A study comparing the ethnic attitudes of students engaged in three levels of French language study in an anglophone university also looks at the relationship between these attitudes and gender, socioeconomic level, and course grade aspiration. Ethnic attitudes are defined as (1) descriptions of francophones; (2) social distance, or the degree of avoidance between two people in social situations; and (3) ethnocentrism-chauvinism. The subjects were 76 students at each of three levels of French instruction, with instructors from a variety of backgrounds. A number of demographic and attitude measures were used. The major findings were: (1) the two lower level classes indicated a desire for more personal contact with francophones; (2) there was decreasing ethnocentrism-chauvinism from elementary to intermediate French; (3) more positive descriptions of francophones occurred between elementary and intermediate French, but not in advanced French; (4) males experienced the most rapid decrease in social distance across all grade expectations; (5) females had higher semantic differential scores across all levels; (6) high mean scores on the three attitude scales correlated with high socioeconomic level; (7) low grade expectations were associated with negative descriptions of francophones, greater ethnocentrism-chauvinism, and greater social distance; and (8) course grade expectations were substantially correlated with all three attitude scale results. (MSE)
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background for the Problem

Never before has it been so impossible for a nation to live independently of others. Inevitably, the fate of the smallest nation influences the fate of its neighbors, and perhaps the fate of all nations. Today, for the first time in history, the absolute interdependence of several cultures and of all races is not just the subject of philosophical meditation and conjecture by the intelligensia; the weight of interdependence bears upon each inhabitant of our planet (Shane and Silvernail, 1977).

It has often been said by language educators that language study can help promote cultural pluralism (Shane and Silvernail, 1977). In addition, it has also been said that languages can encourage the development of attitudes and values requisite to a global perspective (Lewis, 1976). Connell (1975) suggested that much of modern education in all countries emphasizes the process of building a national identity and a respect for national goals and ideals; hence, it fosters ethnocentric-chauvinistic views. Language study should significantly widen perspectives about the
world and its peoples. Language study should build respect for differences and an understanding of other social systems (Shane and Silvernail, 1977).

The Modern Language Association in 1953 made a statement of objectives which was later endorsed by the UNESCO International Seminar. These objectives state a modern language properly taught should: (1) provide positive experiences which enrich and broaden the student's viewpoint of other peoples; and (2) provide experiences in the four language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing. This statement also reiterated that the experience and skills may never be perfected, but the results of the cultural experience should remain to provide a lifelong enrichment for the student of a modern foreign language.

Van Willigen (1961, 1964) stated that because of the psychological nature of languages, people become prisoners of their own culture and ethnocentrism. He declared that the study of a foreign language is a medium for attitude change, a medium that releases a person from the prison which the mother tongue imposes upon self-development. He also indicated that language study develops and sharpens intellectual skills, enriches the mind, arms it against prejudice, ethnocentrism, and facilitates contact with other people.
Empirical evidence for assertion of the existence of negative or stereotypic attitudes toward outgroups, foreigners, and foreign languages is not difficult to find; attitudes toward interethnic relations have been the focus of much research with the studies of a number of investigators substantiating the assumption that foreigners and their languages are viewed less favorably among Americans. Adorno, Frankel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950) found that those who scored high on an anti-Semitism scale also tended to score high on scales which measured hostility toward other minorities. Bettelheim and Janowitz (1950) found that intolerance toward two different minorities operate separately through some degree of generalization. Adorno et al. (1950) found some generalization in attitudes of intolerance and tolerance. Almost all of those who were intolerant of blacks were also intolerant of Jews. Lambert and Klineberg (1967) interviewed 3,300 children from 11 parts of the world. They found that children from these countries expressed positive attitudes only toward countries that were similar to their own. The groups which were seen by American children aged 6, 10, and 14 as different were the Chinese, Indians from India, blacks from Africa, and Russians. Lambert and Klineberg (1967) also discovered
that by the age of 14 American young people were less open to positive views of foreign nations than their counterparts from other countries. Lambert and Klineberg (1967) also found that American children view languages other than English as abnormal, incorrect, and different. This viewpoint suggests ethnocentrism and linguistic chauvinism and indicates a reluctance to study seriously languages and cultures. Hicks and Beyer (1970) collected data on attitudes toward Africa from more than 3,000 American seventh and twelfth graders. They found that these secondary students held stereotypic attitudes toward sub-Saharan Africa. Hicks and Beyer (1970) also found that there was an increase in the tendency for students to express stereotypes of Asia and Africa between grades 7 and 12.

The existence of negative and stereotypic attitudes within segments of American society points to the need for attitudinal change on the part of the American student population. As long as stereotypic attitudes exist within student groups and within the general population, learning about the Francophone world and interethnic studies will suffer. Fortunately, young people can be provided with language and cultural studies which can furnish immediate knowledge of a people's language and
some contact with the culture of other nations.

In contrast to the research focusing on the existence of negative attitudes, there has been a paucity of research in the area of modifying or changing attitudes toward foreign languages and foreigners in the field of foreign language education. Changing beliefs and attitudes are spoken and written about often, but few studies have been done to help understand the variables associated with such attitudes, and how change may be brought about through foreign language study.

A review of the literature yielded a limited number of experimental studies. Bernardi (1967), Cooke (1970, 1978), Cote (1972), DeMedico (1979), Lett (1976), Riestra and Johnson (1964), Savignon (1971), Sutherland (1946), and Tuttle, Guifart, Papalia, and Zampogna (1979) have focused on the modification of attitudes in student samples. Of these, five studies have shown significant modifications of attitudes toward other ethnic groups (Bernardi, 1967; Cote, 1972; DeMedic0, 1979; Riestra and Johnson, 1964; and Sutherland, 1946). Only Bernardi (1967), Cote (1972), DeMedie (1979) and Sutherland (1946) focused specifically upon attitude change in French classes. There is some contention that knowledge of French or any modern foreign language has an impact in reducing social distance, stereotyping, and ethnic hostility (Cooke, 1970; Lett, 1976; and Savignon, 1971).
Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this investigation is to compare the ethnic attitudes of students engaged in three levels of French study in an Anglophone university setting. In addition, this investigator seeks to examine the degree or the strength of the relationship between student ethnic attitudes and the classification variables of gender, socio-economic level and course grade aspiration. In this study, ethnic attitudes are defined as: descriptions of Francophones; social distance; and, ethnocentrism-chauvinism. The major research questions are:

1. Is there a relationship between three levels of French study and student attitude toward social distance?
2. Is there a relationship between three levels of French study and student ethnocentrism-chauvinistic attitudes?
3. Is there a relationship between three levels of French study and the selection of more positive descriptions of Francophones by the students?
4. Are attitude scores related to the classification variables of gender, socio-economic level, course grade aspiration and course level for students in three levels of French study? Also, are there interactive effects among variables?
Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this investigation the following definitions were used:

Attitudes are learned predispositions to respond in a favorable or unfavorable manner with respect to a given object (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). Triandis (1971) defined an attitude as having three interrelated components: (1) a cognitive component which describes beliefs, categories and stereotypes; (2) an affective component which includes the positive and negative feelings a person has; and (3) a behavioral component which reflects the way a person may be disposed to act either in a positive or negative way toward a person in specific social situations.

Ethnic attitude is the knowledge and stereotypes one might have concerning any ethnic group and the manner in which this group should be treated (Bernard, 1967; Harding, 1962).

Ethnic group is a group of people identified by racial, national, or cultural characteristics (Heopes and Pusch, 1981).

Ethnocentrism-chauvinism is the assertion of national, personal and cultural superiority (Heep, 1981). Operationally, this is defined as a score on the Agree-Disagree IDEA Test (Mitsakes, 1977).

Level of French course includes the elementary courses, French 101, 102/106, and the first semester of the
intermediate course, French 201, in the university. Social distance is the degree and grade of avoidance in social situations between two peoples (Bogardus, 1925). Operationally this was defined as a score on a Bogardus Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1925).

Significance and Need for the Study

Considerable research has been devoted to the assessment of individual differences in language aptitude and the reaction of this variable to second language achievement (Carroll and Sapon, 1967; Pimsleur, 1966). Research that has departed from an interest in language aptitude has emerged in the area of social-motivational factors as determinants of language acquisition (Bernardi, 1967; Cooke, 1970, 1978; Cote, 1972; DeMedio, 1979; Lett, 1976, 1977; Riestra and Johnson, 1964; Savignon, 1971; Sutherland, 1946; and Tuttle et al., 1979). The reason underlying this interest concerns two factors: (1) attitudes are subject to change; therefore, student attitudes toward a target ethnic group could be affected by second language acquisition specific to this ethnic group; and (2) if attitudes toward a second language and the ethnic group could be shown to be derived from within the social and personal characteristics of the student, this fact would have theoretical implications for future research into the classification variables of the student.

In the United States little research has been conducted to assess the nature of the sociometric parameters related to differential attitudes among university students studying French. Cote (1972) has explored the motivational effectiveness of cultural explorations on community college students; however, Cote (1972) only tested students in elementary French, so there was no attempt to measure growth in positive and/or negative attitudes across several levels of French study.

Little research in foreign language education exists to suggest that attitudes have been examined in a single analysis employing two or more dependent variables. For example, Bernardi (1967), Cote (1972), DeMedio (1979), Riestra and Johnson (1964), Savignon (1971), Sutherland (1946), and Tuttle et al. (1979) studied only one dependent variable at a time. Lett (1976) made use of multiple regression analysis in order to determine the proportion of variance in ethnocentrism and in dogmatism scores among foreign language students; however, he analyzed each dependent variable separately.

In order to help fill some of the gaps in the research literature this investigation sought to:
(1) compare the ethnic attitudes of students engaged in three levels of French study in a university setting; (2) examine the relationship between student ethnic attitudes and the classification variables of gender, socio-economic level and course grade aspiration; and (3) supplement ethnic attitude research in foreign language education by using a multivariate model.

Chapter II provides a review of the literature and Chapter III presents the design of the study. Chapter IV deals with the analysis of the data, and the summary, conclusions, and recommendations are discussed in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This review of the literature surveys four bodies of references: (1) attitudes toward ethnic groups and their factors; (2) the role of instruction in developing ethnic attitudes; (3) the place of this investigation in foreign language and attitude analysis; and (4) the classification variables.

Attitudes toward Ethnic Groups and their Factors

An attitude is an idea charged with affect which predisposes an individual to act in a particular way in certain social situations (Triandis, 1971). Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) define attitudes as learned predispositions to respond in a favorable or unfavorable manner with respect to a given object. These definitions suggest that attitudes can be conceived as consisting of three interrelated components: (1) a cognitive component; (2) an affective component; and (3) a behavioral component. The cognitive component includes what people think about, how people categorize and discriminate elements of the environment, and the language used to verbalize the elements of the en-
The affective component includes the positive or negative feelings, pleasant or unpleasant states, or simply the way a person evaluates objects in the environment (Chein, 1951; Triandis, 1971). Feelings toward an object in the environment are often determined by some previous pleasant or unpleasant encounter with the object, or an instrumental relationship between the object and an individual's goals (Peak, 1955).

The behavioral component reflects the positive and negative affect and the degree of social distance a person puts between himself or herself and the object (Triandis, 1971). Chein (1951) prefers the term, policy orientation, which asks what should be done after contact with an object in the environment. Consistent with Triandis (1971) and Chein (1951) is the definition of the policy orientation by Kramer (1949) which explains positive or negative acts toward other ethnic groups. Kramer (1949) explained this behavior as succorance vs. nonsuccorance, withdrawal vs. nonwithdrawal, aggression vs. nonaggression, and enforcement of status differentials vs. acceptance of status equality.

Triandis and Triandis (1960) found that some people have norms of avoidance of persons who are different from themselves with respect to race, political orientation, ethnicity, and social class. The degree to
which people are willing to accept individuals who differ on the aforementioned criteria is defined as "social distance". Bogardus (1925) found that white Americans maintained little social distance toward the British, Canadians, and Northern Europeans, and more social distance toward Southern Europeans, Orientals, and blacks. The original scale by Bogardus (1925) resulted in over 30 years of consistent ratings by over 700 respondents between 1926 and 1956 (Cooke, 1973). Research by Lambert and Klineberg (1973) indicated that white Americans continue to maintain social distance, ethnocentric attitudes and stereotypes of non-white, non-European cultures. Triandis and Triandis (1960) found that upper class Americans tend to show less social distance and prejudice than lower class Americans; that Jewish-Americans tend to show less social distance than Gentiles; and that Southern and Eastern Europeans tend to show less social distance and prejudice than American subjects with a Northern or Western European background.

In addition, social psychology has contributed other basic factors applicable to research in attitudes toward ethnic groups. Katz and Stotland (1959) pointed out that attitudes are formed in order to satisfy psychological needs. Avoidance or acceptance of another ethnic group allows an individual to protect his or her ego, value system, or knowledge base. Kelman (1958) specified
three processes of social influence (compliance, identification, and internalization) which lead to a different type of attitude toward ethnic groups. Compliance is the accommodation of a different behavior because of its social acceptability or reward. Identification requires an individual to adopt another person's or group's opinion in order to satisfy self-defining relationships between the person or group, and enhance self-image. Internalization concerns the person who considers an opinion as authentic because of its congruence with his or her rational or irrational value system. Festinger (1957) developed the theory of cognitive dissonance that states that any inconsistent cognition (ideas, information, beliefs, and attitudes) is uncomfortable, and the individual seeks to retain his or her equilibrium or homeostasis, and feels pressure toward consistency. A social psychologist would describe an attitude toward another ethnic group as a class of actions and reactions based upon the cognitive, affective, and behavioral components, and several kinds of functions: adjustment, identification, ego-defense and involvement, value interpretation, norms, habits, expectations, and the perception of the class of actions as rewarding.

Rokeach (1960) added the degree of dogmatism and ethnocentrism in an individual's belief system. Rokeach (1960) found that central beliefs are the most important
to the individual yet more difficult to change than peripheral beliefs. Peripheral beliefs are the superficial convictions which are easily changed. His Dogmatism Scale measures: (1) isolation and differentiation; (2) punitive beliefs, loneliness and helplessness; (3) content of beliefs related to authority and to people; and (4) time perspective belief-disbelief systems. Rokeach (1960) defined the authoritarian syndrome as dogmatism. Rokeach (1960) described the dogmatic as an individual intolerant of ambiguity, who looks at the world in terms of good or evil, who rejects beliefs inconsistent with his or her values. Allport (1954) and Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950) called attention to other negative actions such individuals have toward other ethnic groups: antilecution, avoidance, discrimination, physical attack, and extermination. The most important point is that people who are exemplars of authoritarianism of the right are high on the Dogmatism Scale, nationalistic, anti-world minded, and hostile toward foreigners who are not completely pro-American (Triandis, 1971).

As stated previously, attitudes toward other ethnic groups involve cognition, affect, and behavior acting in concert or individually with other functions. Explicit operational measurement of the three major factors have
been identified by Bogardus (1925), Guttman (1944), Likert (1932), Osgood (1957), McKeach (1960), Thurstone (1928), and Triandis (1971).

The Role of Instruction in Developing Ethnic Attitudes

Research on the effectiveness of educational programs in changing attitudes toward other ethnic groups and international education in the affective and behavioral components have produced a number of studies with both positive and negative results.

An early study of attitude change was conducted in 1927 at the University of Pennsylvania. As a pretest, students were asked to rank ethnic groups according to native abilities. Upon completion of a course in race relations, the students were again asked to rank the ethnic groups. The results indicated no change in attitudes after the college course in American race relations (Young, 1927).

More recent studies indicate that no single institution or agent influences young people in ethnic attitudes (Remy and Nathan, 1974; Torney-Purta, 1981). An International Educational Assessment (IEA) survey found that in all nine countries tested on scales measuring democratic values and interest in political participation, the highest scores obtained were for students whose teachers actively discuss these con-
cepts. The danger to ethnic attitudes as revealed by this study lies in the negative attitude of the teachers toward non-Western cultural topics (Torney, Oppenheim, and Parnen, 1975). Tolley (1973) found that the teacher has some influence on attitudes toward war, especially if the teacher believes that governmental policy must be defended. Mitsakos (1978) used the Family of Man Social Studies Program with elementary school students and measured their views of foreign peoples. The experimental group included 21 classes (N=500). Control group 1 (N=200) used several other social studies programs. Control group 2 (N=200) exposed students to no clearly defined program in social studies. The results of the pre-posttest design revealed no significant difference in achievement or ethnocentrism-chauvinism. However, respondents in the experimental group had a more favorable view of foreign people.

In foreign language education several studies have focused on the effects of cultural units utilized in language classes. Kaulfers, Kefauver, and Roberts (1942) used 151 teachers, 10,000 students, and 23 schools in three western states in an experiment known as the Stanford Language Arts Investigation. Kaulfers et al. (1942) found that the experimental group exhibited more tolerance, reduced racial prejudice, gains in
knowledge about people and countries, and an increase of 100% to 300% in the number of students continuing foreign language study beyond Level Two. This study differs from the present investigation in that Kaulfere et al. constructed an interdisciplinary approach to language study, including English, music, art, and social studies courses in English on foreign culture and literature.

One of the earliest theses in non-linguistic analysis was written by Sutherland (1946) at Glasgow University. She reported that the French were ranked higher by secondary and university students who had studied French than by those who had not studied this language. Subjects were from Protestant fee-paying, Protestant non-fee paying, and Catholic non-fee paying student populations. Bernardi (1967) advised caution in interpreting the results of the Sutherland (1946) study due to the possible effects of intelligence, school environment, and group size.

Riestra and Johnson (1964) studied the effects of an audio-lingual course in Spanish on attitudes towards Hispanics. Using as subjects 126 elementary school students (grade 5) in Champaign, Illinois, the researchers found that children who studied Spanish tended to show more positive attitudes toward Spanish and toward Hispanics than students who had not studied.
Spanish. The data from the pre- and posttests indicated that the positive attitudes of the subjects carried over to Spanish-speaking peoples not studied in class.

Bernardi (1967) investigated the effects of the study of a modern foreign language on attitudes among 296 ninth-grade students in Scranton, Pennsylvania, some of whom were studying French and some Latin. Bernardi (1967) equated his sample on age, sex, grade level, and I.Q. Dependent variables included factual knowledge about the French and the Japanese, and social distances toward the French and toward ethnic groups in general. Data were gathered in a pre-posttest design using a Bogardus Social Distance Scale, three questionnaires, and a grade expectancy scale. The data revealed that the French students exhibited a significant reduction in general social distance, while the Latin students showed no significant change. The Bernardi study (1967) differs in two basic ways from the present investigation: (1) Bernardi failed to investigate several levels of French study and to utilize several classification variables; and (2) Bernardi emphasized the cognitive and behavioral components, whereas, this study concentrated upon the affective and behavioral components. A common element of the two studies involves the use of social distance as a dependent variable.
Cooke (1970, 1978) reported that high school Spanish students taught in a course which presented cultural information and designed to foster positive attitudes toward Spanish-speaking people showed no significant changes in their attitudes. Cooke (1978) used a semantic differential scale and a revised Bogardus Social Distance Scale. The results also revealed that the sample expressed considerable social distance between themselves and blacks, Orientals, Mexicans, and Puerto Ricans. This researcher used a semantic differential and a modified Bogardus Social Distance Scale comparable to the Cooke instruments; however, the Social Distance Scale involved ethnic groups in the Francophonic world with appropriate distractors.

Savignon (1971) reported that the high school French students in a course using a series of cultural orientations showed no significant differences in achievement. Also, there was no significant difference in student attitudes toward the language or toward the French people.

Other research concerning the effect of education on student attitudes has produced positive results. Cote (1972) indicated that community college students instructed in a French course stressing cultural con-
tent showed positive attitudes toward Francophones after an audio-lingual program. Cote (1972) suggested that an introduction to the French language utilizing a socio-anthropological perspective in English might be a more meaningful approach to learning communicative skills in a foreign language.

Lett (1976) reported that ethnocentrism and dogmatism are significantly and negatively related to having studied a foreign language. The object of his study was to investigate the relationship between foreign language study, and ethnocentrism and closemindedness. Data were collected by means of the Rekeach Dogmatism Scale, an ethnocentrism scale, and questions of a demographic and attitudinal nature. Data were collected from 1127 eighth to twelfth grade students from suburban, rural, and inner city areas in greater Columbus, Ohio. Lett (1976) reported that the proportion of variance in ethnocentrism and in dogmatism scores was highest for the rural sample and for females. Moreover, Lett (1976) recognized that the affective component can be investigated using Likert-type scales, and that ethnocentrism and dogmatism figure in the assessment of outcomes after foreign language study. Lett (1976) analyzed each concept—ethnocentrism and dogmatism—as two separate dependent variables in a multiple
regression analysis. The researcher of the present investigation used a multivariate procedure (MANOVA) to analyze the dependent variables in concert.

Clément (1978) investigated the descriptive and predictive aspects of concepts presumed to determine the French-Canadian's competence in English. Clément (1978) collected his data in two secondary schools of the Montréal Catholic School Commission. The investigation tested the hypotheses that persistence in acquiring a second language is primarily a function of motivation while competence is a function of both motivation and language aptitude. Clément (1978) found that a Francophone's persistence in the acquisition of English is related to one's interest in communicating with such individuals. A Francophone's competence in English was also found to be determined by a lack of anxiety when using English, and high self-ratings of proficiency. These conclusions resulted from a factor analytic study using 38 variables or scales in which Clément determined that the motivational characteristics of Francophones learning English involve two dimensions: integrative motives and self-confidence in English. Clément (1978) also found that when motivation is defined as expectations of reaching a goal or an excellent grade, it contributes to student performance independent from aptitude. It
was found that individual persistence, aptitude, the attractiveness of achieving good grades, and the integrative and/or instrumental orientation of the individual Francophone aid in predicting linguistic competence. In addition, Clément (1978) identified some of the intervening processes mediating the effects of language study and the motivational characteristics of Francophones learning English. In the present study the relationship between language study and ethnic attitudes of Anglophones was investigated, taking note of the parallel study undertaken in Québec. On the other hand, the question of prediction, an algebraic definition of motivation and aptitude, and a delineation of the integrative and instrumental sources of student motivation were not addressed in this study.

The most recent studies of the effects of education on the dimensions of ethnic attitudes suggest that knowledge of a foreign language has an impact when coupled with a study of cultural content. DeMedie (1979) found that students taught by specially designed learning activity packages based upon the elements of French culture—sports, the family, education, and youth—demonstrated greater growth in language skills and in the development of some positive attitudes toward the Francophone. The instruments used in the pre-posttest
design were the Finsaleur Modern Foreign Language Proficiency Tests (Form C) and the Foreign Language Attitude Questionnaire (Jakoebvits, 1970). The DeMedie study differs from the present investigation in its use of proficiency as a dependent variable. DeMedie (1979) found significant differences between his groups on the attitude variable, but no distinctions were made among attitude toward the language, the people, or the course.

Tuttle, Guitart, Papalia, and Zampogna (1979) made a multi-media presentation to 160 students of Spanish in New York. The teaching materials consisted of slides stressing either similarities of Puerto Rican lifestyles to their own or differences in lifestyles. The intent of this study was to assess student descriptions of Puerto Ricans, student willingness for social contact, ethnocentrism, and learning style. The group in which similarities were stressed showed significant changes (lowered ethnocentrism) on a semantic differential scale. There were no significant differences in social distance. Tuttle et al. utilized a semantic differential scale, a Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1925), and ethnocentrism scales; however, their approach to data analysis used dependent t-tests in a pre-posttest design. This approach to data
does not accommodate the full analysis of classification variables—gender, socio-economic level, course grade aspiration, time spent in class. The present study employed multivariate analysis to examine the relationship of the classification variables to three dependent variables: descriptions of the Francophone, ethnocentrism-chauvinism, and social distance.

Bettleheim and Janowitz (1951) concluded that the very fact that students hold stereotypes and support discrimination reflects the limitations of our educational system in modifying attitudes; yet the lower levels of prejudice toward other ethnic groups among the better educated seem to involve the social experience of education.

The review of the literature on the relationship between education and ethnic attitudes indicates several important points:
1. Educational experiences designed to change ethnic attitudes in student populations may or may not be successful in fostering positive attitudes.
2. No single agent or institution accounts for all avenues toward attitude change.
3. Many studies have not involved classification variables or multivariate techniques.
4. Foreign language courses designed to change ethnic attitudes may or may not be successful in certain student populations.

5. Changes can occur in the affective component of attitudes and not in the behavioral component, and vice-versa.

Terney-Purta (1981) said that in the absence of opportunities for American students to visit other nations where other languages are spoken, they have recourse to second language instruction which may enhance their ability to see another perspective and to participate in internationalism. The present project was designed to examine the relationship between levels of university French instruction and three dependent variables: descriptions of the Francophone, ethnocentrism-chauvinism, and social distance.

The Present Investigation in the Area of Attitude Analysis and Foreign Language Education

Bernardi (1967) used attitude toward the French as a univariate dependent variable and achievement, social distance, knowledge of ethnic groups, and course grade expectations as independent variables. The present investigation considers attitudes toward the Francophones, ethnocentrism-chauvinism, and social distance as highly interrelated components; therefore, the three dependent
variables suggest a multivariate analysis of the dependent variables in concert.

Gardner and Lambert (1972) and Lambert (1962) predicted achievement from attitudes toward the French-Canadian. Gardner, Vonnacott, and Taylor (1968) studied the characteristics of stereotypes in the Anglophone community toward French-Canadians. Clément (1978) investigated the descriptive and predictive aspects of concepts presumed to determine the Francophone's competence in English. The aforementioned studies conducted in Canada presuppose that an individual successfully acquiring a second language adopts an orientation of lowered ethnocentrism and social distance. Also, Clément (1978) found that there are instrumental goals that aid in predicting successful language study, such as achieving good grades.

The present study takes into account the attitude scales and the dependent variables associated with scales in previous studies in the United States and in Canada. Among the specific approaches to the measurement of attitudes toward ethnic groups, the semantic differential scale, Likert-type scales, and the Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1925) predominate. The present study differs from the aforementioned investigations in that it is multivariate, and four classification variables are
entered into the design. Examining the relationship between the classification variables--group, gender, socio-economic level, course grade aspiration--and the dependent variables is a new step toward delineating the factors that operate within the student population, and how these variables figure in attitude change toward ethnic groups. Multivariate procedures were used because the study's premise is that the components of attitudes are highly interrelated; there is a link between an attitude object and an individual's norms and values, and the affect the person experiences (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975; Rosenberg, 1956). Furthermore, there have been few studies of the university student population studying French and their characteristics in the second language classroom.

The Classification Variables

Demographic characteristics, such as sex, socio-economic level, course grade aspiration, and time spent in class have proven to be determinants in attitudes toward other ethnic groups (Bernardi, 1967; Clément, 1978; Lett, 1976).

Comrey and Nemeyer (1965) discovered that radicalism or liberalism is favored by men and women who are less than 40 years of age, of higher intelligence and educa-
tion, who have access to more information, who have traveled, and who are Jewish. Comrey and Newmeyer (1965) found that Catholics and fundamentalist Protestants are more likely to be conservative than liberal. Adorno et al. (1950) described the authoritarian male as a person who is aloof, stern, punitive, and lacking in imagination. The authoritarian male admires military men, athletes, financiers, and other figures of dominance. He approves of obedience and respect for authority, and often perceives others as deviant and mankind as anarchic. Authoritarianism of the right seems related to anti-world mindedness, and to antipathy and hostility toward foreigners and persons who are not pro-American (Triandis, 1971).

McGuire (1967) suggested that women are more susceptible to influence than men, and thus capable of less dogmatism and authoritarianism. Abelson and Lesser (1959), Janis and Field (1959) found that males have higher correlations between personality variables and influencibility. Hovland and Janis (1959) explained this difference between males and females as a feature of American cultural values that may compel women to conform. Leventhal, Jones, and Trembly (1966) speculated that men often experience a greater feeling of imposition and loss of freedom than women; thus, males may exhibit a very stubborn resistance to change.
In the area of foreign language education Leit (1976) found that male and female secondary students differed in their responses to his 34-item ethnocentrism scale and to his 30-item Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. The range in differences between $R^2$ for males (.05763) and for females (.13954) was greater in the proportion of variance in ethnocentrism.

Another classification variable of import to this study was socio-economic level. Triandis and Triandis (1960) found that upper class subjects tend to show less social distance and prejudice than lower class subjects. Haire and Morrison (1957) found that children from lower socio-economic groups have very different perceptions of authority figures and objects than children of higher socio-economic groups. Mass media, school, peers, and authority figures have a greater influence on the poor child later in his or her development. Rettig (1966) explained that such children who are exposed to a limited range of attitudes interpreted by a homogeneous social group tend to become ethnocentric. On the other hand, a child that has been exposed to a wide range of attitudes interpreted by a heterogeneous social group tends to be more liberal and to have a global perspective.
Course grade aspiration has been defined operationally as a self-rating scale upon which the subject is asked to indicate how well he or she expects to do in a language course (Bernardi, 1967). Bernardi (1967) found that achieving or surpassing French course expectations was associated with a gain in knowledge of the French. Clément (1978) discovered that when motivation is defined in terms of effort toward a goal, the attractiveness of this goal contributes to better performance in the language course.

The preceding research suggests that success-oriented students and students who make an effort to succeed exhibit characteristics that may figure in an investigation into ethnic attitudes. Battle and Rotter (1963) and Omelich (1974) referred to students who achieve expectations as masters of their own destiny. On the other hand, failure-prone students with low expectations may be victimized by their helplessness and low esteem (Dweck and Repucci, 1973). Also, Pearl (1954), Spilka and Struening (1956) found that low esteem and negative self-concept are correlates of ethnocentrism.

Classroom teachers make adjustments in their instruction to allow for differences in semester length and course content. Many French departments have begun
to offer two distinct approaches for the first four semesters—accelerated and normal. In the present study students wishing to accelerate their study of French may complete French 101 and 102 in one semester, or students wishing to accelerate their study of intermediate French may enroll in a one semester course equivalent to French 201 and 202. Also, special courses have been designed for students with two or more years of high school study and who, on the basis of a placement test, appear to lack sufficient skill in French to begin French 201. Some instructors have learned to individualize and to adapt to the range of learning styles and rates using modular scheduling or absolute performance standards. Carroll (1963) indicated that time is a classification variable of import in any paradigm of learning, the degree of learning is a function of the time actually spent in instruction divided by the time needed to complete the material.

Summary

The literature in foreign language education in the area of assessing attitudinal outcomes seems to contain many unresolved questions: (1) does an individual who is acquiring a second language such as French adopt a less rigid or less biased perception and description
(2) does an individual who is acquiring a second language such as French develop a lesser degree of ethnocentrism and chauvinism? There is some contention that knowledge of French or any modern foreign language has an impact in reducing social distance, stereotyping, and ethnic hostility (Cooke, 1970; Savignon, 1971; and Lett, 1976).
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES

Sampling

The sample consisted of students in twelve randomly selected French classes at a major state supported university. Four classes were selected at each of three levels of French study. The French instructors who participated in this study were oriented individually by a letter and a visit by the investigator. They were informed that the study involved students of French 101, 102, 106, and 201, and how and when the three attitude inventories were to be administered. They were informed that their students would participate in normal course assignments and testing; however, during the last week of the semester the students would complete three short attitude inventories, and one personal data sheet. Further, there would be no penalty for not participating in the study.

Each instructor completed a teacher data sheet at the beginning of the investigation requesting name, nationality, gender, Francophonic travel, textbook used, time devoted to cultural topics, realia used, tracking and minicourses, and level of education.
The Student Sample

The sample used in the study included students engaged in the first three levels of university French study. Table 1 gives a description of the subjects in terms of level, gender, rounded mean age, and number of classes per level in this investigation.

TABLE 1
DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDENT SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>No. Students</th>
<th>No. Females</th>
<th>No. Males</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>No. Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRENCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102/106</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Instructors

Tables 2-4 describe the instructors who participated in this investigation in terms of nationality, years of teaching experience, highest degree held, gender, number of classes, and number of students participating in this investigation.
### TABLE 2
DESCRIPTION OF FRENCH INSTRUCTORS: FRENCH 101

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Teaching Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Held</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3
DESCRIPTION OF FRENCH INSTRUCTORS: FRENCH 102/106

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHER</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Belgian</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of Teaching Experience</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree Held</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The instructors for this investigation were chosen randomly from the total population of twenty sections of French 101, five sections of French 102/106, and nine sections of French 201. As indicated in Tables 2-4, all instructors held a B.S. in French, had four or fewer years of teaching experience, and the majority were American-born. The instructors also included three Francophones—two from France and one French-speaking Belgian. The Iranian and German-born instructors had received extensive instruction in French in their respective nations. The Belgian instructor held a European degree, the Candidature, which
is roughly equivalent to the B.A., as well as a translator's certificate from an American university.

The Teacher Data Sheet (Appendix E) indicated that each of the American instructors had some travel in a Francophonic area—mostly France and/or Québec. One teacher reported travel to the French Antilles; none revealed travel to a Francophonic nation in Africa.

Most instructors reported that most of their class discussions about Francophonic culture centered around their personal experiences in Francophonic daily life. Instructors indicated that they were especially sensitive to student questions concerning cultural differences. Realia such as coins, stamps, maps, newspapers, magazines, menus, books, arts and crafts were listed as cultural materials used in class or in class preparations. No minicourses or tracking were reported by the instructors.

The French Courses

French 101. French 101 is a first semester college course which emphasizes the four basic language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. This course is designed to introduce the French language to students who have had little or no French. The course and the textbook focus upon functional communication: self-expression within a familiar context. Deductive and
inductive methods of teaching grammar are used. The text for this course is:


Photographs and sketches depicting the situational context add to the attractiveness of the text and to a more rapid acquisition of the vocabulary. The use of visual stimuli for teaching and testing oral skills is consistent with audio-visual programs now in vogue.

The vocabulary is presented thematically, and in morphologically appropriate blocks. Many new words are cognates and the progression from chapter to chapter is very fluid. The articulation with French 102 is comfortable.

French 101 utilizes concise transformational drills: recombination, substitution, and interrogative-declarative. Exercises are designed to produce individual responses to commands such as: *Décrivez, Demandez, Posez*, etc. Exercises begin each chapter of the textbook and are followed by a dialogue or a reading passage. The instructor introduces the unfamiliar vocabulary and structures before the drill phase, and closes with the reading passages or a conversation.

There are ten quizzes, or minor tests, during the semester and one midterm and final examination.
Laboratory exercises augment the classroom aural-oral drills, especially the most difficult grammatical points. Grades are computed as follows:

- 50% classwork (assignments, exercises, quizzes or minor tests, homework)
- 20% midterm examination
- 30% final examination

**French 102/106.** French 102 and 106 are second semester courses which continue the elements of basic proficiency: phonology, morphology, and syntax. The courses are also designed to re-introduce the undergraduate student to the Francophonic world through readings, realia, and photographs. Exercises that focus upon role-playing, interviews, discussion, and oral comprehension are contained in the textbooks. The textbook for French 102 is:


French 106 is roughly equivalent to French 102; however, the former is designed to review students who present two or three years of secondary school study and who, on the basis of the placement examination, appear to lack the skills to proceed to French 201. The text for this course is:

The presentation of the material in French 106 is mostly in simple, natural French. The instructor reviews any requisite learning before a complex structure is introduced. This procedure is especially important for the many students who have allowed several semesters to elapse before resuming their study of French. Basic topics such as numbers, regular verbs, negation, basic prepositions, demonstrative and possessive adjectives, the partitive, and the passé composé may need review.

All 102 and 106 instructors rely upon nine quizzes during the semester and one midterm and a final examination. Laboratory exercises, homework, and classwork also figure in computing final grades. The final examination contains an integrated test of oral French, grammar, and reading. Grades are computed as follows:

50% classwork (assignments, quizzes, tests, laboratory work, homework)
20% midterm examination
30% final examination

French 201. French 201 is a first-semester intermediate college course which continues the elements of French 102/106. The intent of this course is to improve reading and writing skills, and to continue building upon the oral proficiency developed at the elementary level (French 101-102/106). Readings come from several
Francophonic areas: France, Québec, and Francophonic Africa. There is a thematic vocabulary list which focuses upon common functions and the grammar units. The teacher provides open-ended exercises, translations and/or guided conversations.

Collateral readings in anthology form, which cover several centuries and a wide variety of authors and genres, are offered to the student. Students are introduced to eight units prefaced by a short cultural essay in English in which the authors discuss the family, leisure, school, urban areas, and the Francophonic world. The teachers provide a systematic set of questions that range from simple to complex, from impersonal to personal: the accent is upon personal answers that generate conversation, and the use of the thematic vocabulary. The reading passages are ranked: relatively easy, more difficult, and challenging.

In the schedule of classes, there are twelve quizzes, one midterm examination, four assigned compositions in French, and a final examination. Grades are computed as follows:

- 50% classwork (quizzes, compositions, and discussions)
- 20% midterm examination
- 30% final examination
Data Gathering Instruments

Teacher and pupil data were obtained by short questionnaires. The pupil data sheet (Appendix D) included: gender, age, birth date, class, school name, instructor's name, course grade aspiration, room, and period. The teacher data sheet (Appendix E) requested information about: name, room and period, amount of time devoted to teaching French, name and publisher of current textbook, amount of time devoted in class to cultural materials and explanations, availability of cultural materials or realia, tracking and minicourses, nationality, and level of education.

Socio-economic information was determined by a Warner Revised Scale for Rating Occupations. This five-point scale can be used to determine socio-economic class as well as financial and/or political power (Warner, Meeker and Bells, 1960).

Three major attitude instruments were used in this study: a semantic differential, a revised Bogardus Social Distance Scale, and the Agree-Disagree IDEA Test (Mitsakos, 1977). The semantic differential consists of a set of twenty bipolar adjectives with each pair of adjectives separated by a seven step scale; respondents indicate the extent to which they think the concept is associated with a pair of adjectives by checking one of seven rating
steps. The evaluative nature of the bipolar adjectives (positive or negative) follows the models in Cooke (1978), in Gardner, Wonnacott, and Taylor (1968), and in Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957). Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, and 20 have been validated as being reliable for measuring ethnic attitudes on a semantic differential by Cooke (1978). Items 6, 7, 8, 9, and 18 have been validated as being reliable for measuring attitudes on a semantic differential by Osgood et al. (1957). Items 1, 5, 11, 12, and 14 have been validated as being reliable for measuring ethnic attitudes on a semantic differential by Gardner et al. (1968). Adjective pairs were randomly reversed in polarity in an effort to control the response set. A high score indicates favorable attitudes toward Francophones (Appendix A).

The revised Bogardus Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1925) is a scale of social distance in which a respondent indicates his or her degree of actual and desired social contact with persons from twenty nations and/or provinces on a seven step scale. Brazil, China, Cuba, France, Germany, Holland, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Poland, and the Soviet Union were items taken from the original Bogardus Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1925). Canada, another country found on the Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1925), was represented by Québec and Ontario on the new scale.
Six other nations and/or provinces were added to the new Social Distance Scale: four Francophonic regions (Haiti, Martinique, Sénégal, and Zaire) and two other nations (Iran and Nigeria). A high score is indicative of low social distance (Appendix C) and is considered to be positive.

The **Agree-Disagree IDEA Test** (Mitsakos, 1977) is a Likert-type scale consisting of fifteen items in which the respondent indicates his or her opinion on statements about internalism, nationalism, and social protectionism on a five point scale. This scale serves as a measure of ethnocentrism and chauvinism. The evaluative nature of the questions follows the model used in Mitsakos (1977): statements are assigned as positive or negative as in Mitsakos (1977). The register of speech of the original **Agree-Disagree IDEA Test** (Mitsakos, 1977) was raised to accommodate the university sample, the sentences were adjusted grammatically to fit the more formal speech of the university sample. A high score is indicative of high ethnocentrism-chauvinism and is considered to be negative.

Reliability and validity data for the semantic differential and the **Bogardus Social Distance Scale** are presented in Shaw and Wright (1987). Newcomb found the **Bogardus Social Distance Scale** reliable and valid, and
stated that the split-half reliability for this scale is .90 or higher (Shaw and Wright, 1967). Tuttle et al. (1979) found the test-retest reliability of their Social Distance Scale to be .85. Campbell (1953) stated in his review of the Social Distance Scale (Bogardus, 1925) that this instrument proved most useful in measuring social contact among ethnic groups. Bogardus (1958) after thirty years of research, reported consistent ratings for over 700 respondents (Cooke, 1973).

Test-retest reliabilities range from .83 to .91 for the Osgood study of the semantic differential and .97 in the Russell and Suci investigation (Shaw and Wright, 1967). Mitsakos (1977) found the alpha reliability coefficient on the Agree-Disagree IDEA Test to be .82.

"Known groups" approaches to validity have been investigated for the semantic differential, the Bogardus Social Distance Scale, and Likert-type scales of ethnocentrism and they have been shown to discriminate between two or more groups who are "known" to differ predictably on the variables being measured or who can at least be expected to differ in predictable ways (Lett, 1977).

In order to obtain preliminary measures of internal consistency and reliability on the three attitude inventories, several undergraduate French classes were tested. Results are located in Tables 5 and 6.
In order to obtain a final reliability coefficient, coefficient alpha (Cronbach, 1951) was calculated by the SPSS RELIABILITY procedure (Norušis, 1979) using a random selection of students from French 101, 102/106, and 201.
(25 students each at three levels of university French study). Table 7 displays the results.

### TABLE 7

**TESTS OF RELIABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>No. of Questions</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Reliability (ALPHA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Differential</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Distance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree-Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to obtain a validity check, the new measures were correlated with an existing measure. The results were:

### TABLE 8

**CONCURRENT VALIDITY TEST—r-test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French 102 (N=30)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic differential (Cooke, 1978) with new Semantic differential</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.76***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergadus Social Distance Scale (Cooke, 1978) with new Social Distance Scale</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.78***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree-Disagree IDEA Test (Mitsakos, 1977) with the new Agree-Disagree IDEA test</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.83***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001
Experimental Design and Analysis

The design of this investigation was posttest-only (Campbell, 1957) which has the advantage of avoiding a pretest X manipulation interaction. The dependent variables for this investigation were attitudes measured by three attitude inventories. Included were a semantic differential scale, a modified Bogardus Social Distance Scale, and the Agree-Disagree IDEA Test. The attitude inventories were administered one week before final examinations (Fall semester, 1983) to students at three levels of university French study. Each student was classified according to the following factors: group, gender, socio-economic level, and course grade aspiration. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to analyze the data from the three attitude inventories. The basic test of significance for this investigation was Hotelling-Lawley Trace and the approximate F-ratios. The alpha level was set at .05.

After the significant effects and interactions were determined by the multivariate procedure, the cell means of the significant interactive effects were determined and plotted. The analysis of the interactive effects formed the basis for answering research question 4. Mean scores for the three groups—French 101, 102/106, and 201—were 55
compared by the multivariate procedure in testing research questions 1 through 3. The Tukey-Kramer test served as a multiple comparison procedure.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter concerns the treatment of the data involving the following variables:

**Dependent Variables**
1. Descriptions of the Francophone. Operationally this was defined as a score on a semantic differential scale (Appendix A).
2. Ethnocentrism-Chauvinism. Operationally this was defined as a score on the Agree-Disagree IDEA test (Appendix B).
3. Social Distance. Operationally this was defined as a score on a Regards Social Distance Scale (Appendix C).

**Independent Variables**
1. GROUP is defined by three levels of instruction in French: French 101, French 102/106, and French 201.
2. SEX: male and female.
3. Socio-economic status (SES), four levels: upper (SES1), upper middle (SES2), middle (SES3), and lower middle (SES4) classes. Operationally this was defined as a ranking taken from a Warner Revised Scale for Rating Occupations (Warner, Meeker and Bells, 1960). Socio-economic status was determined by matching the occupation listed on the
personal data sheet (Appendix D) with the social class categories—professionals, proprietors and managers, businessmen, clerks and service workers, manual workers, and farmers—and their ranking on a Warner Revised Scale for Rating Occupations.

4. GRADE, varied at four levels: 4 = A; 3 = B; 2 = C; 1 = D. GRADE was defined as grade expectations as reported by the student (Appendix D).

Once the posttests were completed, the responses were subjected to a 3 x 2 x 4 x 4 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). The multivariate procedure produced means and standard deviations for each dependent variable, partial correlation coefficients, three univariate models, and the multivariate model. The basic test of significance utilized in this investigation was Hotelling-Lawley Trace. The alpha level, or the probability level above which the null hypothesis was rejected, was set at .05. In order to minimize the number of kilobytes of memory for the model, non-significant high-order interactions were absorbed into the error variance.

After the significant effects and interactions were determined by the multivariate procedure, the cell means of the significant interactive effects were determined and subsequently plotted. The analysis of
the interactive effects formed the basis for answering research question 4: Are attitude scores related to the classification variables of gender, socioeconomic level, course grade expectations, and course level for subjects in three levels of French study?

Student mean scores for the three groups—French 101, French 102/106, and French 201—were compared by the multivariate procedure in testing research questions 1 through 3.

1. Is there a relationship between the levels of French study and a desire for more personal contact between subjects and other ethnic groups?
2. Is there a relationship between the levels of French study and a decrease in ethnocentric-chauvinistic tendencies of the subjects?
3. Is there a relationship between the levels of French study and the selection of more positive descriptions of Francophones by the subjects?

Where differences did occur, the Tukey-Kramer test was subsequently utilized to compare means between pairs of the groups.

**Multilevel Attitude Study**

The results of the multivariate analysis are presented in Table 9.
### TABLE 9
Summary of Analysis of Variance of the Main Effects
and Major Interactive Effects for Four-Way Attitude Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df Multivariate F</th>
<th>Univariate F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotelling-Lawley</td>
<td>Semantic Diff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP X SEX</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP X SES</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX X SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP X GRADE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.96**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX X SES X GRADE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.01**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Among Means**

| Univariate Means Squares: | 139.20 | 50.26 | 5°2.19 |

**Within Groups**

| Total | 227 |

* p < .05
** p < .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable Scale</th>
<th>R-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptions of Francophones</td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism-Chauvinism</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Distance</td>
<td>.608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This analysis produced some expected and unexpected results. First, true to expectations, it was found that GROUP, SES, and GRADE had significant effects at the .05 level in the multivariate test (Hotelling-Lawley Trace). The univariate $F$-ratios for the independent variable, GROUP, were significant for all three dependent variables at the .01 level of significance, indicating that the mean scores were statistically significant for respondents across the three levels of French study. The univariate $F$-ratios for the independent variable, SES, were significant on two dependent variables (descriptions of Francophones and social distance) at the .05 level of significance. GRADE, or course grade expectation, produced the largest univariate and multivariate $F$-ratios on all dependent variables; therefore, one can summarize that the inclusion of this variable greatly enhances the effectiveness of the model by accounting for a larger portion of the total variance ($R^2 = .52$ for descriptions of Francophones; $R^2 = .43$ for ethnocentrism-chauvinism; $R^2 = .41$ for social distance).

Second, contrary to expectations, it was found that SEX had no significant effect at the .05 level as determined by the multivariate test or Hotelling-Lawley Trace; however, one univariate $F$-ratio was found to be significant at the .05 level—descriptions of Francophones.
As previously noted, several interactions occurred which necessitated a more detailed analysis. The data can be explained in terms of these interactions beginning at the most complex level. In reading the output, Finn and Mattsson (1978) suggest that the higher order effects should be interpreted first.

**SEX X SES X GRADE Interaction**

The F-ratio for the multivariate test (Hotelling-Lawley Trace) was found to be significant at the .01 level of significance. Only one univariate F-ratio, social distance, was significant at the .05 level. Figure 1 and Tables 11-12 illustrate the second-order interaction on the dependent variable--social distance. Figure 1 involved a combined sample plot of the interactive effect in which the mean scores of SEX and SES were combined. The variable, GRADE, was placed at equal intervals (grades D, C, B, A) on the horizontal axis.
Figure 1

Combined Sample Plot of SEX X SES X GRADE Interaction
Social Distance of Univariate Model

Male SES1
Female SES1
Male SES2
Female SES2
Male SES3
Female SES3
Male SES4
Female SES4
### Table 11
Cell Means: SEX X SES X GRADE Interaction, Social Distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSES1</th>
<th>MSES2</th>
<th>MSES3</th>
<th>MSES4</th>
<th>PSES1</th>
<th>PSES2</th>
<th>PSES3</th>
<th>PSES4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>66.69</td>
<td>42.67</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>87.41</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>86.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>93.29</td>
<td>93.61</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>120.89</td>
<td>103.33</td>
<td>95.95</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>121.38</td>
<td>117.00</td>
<td>140.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>124.32</td>
<td>114.67</td>
<td>110.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BEST COPY AVAILABLE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MSes1</th>
<th>MSes2</th>
<th>MSes3</th>
<th>MSes4</th>
<th>Pses1</th>
<th>Pses2</th>
<th>Pses3</th>
<th>Pses4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 12**

Frequency Table: SEX X SES X GRADE Interaction, Social Distance

**BEST COPY AVAILABLE**
The following conclusions can be drawn from Figure 1 and Tables 10-11.

1. Males in SES3 (middle class) and SES4 (lower middle class) expecting a grade of D manifested more social distance than other subjects.

2. Males in SES3 (middle class) expecting a grade of A evidenced the least social distance among all respondents.

3. Females on the average tended to show less social distance in comparison with the male subjects.

4. Males in SES4 (lower middle class) tended not to expect grades of D and A; females in SES1 (upper class) and SES3 (middle class) tended not to expect a grade of D. Females in SES4 (lower middle class) tended not to expect a grade of A or C.

5. Caution must be exercised in interpreting the results of the second-order interaction because of the missing cells, and the presence of cells with limited observations.

**GROUP X GRADE Interaction**

The interactive effects of GROUP and GRADE were found to be significant at the .01 level. The univariate F-ratio was found to be significant at the .01 level for the semantic differential (descriptions of Francophones) and for social distance and at the .05 level for ethnocentrism-chauvinism. Figure 2 and Table 13 illustrate the interactive effect on the dependent
variable—description of Francophones.

Figure 2

Plot of interaction: GROUP X GRADE
Descriptions of Francophones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>French 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>French 102/106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>French 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>115.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>127.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1  French 101
Group 2  French 102/106
Group 3  French 201
The following observations can be made:

1. Respondents in GROUPS 2 and 3 expecting an A evidenced the most positive descriptions of Francophones. Respondents in GROUP 1 expecting a B scored higher on the semantic differential than all respondents expecting a grade of B.

2. Respondents expecting a D chose less positive description of Francophones across all groups.

3. Respondents in GROUP 3 had lower mean scores on the semantic differential than GROUPS 1 and 2 among subjects expecting a B.

4. There was no significant difference between GROUPS 2 and 3 among subjects expecting a C and D.

Interpreting the results, it would appear that the experience of expecting a good grade figures in the attitude structure of the dependent variable—descriptions of Francophones: the higher the expected final grade, the more positive the descriptions of Francophones on the average. In addition, increasing semesters of French study tended on the average to be associated with more positive descriptions of Francophones.

With respect to ethnocentrism-chauvinism, Figure 3 and Table 14 present an illustration of the interactive effect and the cell means.
Figure 3
Plot of Interaction: GROUP X GRADE
Ethnocentrism-Chauvinism
Table 14
Cell Means: GROUP X GRADE Interaction
Ethnocentrism-Chauvinism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>37.27</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>28.56</td>
<td>40.48</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>64.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>38.82</td>
<td>43.12</td>
<td>55.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1: French 101
Group 2: French 102/106
Group 3: French 201
The following results can be drawn from Figure 3 and Table 14.

1. There was a decrease in mean scores on the ethnocentrism-chauvinism scale from GROUP 2 (French 102/106) to GROUP 3 (French 201) across all grade expectations. There was a decrease in mean scores on the Agree-Disagree IDEA Test from GROUP 1 (French 101) to GROUP 2 (French 102/106) only for respondents expecting grades of A and B. Respondents anticipating a grade of C and D in GROUP 2 (French 102/106) had higher mean scores than expected. These respondents in GROUP 2 (French 102/106) at grades C and D tend to be responsible for the lack of a decreasing trend in ethnocentrism-chauvinism from GROUP 1 (French 101) to GROUP 2 (French 102/106).

2. Means for respondents expecting grades of A through D were 31.43, 42.17, 46.34, and 61.28, respectively. One may summarize that respondents who expect high grades tend to display less ethnocentrism-chauvinism in the sample.

The interactive effects of GROUP and GRADE on the dependent variable, social distance, is illustrated in Figure 4 and Table 15.
Figure 4

Plot of Interaction: GROUP X GRADE

Social Distance

GROUP 1
GROUP 2
GROUP 3

GRADE
Group 1  French 101
Group 2  French 102/106
Group 3  French 201
Table 15

Cell Means: GROUP X GRADE Interaction
Social Distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>116.93</td>
<td>89.88</td>
<td>79.03</td>
<td>20.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>129.22</td>
<td>111.90</td>
<td>83.17</td>
<td>78.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>118.80</td>
<td>90.30</td>
<td>82.92</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 1  French 101
Group 2  French 102/106
Group 3  French 201
The data in Figure 4 and Table 15 indicate that high grade expectations were associated with steady decrements in social distance toward other national and/or ethnic groups. Means for subjects expecting an A through D were 121.65, 97.36, 81.71, and 41.22, respectively. There tended to be an increase in mean scores on the Social Distance Scale from French 101 to French 102/106 followed by a decrease in mean scores at French 201:

GROUP 2 respondents expecting grades of A through D scored much higher on the Social Distance Scale than expected.

GROUP X SES Interaction

The interactive effects of GROUP and SES on the multivariate F-test were found to be significant at the .01 level. Only two of the univariate F-statistics were found to be significant at the .05 level—descriptions of Francophones and social distance.

Figure 5 and Table 16 array the data for the dependent variable—descriptions of Francophones.
Figure 5

Plot of Interaction: GROUP X SES
Descriptions of Francophones

SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL

SES4  SES3  SES2  SES1

SES4  SES3  SES2  SES1

Lower Middle Class
Middle Class
Upper Middle Class
Upper Class
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>SES1</th>
<th>SES2</th>
<th>SES3</th>
<th>SES4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>83.80</td>
<td>75.45</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>103.29</td>
<td>85.58</td>
<td>103.33</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>121.38</td>
<td>95.81</td>
<td>86.02</td>
<td>61.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SES1: Upper Class  
SES2: Upper Middle Class  
SES3: Middle Class  
SES4: Lower Middle Class
Socio-economic level was a contributing factor in mere positive descriptions of Francophones in SES1 and SES2. However, there was no significant difference at the .05 level for respondents in SES2 and SES3 on the semantic differential scale. Means for SES1 through SES4 were 108.56, 88.40, 88.27, and 72.89, respectively. Respondents in SES1, or the upper class, chose more positive descriptions of Francophones, and evidenced significantly more favorable descriptions from GROUPS 2 to 3. The following conclusions can be drawn from the data.

1. Lower SES was associated with less favorable descriptions of Francophones in GROUPS 1 and 3, except for GROUP 2 where the mean scores on the semantic differential at SES3 and SES4 were unexpectedly high.

2. Upper and upper middle SES were associated with progressively higher mean scores on the semantic differential from GROUPS 1 to 3.

3. There was a decremental effect from French 102/106 to French 201 due to high scores of GROUP 2 at SES3 and SES4 on the semantic differential.
The univariate $F$-ratio for the GROUP X SES interaction was significant at the .05 level for the dependent variable—social distance. Figure 6 and Table 17 present the nature of the interaction and the cell means.

Figure 6

Plot of Interaction: GROUP X SES
Social Distance

SOCIO-ECONOMIC LEVEL

SOCIAL DISTANCE

Group 1

Group 2

Group 3
### Table 17
Cell Means: GROUP X SES Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Distance</th>
<th>SES1</th>
<th>SES2</th>
<th>SES3</th>
<th>SES4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>110.76</td>
<td>78.52</td>
<td>67.91</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>113.36</td>
<td>90.79</td>
<td>110.33</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>117.85</td>
<td>99.38</td>
<td>77.50</td>
<td>35.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SES4: Lower Middle Class  
SES3: Middle Class  
SES2: Upper Middle Class  
SES1: Upper Class
A decrease in the total score on the Bogardus Social Distance Scale was associated with lower socio-economic levels. Means for SES1 through SES4 were 113.99, 89.56, 85.25, and 53.89, respectively. It can also be seen that respondents in SES1 and SES2 scored progressively higher on the Bogardus Social Distance Scale from French 101 to French 201; however, subjects in SES3 and SES4 had lower mean scores on the Social Distance Scale in French 201 than in French 102/106. The high mean scores of the subjects in SES3 and SES4 (middle and lower middle classes) tend to cause the trend toward less social distance toward other ethnic groups not to extend to French 201.

GROUP X SEX Interaction

The interactive effects of GROUP and SEX on the multivariate F-statistic or Hotelling-Lawley Trace were found to be significant at the .01 level. The univariate F-ratio was significant at the .05 level for descriptions of Francophones, and was operationally defined as a mean score on a semantic differential scale. Figure 7 and Table 18 present the nature of this interaction and the cell means for the data.
Figure 7

Plot of Interaction: GROUP X SEX
Descriptions of Francophones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>102/106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18

Cell Means: GROUP X SE) Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80.45</td>
<td>82.18</td>
<td>90.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>88.66</td>
<td>102.29</td>
<td>94.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptions of Francophones

- Group 1: French 101
- Group 2: French 102/106
- Group 3: French 201
Means for males and females were 81.46 and 95.26, respectively on the semantic differential. It can be seen that a significant difference was found between male and female subjects on the dependent variable—descriptions of Francophones. Females had higher mean scores on the semantic differential in French 102/106 (GROUP 2) than in French 201 (GROUP 3). The high scores by females at GROUP 2 tended to be responsible for the lack of a significant difference between GROUPS 2 and 3 on the semantic differential.

The Responses to the Research Questions

A significant multivariate F was found for GROUP. All three dependent variables—descriptions of Francophone, social distance, and ethnocentrism-chauvinism—contributed to the significant multivariate F. The responses to the research questions are presented here using the MANOVA output of the main effect, GROUP, and the previous analysis of the interactive effects for the other main effects—SEX, SES, and GRADE.

Research question 1. Is there a relationship between the levels of French study and a desire for more personal contact between subjects and other ethnic groups? Results from the MANOVA procedure only indicated
that a difference existed. To determine more specifically where the difference existed, further analysis was required. The Tukey-Kramer test was used to compare the mean scores of GROUP 1 (French 101), GROUP 2 (French 102/106), and GROUP 3 (French 201). The test indicated a significant difference between GROUPS 1 and 2, \( t(3, 225) = 6.42, p < .01 \). Also, the Tukey-Kramer test indicated a significant difference between GROUPS 2 and 3, \( t(3, 225) = 4.53, p < .01 \). Means for GROUPS 1 through 3 were 72.80, 102.62, and 82.60, respectively. Since high scores on the Social Distance Scale indicate lower social distance, the results indicate that the scores obtained by GROUP 1 (French 101) and GROUP 2 (French 102/106) were significantly different in a positive way; however, this trend did not extend to GROUP 3 (French 201). The lack of higher mean scores from GROUPS 2 to 3 may be explained by the high mean scores in GROUP 2 across grade expectations (See Figure 4 and Table 15) and by the high mean scores at SES3 (middle class) and SES4 (lower middle class) on a Bogardus Social Distance Scale (See Figure 6 and Table 17) in GROUP 2.

Research question 2. Is there a relationship between the levels of French study and ethnocentric-chauvinistic tendencies of the subjects? The results taken from the MANOVA procedure to compare the mean scores
of the three groups on the *Agree-Disagree IDEA Test* indicated a significant difference at the .05 level. Since the MANOVA procedure does not reveal which means differ, the Tukey-Kramer test was used to compare the mean scores of GROUP 1 (French 101), GROUP 2 (French 102/106), and GROUP 3 (French 201). The test indicated a significant difference between GROUPS 2 and 3, $\bar{q} (3, 225) = 6.30$, $p < .01$. The Tukey-Kramer test did not indicate a significant difference between GROUPS 1 and 2, $\bar{q} (3, 225) = 1.26$, N.S. Means for GROUPS 1 through 3 were 48.12, 46.27, and 41.46. Since low scores on the *Agree-Disagree IDEA Test* indicate low ethnocentrism-chauvinism, there was a trend toward decreasing ethnocentrism-chauvinism from elementary to intermediate French (see Figure 3 and Table 14).

**Research question 3.** Is there a relationship between the levels of French study and the selection of more positive descriptions of Francophones by the subjects? Results from using the MANOVA procedure to compare the mean scores of the three groups on the semantic differential indicated a significant difference at the .05 level. The Tukey-Kramer test indicated a significant difference between GROUPS 1 and 2, $\bar{q} (3, 225) = 5.34$, $p < .01$. The test showed no significant difference between
GROUPS 2 and 3, \( q (3, 225) = .77 \), N.S. Means for GROUPS 1 through 3 were 84.53, 92.23, and 92.79, respectively. Since high scores on a semantic differential indicate more positive descriptions of Francophones, the results indicated that the scores obtained by GROUPS 1 (French 101) and 2 (French 102/106) were significantly different in a positive way; however, there was no significant difference between the scores obtained by GROUP 2 (French 102/106) and GROUP 3 (French 201). The lack of higher mean scores from GROUPS 2 to 3 may be explained by the unexpectedly high mean scores at SES3 (middle class) and SES4 (lower middle class) in GROUP 2 (French 102/106) on a semantic differential (See Figure 5 and Table 16). Another factor that contributed to the high mean scores in GROUP 2 was the high scores of females (See Figure 7 and Table 18).

**Research question 4.** Are attitude scores related to the classification variables of gender, socio-economic level, course grade expectations, and course level for subjects in three levels of French study? The results of the analysis of the interactive effects indicated that female participants tended to manifest more positive descriptions of Francophones than male subjects. There were no significant differences in female and male mean scores on a **Social Distance Scale** and the **Agree-Disagree IDEA test**.
High socio-economic status (SES) and being female were associated with more positive descriptions of Francophones, lower ethnocentrism-chauvinism, and lower indices of social distance to other ethnic groups. Scores taken from upper middle and middle SES respondents were not significantly different from each other across the three levels of French study at the .01 level on the three dependent variables.

Course grade expectations produced the largest univariate and multivariate $F$-ratios on all three dependent variables. Expecting a high grade in French 101, 102/106, and 201 was associated, on the average, with more positive descriptions of Francophones, less social distance toward other ethnic groups, and less ethnocentrism-chauvinism. Low grade expectations and low SES were associated, on the average, with more negative descriptions of Francophones, more social distance, and high ethnocentrism-chauvinism.
CHAPTER V
Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Restatement of the Problem

The present study was designed to investigate the relationship between three levels of French study and ethnic attitudes. Specifically in this study, ethnic attitudes were defined as descriptions of Francophones, as social distance, and as ethnocentrism-chauvinism. The major research questions were:

1. Is there a relationship between the levels of French study and a desire for more personal contact between the subjects and Francophones?
2. Is there a relationship between the levels of French study and a decrease in ethnocentric-chauvinistic tendencies of the subjects?
3. Is there a relationship between the levels of French study and the selection of more positive descriptions of Francophones by the subjects?
4. Are attitude scores related to the classification variables of gender, socioeconomic level, course grade aspiration, and course level for subjects in three levels
of French study? Also, are there interactive effects among variables?

This investigation was conducted in response to the contention that knowledge of French or any modern foreign language has an impact in reducing social distance, stereotyping, and ethnic hostility (Cooke, 1970; Lett, 1976; and Savignon, 1971). Specific to this study, objective evidence was needed to show whether there was a relationship between several levels of university French study and reduced social distance, more positive descriptions of Francophones, and lower ethnocentrism-chauvinism. Finally, little research existed in foreign language education demonstrating that attitudes can be examined in a single analysis employing two or more dependent variables. Since Chein (1951), Rosenberg and Hovland (1960), and Triandis (1971) divided attitudes into three measurable components—cognitive, affective, and behavioral—and since Rosenberg (1956) found these three components to be interrelated, a need existed to analyze the relationship between French study and ethnic attitudes, ethnocentrism-chauvinism, and social distance in a multivariate model.

**Description of Procedures**

The sample used in this investigation consisted of twelve classes (four at each of three levels of French
study) randomly selected from a university French department. The group at each level (French 101, 102/106, and 201) consisted of 76 students. Three attitude inventories and one personal data sheet were administered to the entire sample during the last week of the Fall semester of 1983. Furthermore, each instructor completed a teacher data sheet requesting name, nationality, gender, Francophonic travel, textbook used, time devoted to cultural topics, realia used, tracking and minicourses, and level of education.

In addition to the information gleaned from the personal data sheets (student and instructor), the research data consisted of the student scores on three attitude inventories: a semantic differential, a revised Bogardus Social Distance Scale, and the Agree-Disagree IDEA test. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to analyze the data from the three attitude inventories. The basic test of significance for this investigation was Hotelling-Lawley Trace and the approximate F-ratios. The alpha level was set at .05.

After the significant effects and interactions were determined by the multivariate procedure, the cell means of the significant interactive effects were determined and plotted. The analysis of the interactive effects formed the basis for answering research question 4.
Mean scores for the three groups—French 101, 102/106, and 201—were compared by the multivariate procedure in testing research questions 1 through 3. The Tukey-Kramer test served as a multiple comparison procedure.

**Major Findings**

The major findings are summarized as follows:

1. The results of this study indicated that there was a desire for more personal contact between the subjects and Francophones from French 101 to French 102/106; this trend did not extend to French 201.

2. The results of the present study indicated that there was a trend toward decreasing ethnocentrism-chauvinism from elementary French (French 101-102/106) to intermediate French (French 201).

3. The results of this study indicated that there was a selection of more positive descriptions of Francophones from French 101 to French 102/106; however, the trend did not extend to French 201.

4. Males tended to experience the most rapid decrease in social distance in comparison to females across all grade expectations in this study.

5. Females tended to have higher mean scores on the semantic differential than males across all three levels of French study. There was no significant difference between mean scores for males and females on a Social.
6. High mean scores on the three attitude inventories were associated with high socio-economic level.

7. Low grade expectations were associated on the average with: (1) negative descriptions of Francophones; (2) greater ethnocentrism-chauvinism; and (3) greater social distance.

8. Course grade expectations produced the largest univariate and multivariate F-ratios for the three attitude inventories. The importance of course grade expectations was consistent with studies by Bernardi (1967) and Clément (1978).

Limitations of the Study

The major limitations of this study were:

1. Control for internal validity was difficult for history or the occurrence of events contemporary to this investigation. The posttest-only design minimized the likelihood of a large number of events that would affect the sample. Such events as French military activity in Lebanon and Chad, and any changing economic and/or political conditions in France and Québec were kept in a log by the researcher.

2. The selection of the sample had some limitations in the university student population: the university used in the study had few non-white students. Race of subjects was perhaps a crucial variable not included in the list of
independent variables. Also, rural, suburban, and inner city subjects were not determined on the personal data sheet. Selective perception or the screening and categorizing of events and people varies among races and urban densities (Worcel and Cooper, 1983).

3. The design of this investigation had some limitations because of its cross sectional nature—three distinct groups representing three distinct levels of French study. It would have been more precise to use one group and allow that group to be tested at each level; however, the mortality rate in such longitudinal studies would have made such an investigation prohibitive. University students frequently allow two or more semesters to elapse before resuming language study at the next level. Time did not permit such a study to be undertaken. The post-test-only cross sectional design eliminated the mortality rate problem by testing students one week before the final examination in the course.

4. The design of this investigation also had some limitations because French 102 and 106 represented two dissimilar student samples—the one composed of students with one year of high school study or one semester of college study, the other composed of students with two or more years of high school study and who, on the basis of the placement test, appear to lack sufficient skill in
French for French 201. In short, students ran the gamut from students with several years of secondary school study to students with a very basic level of proficiency. The present study combined French 102 and 106 into one level because courses specifically designed for students who present several years of secondary language study and who are not prepared for French 201 were the exception and not the rule in language departments.

**Educational Implications**

The results of this study suggest several implications for educational practice.

1. The mean scores for male respondents on the three dependent variables—descriptions of Francophones, ethnocentrism-chauvinism, and social distance—were lower than for female subjects on the average. Certainly instructors should anticipate that some students (male and female) may have a generally negative set of stereotypes of Francophones and other ethnic groups. Teachers must consider ways of systematically modifying these images as well as teaching the language.

2. Another classification variable significant to educational practice in foreign language education was socio-economic status. Socio-economic status may influence a subject's perception of the task of learning
Students from the upper socio-economic levels may be exposed to a wider range of attitudes, social groups, and may be more likely to have traveled than the student from a lower social class (Rettig, 1966). Students from the upper socio-economic levels may view language study as a way to gain social recognition or economic advantages (Gardner and Lambert, 1972). Students from lower social classes who are lacking in exposure to global perspectives, travel, and other ethnic groups may be quite ethnocentric (Triandis, 1971). Cross cultural activities that stimulate self-awareness and intercultural awareness should be integrated into the language curriculum.

3. Given the research in the field of foreign language education concerning grade expectations and positive attitudes toward other ethnic groups (Bernardi, 1967; Clément, 1978), students should be encouraged to work at their own pace, spending as much or as little time as needed to master assigned laboratory and course objectives. The normal four-semester sequence should be relegated to the student of average aptitude in order to provide the organizational structure and an option which provides an opportunity to achieve at a higher level and to receive reinforcement from grades.
The following recommendations are suggested for further research:

1. A high priority should be the development of measures for assessing attitudinal outcomes, both in the affective and behavioral components. The difficulties inherent in attitude measurement in the affective and behavioral components have been aggravated by the relative scarcity of theoretical and methodological discussion in the literature for language teachers. Most of the available information is found in social psychology, a literature unfamiliar to the language educator (Lett, 1977).

2. Similar multivariate research is needed in Spanish Education to determine the attitudinal characteristics of Anglophones learning Spanish. Meta-linguistic studies or studies of how individuals verbalize knowledge about the processes of thinking, remembering and speaking, and the attitudinal concomitants of the acquisition of Spanish have been limited in number (Torney-Purta, 1961).

3. Research is needed which would replicate this study with a rural, inner city, and suburban sample at the secondary level. The proportion of variance in ethnocentrism scores explained by foreign language study have been found to be different for rural, inner city, and
suburban samples (Lett, 1976).

4. Research is needed to support the importance of teacher characteristics that may contribute to positive attitudes toward the study of a foreign language and that maintain instrumental and/or integrative motivation.

Concluding Statements

The results of this study indicated that there was a relationship between student attitudes toward other ethnic groups, Francophones, and ethnocentrism-chauvinism and three levels of French study. The results were, however, limited by the cross sectional nature of this investigation. Conclusive statements about changing attitudes in foreign language classes might be drawn from a longitudinal study using one group.

The findings of this investigation suggested that there was greater variability in French 102/106 in comparison to French 101 and French 201. Students with several years of secondary school language study and students who had completed one semester of university study tended to exhibit unexpectedly high mean scores on a semantic differential, a revised Bogardus Social Distance, and the Agree-Disagree IDEA Test. It may be that positive attitudes were developed at the secondary school level and subsequently contributed to the high mean scores across grade expectations and at lower socio-economic
levels.

The findings of this study also suggested that success in a French course tended to override other variables such as gender and socio-economic status. It may be that grade expectations motivate students for innumerable reasons and, perhaps, obscure the integrative purposes of a language course. That is, the hard work to maintain high grades, the reward of progressing to the next level of language study or graduation, the feeling of pride and self-worth, failure avoidance, and countless other instrumental reasons may explain the high univariate and multivariate \( F \)-ratios in this investigation for the independent variable, GRADE. In view of the fact that this investigation showed a large portion of the variance in the three dependent variables to be contributed by grade expectations, it must be concluded that language teachers should be cautious in their claims regarding the integrative benefits of language study.
APPENDIX A

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL TEST

Put an X in the space along the line which best describes your opinion of the French-speaking people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unsociable</th>
<th>Sociable</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Cruel</th>
<th>Kind</th>
<th>Arrogant</th>
<th>Humble</th>
<th>Beautiful</th>
<th>Ugly</th>
<th>Clean</th>
<th>Dirty</th>
<th>Foolish</th>
<th>Wise</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Talkative</th>
<th>Quiet</th>
<th>Insensitive</th>
<th>Sensitive</th>
<th>Generous</th>
<th>Stingy</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Excitable</th>
<th>Calm</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Rich</th>
<th>Unaspiring</th>
<th>Ambitious</th>
<th>Usual</th>
<th>Unusual</th>
<th>Boring</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
<th>Submissive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>-</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
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<td></td>
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</table>
APPENDIX B

Agree-Disagree IDEA Test

There are fifteen statements in this questionnaire. Please indicate your personal opinion of each statement by writing a number from 1 to 5 on the line corresponding to the appropriate statement.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

1. The U.S. should not export food to Third World or Communist nations.

2. The U.S. should be willing to wage war over political disagreements.

3. War can be averted through negotiations and diplomacy.

4. Schools should teach that the U.S. is the best country in the world.

5. The greatest danger to our government is the introduction of foreign ideas.

6. The U.S. controls the world.

7. Care must be taken of Americans first, foreigners second.

8. The American government may practice deceit in order to protect the American people.

9. Helping other nations is a waste of our money.

10. Our nation is capable of solving the world's problems by itself.

11. Diplomacy and negotiations are better than armed conflict.

12. Americans are the best in the world.
13. Scheels waste too much time teaching about other nations and peoples.

14. One cannot solve the world's problems; therefore, there is no sense worrying about them.

15. The U.S. should stop the flow of aliens and foreigners into this country.
Appendix C

Revised Bogardus Social Distance Scale

Put an X in the block after each statement with which you agree. Remember to give your first feelings or reactions in every case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>as a visitor to my country</th>
<th>as a citizen of my country</th>
<th>as a member of my church</th>
<th>as a classmate in my school</th>
<th>as a neighbor on my street</th>
<th>as a member of &quot;my&quot; crowd</th>
<th>into kinship by marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEXICO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANADA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOVIET UNION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. GERMANY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGERIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I WOULD BE WILLING TO ACCEPT A PERSON FROM THE COUNTRY LISTED BELOW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>as a visitor to my country</th>
<th>as a citizen of my country</th>
<th>as a member of my church</th>
<th>as a classmate in my school</th>
<th>as a neighbor on my street</th>
<th>as a member of &quot;my&quot; crowd</th>
<th>into kinship by marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUEBEC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENEGAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAITI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOLLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAIRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTINIQUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDONESIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Personal Data Sheet

_________ Male   _________ Female

Age________________________________________

Date of Birth ________________________________

School ______________________________________

Instructor's Name ______________________________

Room ___________________________ Course ______

Father's Occupation ____________________________________________

Mother's Occupation ____________________________________________

What course grade do you expect at the end of this semester? ____________________________________________
Teacher Data Sheet

Name ____________________________   ______ Male ______ Female

Nationality ________________________

Amount of Travel (Francophone countries only) __________________

School Name ___________________ Period and Room ________________

Amount of Time Devoted to Teaching French _________________________

Name and Publisher of Textbook ________________________________

Amount of Time Devoted to Cultural Topics (per period)

Daily Life _________

Literature _________

Art and Ideas _________

Cultural Differences _________

History-Geography _________

Current Events _________

Youth _________

List the Cultural Materials used in Class or in Your Preparations

Describe your Minicourses or Tracking (If applicable)

Level of Education: ______ B.A. ______ M.A. (Education) ______ M.A. (French

 ______ Ed.S. ______ Ed.D. or Ph.D.  
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Appendix F

Informed Consent Form
During next week Carl L. Garrott, a doctoral student at the University of Kentucky, will be conducting a study in your French class. You may participate in this investigation from 5-9 December, 1983. The purpose of the study is to gain knowledge about the attitudes of university French students toward ethnic groups and ethnocentrism-chauvinism.

All activities pertaining to this study are designed to coordinate with the regular classroom work and the actual time involved will only be 15 to 40 minutes. You will participate in normal course assignments and testing. For this investigation, you will complete three short attitude inventories, and one personal data sheet.

Your responses will be kept anonymous, and this study is no way harmful to you. There is no penalty for not participating in this investigation, and you may withdraw at any time without consequence.

If you have questions about the study prior to giving your permission, you may call C. Garrott (Office: 257-6770; Home: 255-9060).

I hereby give my permission to participate as a subject in this study.

(name)

(date)

One copy of this form has been retained by the subject.

Principal Investigator __ Date
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