drill from English to the target language. Thanks to the excellent documentation, the program is easily edited. The author provides the exact statement lines for the editing of text to conform to the new language as well as a list of subroutines.

While this program, with its ease of operation and editing, is quite a desirable tool, from a design standpoint it is seriously lacking. The drills are unimaginative as far as natural language is concerned. The branching, answer judging, and interactive capabilities of the computer as an educational medium have all but been ignored. In the English-to-target language drills, incorrect answers receive the same feedback (incorrect) whether on the first

second try, with no hints or help on-line; and, after the third incorrect response, not only is the correct answer simply printed on the screen, but the user is never asked to type that correct answer. To complicate matters, this entire question-response-feedback routine scrolls in cluttered fashion up the display screen.

In the matching drill, the user is required to enter the responses for all items with no feedback until the last choice has been made, and all this amidst inverse and flashing characters. While the user does have a second chance to answer correctly, only incorrect items are indicated on the screen (the incorrect choice made by the user the first time is not shown; neither are the correct matches). The user then has all twenty matching items to choose from when attempting to correct the items he missed. And, after all of this choosing as well as a rather lengthy explanation of scoring, the student is never provided with individual drill scores, only with a percentage score at the end of all three drills. The program is further constrained by the fact that the user must go through all three drills before exiting. And, in the case of the English-to-target language drills, the user is never told how many items he will be expected to do.

The program in its present form has serious design and even pedagogical flaws. However, thanks to the excellent documentation, modification of the core of the program to include branching and answer judging would not be difficult to achieve. For random quiz generation or practice on hard copy, this program might be useful. As a program designed for computer use, it fails to live up to what we expect of CAI materials.

Danea A. Caskey

The Russian Disk
author unknown
Published by Instant Software, Inc.

Quality of Content: 3

Some English words in the instructions were misspelled, and at least one Russian word was as well. Instructions speak of "translating" Russian words, but the user is really to identify a cognate.

Relevance to Subject Area: 4

Treatment of the Cyrillic alphabet is vital to learning Russian. The lesson's claim to teach pronunciation is less justified.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 2

Some review and help features exist, but they are not well exploited. Only in the final section are difficulty levels distinguished.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 3

The pace is challenging, even for the adult audience of potential travellers for whom this seems to have been designed. A well-motivated student should manage well with it.

Technical Reliability: 3.5

The program ran acceptably, though the documentation does not describe all of its features.

Ease of Operation: 3

Loading is fairly complicated, and help is not always available. The Model III lacks certain characters (\,]) required for responses. Directions for parts 4 and 5 are not satisfactory.

Graphic Design: 4

Cyrillic characters are produced in low-resolution graphics. These are not always recognizable. The screen is frequently crowded and difficult to read.

Technical Documentation: 3.5

Information is adequate, but discussion of one vs. two disk drives is not clear.

Content Documentation: 1

The one-page documentation is much too scanty. There is no list of Cyrillic alphabet, vocabulary items, or the like.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 0Assessment of Reviewer #1

The Russian Disk is a program to present the Russian alphabet and practice it in several ways. It was designed to run on the TRS-80 Model I, but can be converted for use on the Model III.

Lessons 1, 2, and 3 introduce the Cyrillic alphabet to students in segments of simple consonants, hard and soft vowels, consonants of medium difficulty, and difficult consonants. It is not clear what criteria were used to classify the various sorts of consonants.

After a fairly cursory presentation of a set of letters in which students see a Cyrillic character and a highlighted letter or letters in an English word to illustrate its pronunciation, Russian words are shown on the screen for the student to try to sound out and translate. Instead of using such simple cognates as radio or journalist, the authors have chosen some rather unusual proper nouns (e.g., Zanesville, Utica, Louise).

A judging routine included with this exercise provides for accepting

more than one spelling of the cue word. In fact, the user is instructed to transliterate the Russian word letter-for-letter or to give a close English equivalent. If the student makes an error he is given a second chance, and only after missing the item twice is the correct answer displayed.

Lesson 4 of the disk offers an opportunity to study lists of food items. The Russian words are displayed, along with their English translation, and the student is asked to read and study the words. He then is allowed to enter the number of any of the listed words he wants to be quizzed on later. The directions for picking the words to study are unclear and could lead to confusion and frustration on the part of the student. Further, it is somewhat disconcerting here, and throughout the program, to see giant-sized Russian words standing next to minuscule English words.

In lesson 5, after studying lists of places to eat and street signs, the student is allowed to play a matching game with complicated rules and timing and scoring mechanisms. Two of the symbols required to play the game are not available on the TRS-80 Model III keyboard. One reviewer became so impatient with the game after only a few attempts that he elected to leave that lesson.

Finally in lesson 6 the Cyrillic keyboard is made accessible to the student. Here he is asked to learn the alphabet in order and to locate the symbols on the keyboard. Only the most highly motivated student is likely to make it to this point in the lesson. By choosing to create a Russian program for the TRS-80, the authors were working at a disadvantage-- namely, the lack of programmable characters on that machine. Thus the characters are ungainly. However, for an adult anticipating travel to the Soviet Union, some aspects of this program such as alphabet recognition, food and drink names, and street signs could be of use. But without more thoroughgoing drill and without an audio capability it is unlikely that this package would be of more than passing interest to the classroom teacher.

Virginia E. Layman

Assessment of Reviewer #2

The Russian Disk presents six lessons for a TRS-80 with two disk drives. Special instructions are included for the use of a single disk drive. However, with a single disk one is unable to view the "Main Menu" displayed in the documentation. The documentation, moreover, gives no indication of the further indexing of the lessons which appear on menus in each lesson. All of this tends to be confusing to the viewer. The scanty documentation leaves the user ill-equipped to cope with the program's demands.

The lessons lead progressively from the vowels to the "easy" consonants, the "difficult" consonants, names and words to translate (perhaps transliterate would be a more accurate description), and finally they culminate in a game. Some lesson segments are decidedly short. Russian 2 had two names under Famous Names. All

Russian celebrities' names are accompanied by a short biographical sketch in English. The advantage of this feature is not clear. In one lesson an error appears in the name Brezhnev. Letters are deleted. Near this point the program "broke" and program language appeared on the screen.

Directions are sometimes ambiguous, e.g. "Type 0 to go on" when the user must also press ENTER. "Choose from below as many times as you need," leaves the user wondering how to proceed.

The game which appears in lesson 6 has little appeal. It is a frustrating activity which scores the student on his ability to recognize the English translation, in a quickly rotating list of words, of a Russian word appearing on the screen. The student may stop the rotation with a key press, but there is scarcely time to "trap" the appropriate word.

The Russian Disk might serve as a reinforcement to a student who is learning Russian through other sources, but as a primary source its defects outweigh its benefits.

Alvin Lubiner

Alicia - A Spanish Bilingual Reader
by George Earl

Published by George Earl, San Antonio, Texas

Quality of Content: 3

Instructions were not always clear. The main index lists numbers and letters without explaining their meaning. The significance of the choice to type in English or Spanish is not always clear.

Relevance to Subject Area: 2

Will a teacher assign 36 passages from Alice in Wonderland to translate? A Spanish selection (e.g., Marianela) would be better.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 1.5

Apart from immediate feedback, the lesson gains little from delivery by computer rather than by workbook or even text. It is essentially single-word translation without branching options or individualization. Missed items are, however, reviewed.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 1.5

Subject matter is appropriate to elementary students, but grammar and idioms are very advanced. The chief virtue--use of a connected story-- is diluted by the presentation of phrases piecemeal and the re-introduction of missed items.

Technical Reliability: 4.5

Though the program ran as expected without error, no instructions on "escaping" from a section are given despite an assurance that one can do so.

Ease of Operation: 2.5

The index format was inefficient and confusing; a student cannot find a given passage with certainty. Most disappointing is the method of handling a typed word: one keypress plots a letter in all places where it occurs in the word (as in "Hangman"), thus making normal typing impossible. Nor can a student change an incorrect letter once it is entered.

Graphic Design: 3.5

Graphics are used only to plot a large-print text, a bonus for legibility but lending a juvenile aura to the exercise. Good use is made of color.

Technical Documentation: 3.5

Acceptable, though memory needed is not specified.

Content Documentation: 1.5

There is no documentation of the content.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 0Assessment of Reviewer #1

This program is based on an idea which has possibilities, but is destroyed by the logistics. The story "Alice in Wonderland" is used as a basis for single-word translation. The student chooses a paragraph from the story (using a confusing numbered index) and chooses whether he wants to type in the English or the Spanish translation. He reads the whole paragraph, then is given (one at a time) phrases from which he is to translate one word. Since the program may choose any consecutive sequence of words to display as one of these "phrases", the screen often shows one consisting of parts of two different meaningful phrases (e.g., the end of a verb phrase and beginning of the following noun phrase). The student loses the idea of context and the flow of the story as he begins to use the program only as a flashcard drill in which he reads only the word to be translated. The story's continuity is further lost by the insertion, further on, of the phrase and words which the student has previously translated incorrectly. These phrases are now not only out of context, but also out of order in the story.

Since there are different modules, it would have been better to use unrelated paragraphs, listed by subject in the index. It would also be more effective to provide the student with a meaningful phrase with one missing word and have him provide that word in the target language instead of translating. This would teach reading

comprehension by context as well as reviewing the vocabulary. Help should also be available in the form of vocabulary lists, phrase translation, or presentation of the missing word one letter at a time. As it is, the only thing which makes this program better than a flashcard drill is that the students do see the words in context at the beginning--if they bother to read the paragraph.

Helen St. Louis

Assessment of Reviewer #2

Alicia is designed to teach vocabulary via direct translation from English to Spanish and from Spanish to English. Some thirty-six separate passages are offered to the student, who is advised to begin with the first passage, #1A. The student is not prevented from beginning anywhere, and the machine makes no effort to "remember" or to remind a student which passage(s) he has already completed.

The student is advised of two options at the beginning of each passage:

"Press 1 to type English words (easier)

Press 2 to type Spanish words (harder)"

What he is not told is that both sections must be done (unless, of course, the student has been smart enough to read the single page of instructions and discover that the whole process can be bypassed by pressing CTRL-C).

Assuming a student has selected the "easier" section, the screen presents a short passage (3-4 lines) from the "Alice in Wonderland" tale in Spanish. That is followed by another screen in which a single line of the same passage appears at the top and a "hangman"-type series of blanks at the bottom. A word from the sentence is displayed for the student, whose task it is to fill in the blanks with letters until the English word is complete. A right answer produces a running score (e.g., "50% of 2 questions perfect"). A wrong answer produces a repetition of the word on alternate questions. Wrong answers after the first try do not affect the overall score.

If a student selects the "harder" mode, the Spanish and English are reversed, i.e., the text appears in English and the student types the words in Spanish.

One must question the desirability of using this translation method as a means of teaching vocabulary. Assuming one is sold on this method, then questions should be raised about the words and phrases selected for translation. Often they are not the key words in a sentence, and most often they are not those which are most "translatable". The author advises students that the translations are his and are not necessarily literal. (Do most students understand what "literal translation" means?) Yet he translates "nada" in the expression "No tengo nada" ("I don't have anything") as "nothing"! Likewise he translates "orilla" as "bank". What about the student who has learned that "orilla" means "shore" or that "bank" in

Spanish is "banco"? It is true that "orilla" is presented in association with "rio" ("river") but such contextual cues are not always provided.

Mr. Earl is to be complimented for two things--the amount of time and energy that obviously went into the preparation of Alicia, and the clever use of graphics to introduce the program. It is unfortunate that his end product is one which has little, if any, instructional validity.

James J. Ferrell

Developmental Spanish Tutorial Program
by Robert Phillips, Ph.D. Miami University, Ohio
Experimental Program - Unpublished

Quality of Content: 3.5

The information is generally correct, although the mode of explanation for the uses of "ser" and "estar" and the imperfect tense may not be acceptable to all teachers. In general, explanations are rather wordy for this medium, yet in need of further refinement.

Relevance to Subject Area: 5

The four grammatical concepts presented (ser/estar, para/por, preterit/imperfect, subjunctive) are key elements in a Spanish curriculum.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 4

The program provides individualization through error correction, scoring and student-controlled access to explanations. It may be questioned, however, whether a skilled teacher using colored chalk or AV materials might not handle some of the material more effectively.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 4.5

The program is probably geared to college students, but--except for the explanations of "ser" and "estar"--could be used by high-school students also. Within this range the author has succeeded admirably. Both intellectual level and style are appropriate.

Technical Reliability: 4.5

Apart from some difficulty in leaving a topic to move to another, the program runs almost flawlessly. There are no screen overwrites and branching is accomplished easily. Despite the distractions attendant on the use of the apostrophe and the caret for the accent mark and tilde respectively, the author should be recognized for his

ingenuity in creating two symbols to remedy a shortcoming of the machine.

Ease of Operation: 4.5

In general, students should find instructions clear and on-line help adequate and accessible. Incorrect responses are dealt with very well. The presence of a few displays which lack instructions does not vitiate this strength in the program.

Graphic Design: 2

No graphics are employed, but page designs are generally well done. Some passages of explanation such as those concerned with the subjunctive, are too crowded for good legibility. Inverse flashing is distracting; the same goal could be accomplished with inverse only.

Technical Documentation: 0

This is an experimental program.

Content Documentation: 0

This is an experimental program.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 0

Not possible at this time.

Assessment of Reviewer #1

The nature of the program is tutorial with much drill and practice support. It may also be characterized as warm, friendly, and helpful. The scope of the program is not thorough in the respect that it deals principally with only one of the main verbs of volition. Furthermore, it is ambiguous to state that the formula for influencing someone's behavior is to use the subjunctive in the subordinate clause as if this were the only way to do this. The author totally ignores the option of saying something like: "Me manda estudiar la lección."

It is confusing to have to obey an affirmative command to accomplish a negative task. "No" means "Yes, turn off the bell."

While the author sets the prerequisites to this lesson in an informal manner, which is a welcomed innovation, the novice may not understand instructions like "Press '/' to skip" (i.e., to skip the remainder of the exercise and return to the index). Directions generally are less frequent and explicit than one might like.

Unfortunately, the author, in his desire to be unqualifiedly correct, sets up a contradiction for the student at the outset. To say that the subjunctive is a mode or a mood and not a tense on one line, and, on the very next line, to state "There are two

subjunctive tenses: present and past" creates a problem for the student-viewer. It is one thing to say this in class, have a student question the apparent contradiction, and offer an explanation; but, on computer, the student is left confused. Incidentally, there are four subjunctives that we teach in high school (present, imperfect, present perfect, and pluperfect); we no longer teach the future subjunctive. Why state that there are only two?

To say that the subjunctive has "no meaning" is also misleading, and leaves the student asking himself: "Then why learn it?" Certainly "may" is readily identifiable (author's own words) with the present subjunctive; "may have" with the present perfect subjunctive; and "might have" with the pluperfect subjunctive. Beyond this, the author should not state: "This lack of 'meaning' makes it easy to forget its use;" but amplify by showing how the subjunctive expresses other meanings, thoughts, intentions, etc.

All the examples are unrelated. This is a serious flaw in the presentation of this subject. Certainly the subjunctive can be presented in a coherent, natural dialog or setting.

The author makes a very strong point of explaining that in the subordinate clause the verb appears in the infinitive in English very often. Then he negates all that he taught by forcing the viewer to practice an artificial and incorrect exercise on "They want that we study." No one would speak English like that. Why show the incorrect structure? It is meant to reinforce a pattern that simply does not exist in English.

The author lists five commands that "work" in this part of the lesson. They are: /word, /answer, /stop, /skip, and /bell. No explanation is given, and I doubt that a student unfamiliar with programming will understand in what sense these odd expressions are commands or how to execute them.

At the end of each part, the author surprises the viewer with his score. I believe the viewer would be better served if the score were indicated after each answer. It spurs one onward.

Then there is another negative surprise. The author states that he has thirty more drill questions waiting in the wings and invites the viewer to dodge them. What happens to the student who has but a couple of minutes left and would like to try five more? He simply can't. There is no exit and the score is based on thirty replies.

In one instance, at least, the author accepts "tu" (your) for "tū" (you). This is unacceptable, after he has gone through so much trouble to invent and stress a way to represent accent marks.

William D. Isaacson

Assessment of Reviewer #2

Although labelled a tutorial, this program is a drill and practice exercise which reinforces students' acquisition of four difficult concepts of Spanish syntax and semantics. Explanations of the uses of the four concepts are presented for review and assistance but not as new information; thus, the program cannot be considered a tutorial.

This program provides students with a great deal of drill through written manipulation of the language and stimulates positive interaction with appropriate feedback. The feedback has a personal touch and is thorough and helpful, yet not overbearing. There is a scoring element which makes students aware of their progress as they complete a series of 15-20 items of a drill.

A lesser number of items in a drill series, advance notice of that number, and an on-screen tallying device are all desirable but missing. A very important aspect of the program is that students must correct their errors before proceeding. All options and commands are explicit, and students have the opportunity to make choices throughout the drill. When writing a word which completes a Spanish sentence, the student sees the correct answer superimposed in the space provided for it. This process fulfills a vital need in all foreign language learning and teaching, that of presenting language in context rather than in isolated forms. Although the typing of a complete sentence during a drill on the computer can become tedious and frustrating and is not recommended, this activity is encouraged at one point in the program, yet is not mandatory since the author is seeking proper verb forms rather than the completion of correct sentences. By attempting to write complete sentences in the target language, however, students once again are using language in context.

The use of the lower case in the second "para/por" drill is more effective visually, but, most importantly, solves the problems of accent marks. The problem of foreign language programs written without the proper character chip in the computer which generates accent marks is of major concern to teachers who stress proper accentuation. The typing of the mark as a character takes time and does not present an accurate likeness; thus, the dilemma! A possible resolution of the problem is that upper case letters in Spanish are usually not accented.

An option to return to the main index would be useful for students who may not want to drill more than one major topic at a time.

This experimental Spanish disk is a very viable educational tool as a drill and practice exercise. It has a definite purpose through its offering of reinforcement and remediation to students who can benefit from drill and practice in any one of four important and challenging concepts of Spanish syntax and semantics.

Ruth D. Campopiano

Practicando Español con la Manzana II, Part I (Verb Drill)
 by Robert Phillips, Ph.D., Miami University, Ohio
 Published by Conduit

Quality of Content: 3.5

While no content errors were evident, the "vosotros" forms were omitted. Both reviewers expressed concern over this. Tables which presented verb endings were somewhat confusing, especially the one for the present tense.

The program uses an apostrophe after the vowel as an accent mark: "Mari'a" for "María". Students might find this confusing.

Relevance to Subject Area: 4.5

This lesson includes 19 categories of verb drills covering regular and irregular forms of all indicative tenses, present and past subjunctive, and command forms. It seems to be broad enough in scope to be useful at all levels of study - first through fourth year.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 4

The lesson is extremely well suited to the computer. It provides much interaction with the student, who has three options with a drill. He may type "help" for a hint, "review" for explanation and/or verb-ending chart, or "answer" for the answer. Other options are "change" to go to a different drill or "stop" to end the drill.

The section on command forms allows even more control. A student may choose the type of command (familiar or formal, affirmative or negative, with or without pronouns) and the level of difficulty.

Scoring is excellent. After each section a student is told the number of items attempted, number correct on the first try, and number of items "failed" (would "miss" be better?). He is even given the number of errors with accents.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 4.5

Flexibility in level of difficulty makes this package suitable for high school and college level students.

Technical Reliability: 3.5

The program generally ran well and provided excellent branching in both student and instructor modes. Student options like "stop" do not, however, work when the program is waiting for a verb form to be entered; CTRL-BREAK had to be used then.

Some difficulties surfaced in instructor/editor mode. The EASY/Print section failed when a reviewer typed in 1,1. Perhaps quotation marks on the input were needed. In the EASY/CHANGE section, the same reviewer created a new drill but found

documentation did not make it clear how to access the drill. Moreover, the explanation on how to add hints to a question was vague enough that the reviewer had to make three attempts before getting it right.

These comments should be balanced against general praise for the range and sophistication of the options made available in editing mode. This is a complex program which makes demands on the instructor but rewards perseverance.

Ease of Operation: 4

The use of jargon "Do you want instructions? y/n" is an occasional problem, as is the fact that the student's five branching options are not always advertised. The friendly tone ("I will give you two chances and then I will tell you the answer.") is welcome. A means of getting back to the instructions later in the program would expand their usefulness.

Graphic Design: 3

While no graphics as such are in evidence, charts are used to show verb formations and student progress. There are no special characters for diacritical marks. The use of scrolling in a series of questions - with the result that a column of flashing cursors marches up the screen - is unfortunate. Some displays are so filled with text as to be difficult to read.

Technical Documentation: 4

Apart from some difficulty in getting to the title page in the verb section (one must type "catalog" at the prompt), documentation is clear and adequate. The minimum configuration is Applesoft in ROM, DOS 3.2, 48K.

Content Documentation: 4.5

There is an attractive manual by Conduit. Students working independently should have no difficulty.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 1

Teachers who attempted to enter content experienced various degrees of difficulty. There were complaints that the manual did not deal adequately with this procedure. Considerable time and effort are needed to carry the process through successfully. Until and unless the program is improved in this respect, users should be warned to come armed with patience and determination.

Assessment of Reviewer #1

The verb section of this courseware contains a substantial data base (19 categories of verbs) and a variety of drills. However, all drills demand that the student type entire verb forms. Therefore, students who use this package should be familiar with the typewriter

keyboard lest they be distracted by it. There is good student control in that one may choose the level at which he wants to work. He may also opt to leave an exercise by simply typing "CHANGE" or "STOP". The command section allows excellent student control since one selects familiar and/or formal, with or without pronouns, etc.

This courseware could be used to truly individualize drill if it weren't for a few of the review pages. They may confuse students, at least my students. When reading these verb charts, the student may think that the subject pronoun is the verb stem. Also, the verb is broken up into three sections. I don't teach the verb that way and the text I use doesn't present it in that fashion. I wonder if this section of charts could be made editable? Or could their charts look more like the preterite tense chart which is done in the usual way of stem and ending?

I would like to use this courseware in a modified version. If the charts that I have previously mentioned could be different and if booting up and editing routines could be simplified for the novice, I would purchase this package.

When I first booted up the system, I became a little disoriented because I didn't see a title page. Fortunately I knew enough to type "CATALOG". If I didn't feel comfortable with computers, I might feel overwhelmed and quit before even trying a verb drill.

Ann Marie Santoro

Practicando Español con la Manzana II, Part II (Vocabulary Drill)
by Robert Phillips, Ph.D., Miami University, Ohio
Published by Conduit

Quality of Content: 5

The vocabulary presented is based on the first chapters of Turk and Espinoza's text Foundation Course in Spanish. The explanations are for the most part clear and precise.

Relevance to Subject Area: 4.5

The program drills vocabulary, English to Spanish, from the first ten chapters of the text. The student handbook provides a content outline of the textbook and chapters.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 4

Although vocabulary drill can be done with flash cards, the program provides valuable features: limited answer judging (accent placement, use of the tilde), hints upon request, scorekeeping (number attempted, number right on second try, number failed, number of errors in accents). Thus substantial individualization is achieved.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 4

The content provided is based on a textbook that suggests college level, but the teacher utility program permits creation of drills appropriate to any textbook.

Technical Reliability: 4.5

Both in teacher and instructor mode, this program runs flawlessly if one reads and follows instructions which accompany the disk. There are no screen overwrites.

Ease of Operation: 5

"Help" (the first letters of the Spanish word) is provided (without penalty) for each item and the "answer" function is always operative. Two attempts are permitted before automatic presentation of the answer (with loss of credit). The student may not continue until the correct response has been typed in.

There is a student booklet which includes an introduction to the (Apple) microcomputer and a content outline of the chapters.

Graphic Design: 3.5

Graphics are not employed, though their use might enhance the drills. With a few exceptions, displays are well-conceived and uncluttered.

Technical Documentation: 5

The manual provides excellent documentation.

Content Documentation: 5

The manual is excellent both in its instructions to teachers and in the sample student handout it includes.

Type of Content Entry by Instructor: 4.5

Addition and deletion of items or drills are very well handled and directions quite adequate but the procedures are rather complex and need to be followed very carefully. In general this is the single most valuable feature of the program. Familiarity with microcomputers is necessary to prepare teacher and student disks. Teachers should exercise care to prevent students from having access to the editing facility.

Assessment of Reviewer #1

The one feature of this program which I feel makes it superior to others on the market that I have evaluated is the "Teacher Utility Programs". High School teachers, who often may have little knowledge of the computer, can avail themselves of its features. These teachers may tailor the drills and, in fact, the entire program, to meet the needs of a particular program or textbook. The

teacher may add to or subtract from the already existing ten lessons. If he so chooses, he may create his own vocabulary lists, (topical, advanced placement, etc.) and add them as "chapters" to the already existing chapters - including the author's ten.

Robert Phillips has designed a feature that permits the creation of student disks from the Teacher's Master Copy and the newly made vocabulary "chapters".

Another helpful asset of this program is the "Information for Students" booklet. This is distributed to the students in the early weeks of the language course. It contains a description of the microcomputer program and also provides instruction as to how to comfortably use both the machine and the program.

A typical lesson of vocabulary contained between forty and sixty words. An average running time of 20-25 minutes per lesson was recorded by this evaluator.

In summary, I would recommend this part of Practicando Español con la Manzana II very highly. I feel that it lends itself as a strong drill tool in a potentially monotonous task. It is inexpensive and its use requires minimal knowledge of the microcomputer.

Richard Hoppenhauer

Assessment of Reviewer #2

The vocabulary drills are very simple. The student is given English words in random order and must type the Spanish equivalents, including accents (made by typing an apostrophe after the accented letter) and tildes (made by typing a circumflex after the letter). If the student's first answer is wrong, he is given a second chance. After a second wrong answer, the correct answer is supplied. A request for help gives the student a hint - the first three letters of the Spanish word.

The only error diagnosis is a check to see if an accent or tilde is needed or if it is in the wrong position. The student is told either, "The accent mark is in the wrong place." or "An accent mark is needed on this word." The problem of how to generate accents is still unsolved, and every program designer or writer must make a decision as to how to show or not show them. The Phillips solution sometimes gives words an appearance quite different from that in a normal text and, for that reason, seems almost more trouble than it is worth, but that is a matter of opinion.

In this program it is assumed that Spanish nouns ending in "a", "ión", "d" and "z" take "la" as the definite article, and all others take "el". The English cues for these words do not have the definite article, whereas the English cues for exceptions to this rule are accompanied by the definite article - for example, house = casa and the climate = el clima. There is also an allowance made for acceptable alternate answers if they are synonymous - e.g., comenzar and empezar.

The documentation for this program is extremely well done - the best this reviewer has seen. It includes chapters describing the types of drills used, their contents, information for students on how to use them (including sample handouts which can be copied or modified) information on how to use the computer, complete instructions for the teacher on how to create new drills or modify already existing ones.

It is important to note, as the author points out, that student proficiency in drill is not synonymous with communication in the target language. There are students who benefit from drill work and students who do not. They should therefore be introduced to the drills and be allowed to use them as they wish.

Although it is by no means perfect, this drill program provides the teacher with a good tool which is so easy to adapt that it should definitely be considered for use in computer assisted instruction in Spanish.

Barbara S. Whitney

Spanish Hangman
by George Earl
Published by George Earl

Quality of Content: 2

Translations are often stilted. The index page, partly in English and partly in Spanish, is confusing. There are no real explanations for the student.

Relevance to Subject Area: 1

A hangman game is peripheral to the central themes of most language courses.

Suitability to Computer Medium: 2

The presentation is so simple that students could guess their way to the right answer consistently. There are no graduated levels of difficulty. Flash cards would present instruction as effectively.

Appropriateness to Target Audience: 1

No age level is specified; secondary teachers will find the material too elementary.

Technical Reliability: 4

No mechanical problems.

Ease of Operation: 2

There is a clear overall directive: "Adivina una letra - guess a letter." It is documented in the literature that control-C ends the program and sends the student to the index, but this information is not given on the screen.

Graphic Design: 4

The graphics are excellent and show a good deal of creativity. The relationship of the graphics to the instructional program is not always clear, however.

Technical Documentation: 3

Make, model, and operating system (DOS 3.2 or 3.3) are specified; control-C for the index is mentioned.

Content Documentation: 1

There is none.

Ease of Content Entry by Instructor: 0

The program is not user-modifiable.

Assessment of Reviewer #1

The Spanish Hangman is a computer game. The student is given six options:

- 1) English words translated to Spanish by the student.
- 2) English sentences translated to Spanish by the student.
- 3) Spanish words translated to English by the student.
- 4) Spanish sentences translated to English by the student.
- 5) An all-Spanish "Hangman" game.
- 6) An all-English "Hangman" game.

The game with its many options is designed to reinforce the use of the target language, both in vocabulary and sentence development.

The excellent use of graphics in the "Hangman" at the top of the display is a good motivator to get students to play the game initially. The all-Spanish section is a real Hangman game in the target language. The all-English section could be used in an ESL format as a motivating game for the student also.

There are, however, flaws in the program's design. The title page disappears from the screen too quickly. The lovely graphic display at the beginning is repeated too often. The directions also leave the screen too quickly - not giving the students the option to change their minds. The manner in which the options appear on the menu is confusing with some of the items being in Spanish and others in English. The options for selecting sentences to translate appear before those for selecting single words. Most students learn single words before complete sentences, and this sequence would be much more logical. As students guess an answer, either correctly or

incorrectly, the computer makes the decision to move on to the next item, not the student.

Another important aspect of the program which must be mentioned is the lack of Spanish characters. There are no accent marks, tildes, or punctuation marks at the beginning of sentences due to the absence of these characters on the computer keyboard.

Educationally the Spanish Hangman has no real instructional value except as a game. It should not be substituted for teacher instruction and should only be used as a supplement during the student's free time.

Dawn L. Dubinski

R E V I E W E R S

William H. Booz
Teacher of German
Robinson Secondary School
Fairfax, VA

Ruth D. Campopiano
New Jersey Teacher of the Year
Spanish and French
West Morris High School
Chester, NJ

Danea A. Caskey
Department Chairman, Foreign Languages
Baltimore (MD) County Schools

David E. Cox
Supervisor of Foreign Languages
Department of Education
Richmond, VA

Frank Del Favero
Teacher of French and German
Southern Cayuga Jr/Sr High School
Poplar Ridge, NY

Dawn L. Dubinski
Teacher of Spanish
Laurel (DE) High School

James J. Ferrell
Foreign Language Coordinator
East Brunswick (NJ) Public Schools

Beth Hallinan
Department Chairperson, Foreign Languages
Pulaski (NY) Jr/Sr High School

Richard Hoppenhauer
Chairman, Foreign Language Department
Elmont (NY) Memorial High School

William D. Isaacson, Ph.D.
Teacher of Spanish
Bayside (NY) High School

Nancy A. Jeziorski
Teacher of Latin
Horseheads (NY) High School

Carol Kirkpatrick
Teacher of French
William Penn High School
New Castle, DE

Sara Lamb
Teacher of Spanish
Christiana High School
Newark, DE

Virginia E. Layman
Teacher of French
T. C. Williams High School
Alexandria, VA

Noel Louis
Assistant Principal for the
Supervision of Foreign Languages
G. W. Wingate High School, NY

Alvin Lubiner
Coordinator of Foreign Languages
West Orange (NJ) Board of Education

Renée S. MacDonald
Teacher of German
Pitman (NJ) High School

Ruby Mangham
Teacher of Spanish and German
Langley High School
Pittsburgh, PA

Ralph J. Miozzi
Department Chairman, Foreign Languages
Clarkstown Central School District
West Nyack, NY

Sally Orr
Teacher of Latin
Mt. Pleasant High School
Wilmington, DE

John Peters
Teacher of German
Cardinal O'Hara High School
Springfield, PA

Patricia Pullano
Teacher of French
East Rochester (NY) High School

William Riley
Chairman of Foreign Language
La Salle College High School
Philadelphia, PA

Helen St. Louis
Teacher of French
Colton-Pierrepont (NY) Central High School

Ann Marie Santoro
Edgewood Regional Senior High School
Atco, NJ

Bette Keesing Sparago
Teacher of French
North Salem (NY) High School

Daryl M. Steel
Teacher of Latin
Raleigh, NC

Richard C. TenEyck
Chairman, Foreign Languages
High Point Regional High School
Sussex, NJ

Barbara S. Whitney
Teacher of French
The Field School
Washington, DC

R E V I E W S E S S I O N L E A D E R S

Discussions were led by experienced lesson designers from the professional staff of the Office of Computer-Based Instruction:

Evelyn W. Stevens, review coordinator
Christine Brooks
Judith Sandler
Bonnie A. Seiler
Gladys Sharnoff
Jessica Weissman

Lecture Schedule: Summer Institute in Computer-Based Education
for Foreign Language Teachers, Summer 1982

Tuesday, June 29

Historical Introduction to CBE Systems.
Fred T. Hofstetter, Director of the University of Delaware's Office
of Computer-Based Instruction

Wednesday, June 30

What Makes an Outstanding Lesson.
Bonnie A. Seiler, Associate Director for Administration, OCBI

Thursday, July 1

Critiquing CAI Lessons.
Jessica Weissman, Senior Applications Programmer/Analyst, OCBI

Friday, July 2

Making "Smart" Language Lessons.
Gerald R. Culley, Associate Professor of Classics and
Director of the Institute

Tuesday, July 6

Learning from Computer Games.
George W. Mulford, PLATO Services Consultant, OCBI,
Co-director of the Institute

Wednesday, July 7

Strategic Interaction: A Plan for Conversational Development.
Robert Di Pietro, Professor of Linguistics and Chairman,
Department of Languages and Literature

Thursday, July 8

A Vocabulary-Based French Program.
Theodore E. D. Braun, Professor of French

Friday, July 9

Data Collection, Error Analysis, and Improvement of Instruction.
Gerald R. Culley

Monday, July 12

Varieties of Review Structure.
George W. Mulford

Tuesday, July 13

Practice Makes Perfect If...; Or, Writing or Evaluating CAI Lessons.
Angela LaBarca, Assistant Professor of Spanish

Wednesday, July 14

From Idea to Interaction in Spanish.
Thomas A. Lathrop, Assistant Professor of Spanish

Thursday, July 15

An Artificial Intelligence Approach to Language Instruction.
Ralph M. Weischedel, Associate Professor of Computer Science

Friday, July 16

Managing an Individualized Course.
Gerald R. Culley

Monday, July 19

Teachers of English as a Second Language and Microcomputers.
John Harrison, Coordinator of Foreign Languages & ESL
Baltimore County Schools

Tuesday, July 20

Microcomputers and Videodisc.
Carl Gill, PLATO Services Consultant, OCBI

Wednesday, July 21

Audio Devices and their Future.
George W. Mulford

Thursday, July 22

Converting a Large CAI Program to Microcomputer.
Keith Slaughter, Manager, OCBI

Friday, July 23

9:00 - 11:00 Round table discussion: funding, implementing, and
publicizing programs in a high school setting.

- Alicia: Bilingual Reader
 Opportunities for Learning
 8950 Lurline Ave., Dept 26CD
 Chatsworth, CA
- Spanish
 Apple II
 48K
 diskette
 \$29.95
 p. 53
- Astro Word Search
 Opportunities for Learning
 8950 Lurline Ave., Dept. 26CD
 Chatsworth, CA 91311
- French
 Apple II
 32K
 disk
 \$8.38
 p. 1
- BIPACS Structure.
 Bilingual Publications & Computer Services
 33 West Walnut Street
 Long Beach, N.Y. 11561
 Also available in French. Three versions
 for 48K, 64K, 304K. All with audio device,
 i.e., Mountain Computer Supertalker.
- Spanish
 Apple II
 64K
 disk
 \$25.00
 p. 25
- Chinese Lessons
 Computer Translation, Inc.
 1455 S. State Street #3
 Orem, Utah 84057
- Chinese
 Apple II
 48K
 disk
 \$26.29
 not reviewed
- Compu-tations German Vocabulary Drill
 Compu-tations
 P. O. Box 502
 Troy, Michigan 48099
 Also available for French, Spanish,
 DOS 3.2 or 3.3.
- German
 Apple II

 \$24.95
 not reviewed
- Conversational French
 Atari Personal Computing Systems
 1265 Borregas
 Sunnyvale, CA 94086
 By L.G. Alexander and Daniel Pagoon;
 developed for Atari by Longman Group
 Limited. Five cassettes for Atari 400,800.
- French,
 Atari
 16K
 cassette
 \$60
 p. 19
- Conversational German
 Atari Personal Computing Services
 1265 Borregas
 Sunnyvale, CA 94086
 About \$60. By L.G. Alexander
 and Isabel Willshaw. Developed for
 Atari by Longman Group Limited.
- German
 Atari
 16K
 cassette

 42

Dasher

CONDUIT

P.O. Box 388

Iowa City, IA 52244

An editor for creating foreign-language drills, with a wide variety of instructor options; announced for 1983.

General
Apple II
?
disk

not reviewed

Der-Die-Das

Scholastic Software

P. O. Box 2002

Englewood Cliffs NJ 07632

cassette

German
PET
8K
cassette
\$9.95
p. 36

Developmental Spanish Tutorial Program

On loan from author, Robert Phillips

Working copies of new material
by Robert Phillips, Miami U. of Ohio,
author of Practicando Espanol

Spanish
Apple II
48K
disk

p. 56

Foreign Language Drill I

Marck

280 Linden Avenue

Branford, CT 06405

From Progressive Software

General
Apple II

disk
\$21.45
p. 7

French Antonyms

Scholastic Software

P.O. Box 2002

Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632

French
PET
8K
cassette
\$9.95
p. 21

French Hangman

George Earl

1302 S. Gen McMullen

San Antonio, TX 78237

French
Apple II

disk

p. 23

French I,II

TYC (Teach Yourself by Computer)

40 Stuyvesant Manor

Geneseo, NY 14454

Sample lessons generated on the
TYC Individual Study Center

French
Apple II

cassette
\$5.95
p. 3

French Structure

Bilingual Publications & Computer Services
33 West Walnut Street
Long Beach, N.Y. 11561

Also available in Spanish. Three versions
for 48K, 64K, 304K, all with audio device.
This demonstration disk \$25; others \$99.

French
Apple II
64K
disk
\$25.00
p. 25

French Vocabulary Builder

Tycom Associates
68 Velma Avenue
Pittsfield, MA 01201

French
PET
32K
cassette
\$15.95
not reviewed

German Nouns

Scholastic Software
P. O. Box 2002
Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632
Grades 3-6

German
PET
8K
cassette
\$9.95
not reviewed

German Package I, II, III

Micro Learningware
P. O. Box 2134
Mankato, MN 56001
For TRS-80 model I or III
3 programs, \$24.95 each
available cassette or disk

German
TRS-80
undocumntd
\$24.95 ea.
p. 39

German Vocabulary Drill

Powersoft, Inc.
P. O. Box 157
Pitman, N.J. 08071
An editor; contents merely a sample.

German
Apple II
48K
disk
\$24.95
p. 48

Individual Study Center

TYC (Teach Yourself by Computer)
40 Stuyvesant Manor
Geneseo, NY 14454
These are samples to illustrate drills
generated by this program. Available on
Apple II or TRS-80, cassette or disk.

General
Apple II
p. 3

Ist-Sind

Scholastic Software
P. O. Box 2002
Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632
Developed by Microcomputers in Education

German
PET
8K
cassette
\$9.95
not reviewed

Italian Vocabulary Drill

Powersoft, Inc.

P. O. Box 157

Pitman, NJ 08071

An editor; contents merely a sample.
Matching and translation drills.

Italian
Apple II
48K
disk
\$24.95
p. 48

Language Teacher Series

Acorn Software Products

634 North Carolina Ave. SE

Washington, DC 20003

Available languages: French,
German, Italian, Spanish.

General
TRS-80
32K
disk
30.95
10

La Grande Aventure

Creative Computing

P. O. Box 789-M

Morristown, NJ 07960

A game; bilingual English-French.
This is the "original" Adventure
game by Willy Crowther.

French
CP/M
32K
8" disk
\$24.95
p. 29

Lingo Fun

Lingo Fun

P.O. Box 486

Westerville, OH 43081

Just as we went to press, we received
a catalog from this distributor with
several new items. Write for it.

General
Apple II
diskette
not reviewed

Linguist

Synergistic Software

5221 120th Avenue S.E.

Bellevue, WA 98006

General-purpose high-resolution graphics
character generator and drill routine...
all editor, no content.

General
Apple II
48K
disk
\$40
p. 13

Micro-Deutsch

Krell Software Corp.

1320 Stony Brook Road

Stony Brook, NY 11790

Two diskettes and, for PET, a chip.
By John Russell, SUNY Stony Brook.

German
Apple, PET
diskette
\$179.95
p. 44

Mystery House

Sierra On-Line Inc.

36575 Mudge Ranch Road

Corsegold, CA 93614

An adventure game; directions and
responses of player entirely in French.
Two other games also available.

French
Apple II
disk
\$24.95
p. 32

Practicando Español con la Manzana II

CONDUIT

P. O. Box 388

Iowa City, Iowa 52244

copies for \$20

by Robert Phillips,

Miami University of Ohio

Spanish
Apple II
48K
diskette
\$100
p. 60

PLATO Vocabulary Builder.

Control Data Publishing Co.

P. O. Box 261127

San Diego, CA 92126

Available in French, German, and Spanish
versions for Apple II, TI 99/4A, and Atari
800; 500-word vocabulary drills.

General
Several machines
diskette
\$ 45.00
not reviewed

Russian Disk

Scholastic Software

P. O. Box 2002

Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632

From Instant Software,

Peterborough, New Hampshire

Russian
TRS-80
32K
I
\$25.95
p. 50

Schoolhouse Educational Games

Schoolhouse Software

290 Brighton Road

Elk Grove, IL 60007

Six levels in each of four languages
(French, German, Spanish, Russian);
packages include tutorial and drill.

Several
Apple II
48K
diskette
\$120 ea
not reviewed

Six Micro-Stories

Adventure International

Scott Adams, Inc.

Box 3435, Longwood, Florida 32750

Stories require the user to take an
active role by typing in part of the
dialogue (in English only).

English
Apple II
48 K
disk
\$49.95
not reviewed

Spanish Hangman

George Earl

1302 S. Gen. McMullen

San Antonio, TX 78237

Spanish
Apple II
32k
disk
\$29.95
p. 65

Spanish I, II

TYC

40 Stuyvesant Manor

Geneseo, NY 14454

Sample of TYC authoring system:
see "Individual Study Center"

Spanish
Apple II
cassette
\$5.95
p. 3

Spanish Vocabulary

Bilingual Publications & Computer Services
33 West Walnut Street
Long Beach, N.Y. 11561

Also available in French. Three versions
for 48K, 64K, 304K, all with audio device.
This demo disk \$25; others \$99 each.

Spanish
Apple II
64K
disk
\$25.00
p. 25

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Of the professional organizations, ACTFL has shown the most interest in these matters. Watch FLA for descriptions of serious academic work. The NECTFL newsletter for February 1983 contains an article by John Harrison listing many new programs.

The most current information about new materials, distributors, and catalogues is usually in the advertisements in publications like Classroom Computer News.

A participant in the institute, Richard TenEyck, writes that he is forming a company to produce and market software.

For copies of this document, write the authors at the University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19711. Copies will be free while the supply lasts.

AEDS Monitor

Association for Educational Data Systems,
1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

ADCIS Newsletter

Association for the Development of Computer-Based Instructional Systems, Bond Hall, Western Washington University Computer Center, Bellingham, WA 98225

Classroom Computer News

P.O. Box 266, Cambridge, MA 02138

The Computing Teacher

Department of Computer and Information Science,
University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403

Electronic Learning

902 Sylvan Avenue, Englewood Cliffs, NJ 07632

Foreign Language Annals

385 Warburton Avenue, Hastings-on-Hudson, NY 10706

Journal of Courseware Review

Box 28426, San Jose, CA 95159

MicroSIFT News

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory,
300 S.W. Sixth Avenue, Portland, OR 97204

NECTFL Newsletter

Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
Box 623, Middlebury, VT 05753

Pipeline
CONDUIT, P.O. Box 11100, Des Moines City, IA 52240

School MicroWare
Dresden Associates, P.O. Box 25, Dresden, Maine 04342

Swift's Directory of Educational Software
Sterling Swift Publishing Company,
1600 Fortview Road, Austin, TX 78704

THE Journal (Technological Horizons in Education)
Information Synergy Inc., P.O. Box 92, Acton, MA 01720