A college second language program compared the effectiveness of traditional second language instruction and a communicative approach in second year French, German, and Spanish courses. The communicative classes used only authentic materials, thematically organized and prepared for classroom use by the instructors. Similar topics were addressed in each language. Testing of all language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) involved functional language use situations. Comparison of the test results of the experimental and control groups showed no significant differences between them, but an attitude survey of both groups revealed that students responded favorably to the absence of a traditional text. However, while some students thrived on the responsibility offered by the communicative approach, and the experimental group seemed generally well-motivated, some missed the traditional vocabulary lists for each topic, the review of grammatical structure, and the disciplined structure of finite content and testing. The program's teachers found that selection and planning for using the authentic materials required considerable extra preparation time, and that they needed to minimize their role of authority to encourage the students' direct contact with the culture. Students seemed to favor current events materials and gained respect for the new points of view they encountered. (MSE)
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INTRODUCTION

The Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures at Purdue University Calumet requested federal funding to introduce new language teaching techniques and materials at the second year level. We endeavored to prove that it is possible to decrease students' resistance to the study of a foreign language and actually raise their motivation toward the study of a foreign language. We wanted to dispel the old and all too familiar notion that two years of foreign language study nets us only a disgruntled, non-functional L2 student. We aimed to show that at the second year level the use of non-traditional techniques and materials can result in a linguistically functional student who can use language appropriate to a particular situation in order to satisfy a particular communicative need. Therefore, we introduced a communicative language teaching approach coupled with the exclusive use of authentic materials which were thematically organized and prepared for classroom use by the instructors and implemented into the second year of German, French, and Spanish. We also monitored the linguistic progress and attitudes of our students in the grant experimental classes of German, French, and Spanish and repeated the procedure in control groups taught by the traditional, grammatically sequential methods and texts.

Three primary needs for federal support were 1) to reduce the teaching load for the grant instructors to allow for the preparation of suitable material, 2) to purchase the desired authentic materials, and 3) to cover the xeroxing costs for the distribution of the materials into the classroom.

Authentic materials are those that have not been specially written or recorded for the language learner but were originally
directed at the native speaker. They are genuine cultural artifacts such as timetables, newspapers, magazines, letters, hotel guides, restaurant menus, bills, essays, leaflets, recorded interviews, radio and television broadcasts, advertisements and films. These materials are authentic rather than synthetic. They have not been artificially simplified, glossed, rearranged, or otherwise predigested for the consumption of the language learner. The teacher's task is to choose from a wealth of gathered materials those which are appropriate for classroom use. The selected items must relate to or be able to awaken the students' interest. The criteria for selection are quantity, quality, and level of difficulty. We found that oral, visual, or written materials that are too long easily overwhelm the student. Manageable excerpts are preferable since the goal is comprehension as well as insight into the culture of the target languages. Authentic materials are the raw data of a culture, and the students' ability to understand that culture will depend upon their ability to interpret that data. Students who lose their fears and gain the self-confidence necessary to deal successfully with interviews, everyday conversation, statistics, editorials, political cartoons, menus, strategies of renting a room or acquiring real estate, etc. are much better equipped to orient themselves in the culture. It is the teacher's task not to present simplified and stereotypical conclusions about a culture, but rather to help students develop strategies for making their own conclusions based on careful analysis of the available data, an enhanced sensitivity to the total cultural setting, and a heightened awareness of the diversity of values and lifestyles in our global community.
PREPARATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

The two-semester second-year sequence comprised thirty weeks of instruction.

During the Fall 1985 semester, the following topics were chosen:

1. Introduction to the target country (countries) with an emphasis on geography
2. Youth
3. Food and Drink
4. Living Accommodations.

The Spring 1986 semester topics included the following:

1. Leisure Time and Hobbies
2. Education, Training, and Jobs
3. Female and Male Roles
4. The United States Through Foreign Eyes
5. Media.

Material selection for each topic included some combination of reading, aural, and visual resources. These included newspapers, magazines, books, records, personal slides, oral interviews, radio broadcasts, TV broadcasts, realia, films, and personal videotapes.

Topic materials were presented in three phases: introduction, reproduction, and production. The introduction phase involved the decoding of the material. In a reading selection, for example, the student had access to the essential new vocabulary and then read the text for general comprehension, avoiding translation and looking for content recognition and contextual meaning of vocabulary. Sample exercises to review comprehension of the selection included choosing key words, restating main ideas, underlining key phrases, writing paragraph headlines, and listing cognates. Students worked in pairs...
or small groups to encourage maximum language usage and to promote de-emphasis of the instructor as interpreter of the material. For a visual selection, the student had access to new vocabulary. Then, while viewing the material, the student made short statements to list or to react to or to question what he saw. During the introduction to an aural selection, the student identified the speakers, the general topic, the tone, general content, and cultural references, listening for general information rather than for specific. In the decoding phase of any selection, the student also attempted to determine the point of view and tone of the selection, the intended audience, and the desired audience response.

In the reproduction phase, the student prepared written or oral summaries, defined key vocabulary using the target language, posed questions for instructor clarification about the cultural or historical context, and stated reactions to ideas or information as presented. Students moved out of this phase having reproduced the content area with now-familiar vocabulary and with enhanced linguistic and cultural comprehension.

The final or production phase of each unit demanded total student involvement: the production of a response to the topic. The aim of this stage was to involve students in functional, life-like situations that called upon the student's initiative and familiarity with cultural concepts as well as linguistic skills. Some of the functions students have performed throughout the course of the one-year grant period follow. Students

1. Chose and described hotel accommodations from authentic brochures and hotel guides
2. Wrote letters to request hotel reservations
3. Ordered meals in restaurants from authentic menus
   (The Spanish group ordered and ate at a Mexican
   restaurant in a Hispanic neighborhood.)

4. Shopped market stores and carried out money transactions

5. Chose night spots for dancing and drinking from student
   guides and entertainment guides to cities

6. Wrote letters to the target countries' tourism bureaus
   requesting information on summer festivals and activities

7. Chose hairdressers to fit style and budget preferences

8. Wrote letters to magazines that run a penpal service;
   described interests

9. Copied a recipe from a TV show

10. Gave a recipe to the class, explaining ingredients and
    demonstrating preparation

11. Wrote resumes to apply for jobs as listed in the want ads

12. Interviewed as job applicants

13. Produced a 5-minute news program, including commercials

14. Videotaped a "talk show interview" with two actresses
    and showed a "clip" from their latest "movie"

15. Developed a student tourist guide for three cities in
    the target country, including maps, hotel and restaurant
    recommendations, and a list of places of interest

16. Wrote a playlet of a politically active couple at the
    movies

17. Selected real estate from an European Sunday newspaper ad,
    choosing location within a metropolitan setting, interviewing
    the seller, and completing the mortgage transaction at
    the bank.

Each of the instructors agreed upon the general topics as previously listed for the two-semester sequence. The instructors felt the topics would be of interest to the students; the topics were broad enough to allow for a choice of sub-topics; and the instructors had sufficient authentic material from which to choose appropriate reading, visual, and aural selections. The quantity of material presented within each unit varied with the type of material, with the level of
difficulty, and with student demand. It took the instructors some time to be able to gauge the students' ability to cope with the material presented. Students were always asked to deal with whole concepts rather than individual lexical items. Total comprehension was seldom the goal. Exercises dealt with material the student could understand, and the student was encouraged to be a mature learner and to make inferences without understanding every word. Material selection also was designed to lead the student to a functional, realistic use of the language, both in its linguistic and cultural aspects.

It should be noted that review of some grammar was introduced where needed, and new grammatical concepts were studied only as presented in context. Computer programs were available for both grammar and vocabulary drills as desired by the student.

A sample French unit organization for the Leisure Time and Hobbies topic in the second semester of the grant project illustrates the use and implementation of authentic materials to form a topic.

a) An eight-paragraph newspaper article on the fifth TV channel proposed by a Franco-Italian partnership

Students analyzed the general content of the article by group work to choose key words and phrases and to restate major ideas. Students worked through a study sheet to probe for general comprehension and to stimulate questions and comments about the role of television in the target culture.

b) TV program from Jours de France

Each student had a different issue of the magazine and filled out a sheet that required notations of the week, channels, viewing hours, serials, children's programming,
sports, cultural and variety shows, news, and films.

Students presented and compared information within small
groups and drew conclusions, comparing French TV programming
to U.S. TV programming.

c) (Per student request) - Students compiled vocabulary lists to
discuss TV viewing habits (example: turn on, raise the volume,
change the station, weather report, news anchorman, commercials,
announcer...)

d) Seven letters from a TV guide magazine

   Students read for general content and listed range of
   concerns and comments.

   Some students elected to write similar letters about U.S.
   programs.

e) (Per student request) - Plot summaries of an episode of "Dallas"
   and one of the French counterpart, "Chateauvallon."

f) Video interviews of native informants registering attitudes about
   French and American television (from ACTFL 1983: "Video in the
   Classroom: An Authentic Materials Approach")

   Students answered true/false statements, listed positive and
   negative comments of interviewers, and identified attitude
   differences. (These exercises accompanied the tapes.)

g) Article from Le Monde on non-government radio stations

   Students read for general content and summarized the article.

   When students requested more information, some decided to
   research and report on the history and development of
   French radio and television and government control of
   same.
h) Newspaper ad on new FM stations

Students speculated about the role of radio and its implications, raising many questions.

i) Videotape of summer 1985 TV programming: portion of "Des Chiffres et des lettres" (a French game show), regional news, weather, vacation traffic report, research on SIDA (AIDS)

Students listened for general content, noted whatever specifics possible, then commented.

j) Pétanque rules

Students deciphered rules for the sport and compared to similar U.S. sports.

k) Magazine article on preferred weekend activities, costs for movies, theaters, tipping, etc.

Students first listed what they thought the French preferred, then they read to compare to their pre-conceptions and U.S. practices.

l) Videotape of French street scenes (sports, cultural events, family activities) from summer 1985

Students listed what they saw, asked questions, formulated statements and observations.

m) Cartoon selections

Students in pairs explained short cartoon stories to other pairs.

Students made comparisons to U.S. cartoon characters, heroes, situations, and values.

n) Radio call-in song-request show (late night show taped summer 1985)

Students listened for the name of the request, the reason
for the request, and the tone of the song.
Students commented on similarities of French/U.S. pop songs
and reasons for requests.

o) Newspapers
Students were each given newspapers from throughout the
regions of France.
Students chose an article about sports and another about
leisure activities, then clipped and summarized same.

(Items d, e, g, h, i, j, k, l, m, n, and o used in this unit were collected in
France by the instructor during the summer prior to teaching the
grant course.)
CLASSROOM TESTING

To test communicative proficiencies in the L2 classroom we had to discard the notion of discrete point testing, which involves testing a finite amount of language material for which the student can be held responsible. It was necessary to design tests and create testing situations which would give us a measure of the student's performance skill through the use of certain linguistic functions. We relied almost exclusively on the student's response to authentic realia in aural or in written form. We designed functional testing situations which aimed to demonstrate a measurable performance level in each of the four skills — listening, reading, speaking and writing. While listening, reading, or speaking evaluations could be conducted at any point in a unit, the written performance test was always given in the final stages of a unit topic. This timing reflected our overall effort to provide adequate listening, reading, and speaking opportunities within a given subject matter for the student to build confidence in her structural and lexical know-how. Repetition from these three skills served as a foundation from which the student could draw to manipulate successfully a written test assignment.

At the beginning of the second year, tasks for the writing skill included simple letter writing, description of interests, short summaries, and opinion following certain written stimuli. At the fourth semester level, students wrote a structured letter to an editor, curriculum vita within the format of the target language culture, and letters of request (information about real estate from a real estate agency, for example).
To test speaking skills we relied heavily on role playing situations, and we utilized peer evaluation of the speaking performance as well as instructor evaluation. In the third semester, scenarios included checking into a hotel; interaction and transactions in a restaurant; functional use of cultural realia such as hotel guides, maps, and menus; questioning and response within certain situations. The following semester the speaking situations were conducted on a more advanced level. Students, for example, conducted themselves at job interviews, providing all the necessary background information and their qualifications. Students discussed the advantages and disadvantages of different educational systems or the roles of men and women in the target country and the U.S.

Reading tests in the third semester involved sentence summary of a paragraph, sequential organization of paragraphs, and identification of topics and tone of the general content. Fourth semester required the students to be able to summarize content, identify levels of opinion, and react and respond to controversial topics, for example, an unfavorable editorial in a major European newspaper on American foreign policy.

We tested listening after students listened to recorded interviews, frequently of children because of their less sophisticated lexical use. We used grid sheets where students had to identify speakers, their activities, and, to a limited degree, attitudes expressed. In the following semester we relied on the use of authentic radio and TV broadcasts, and we introduced feature length films. Students were required to give opinions on observed cultural characteristics, emphasizing comparison to their own.
PROJECT TESTING

A pre-test, post-test control group design (Stanley 1964) was employed to compare the performance of students in the experimental treatment group with those in the traditional treatment group on three dependent measures:

1) The Modern Language Association (MLA) cooperative Foreign Language Listening test;

2) An interview developed and administered by the project staff; (See Appendix B) and

3) An Attitude Assessment Survey (Welty, 1986) (See Appendix A) developed specifically for this project.

Two statistical techniques were used to analyze the data generated in the study: (1) a T-test of independent samples; and (2) a one-way analysis of variance.

Results from the MLA Listening Test

The MLA listening test, a measure of the student's ability to comprehend the spoken target language, was administered to experimental and control subjects in each language group.

An analysis of variance, comparing the MLA pretest scores of experimental and control subjects for each of the languages, was computed and revealed no significant differences among the groups. Thus, it was concluded that the pre-test scores for experimental and control subjects were derived from the same population and that an analysis of co-variance was unnecessary.

A series of T-tests for independent samples were then computed to compare the mean difference test scores (difference equals post-test minus pre-test score) for experimental and control subjects for each language and across all languages. The results of these tests,
presented in Table 1, revealed the following:

1) when experimental subjects from all languages were compared with the control subjects from all languages, there were no statistically significant differences between groups on the MLA listening test;

2) when experimental and control subjects in the French language group were compared and when experimental and control subjects in the German language group were compared, there were no statistically significant differences between groups on the MLA; and

3) when experimental and control subjects in Spanish were compared, there was a statistically significant difference at the .001 level.

Results from the Oral Interview

Experimental and control subjects in each of the language groups were administered a five-minute oral test designed to assess the subjects' ability to speak the target language. This test was administered in a standardized manner by a trained interviewer.

An analysis of variance, comparing the oral pre-test scores of experimental and control subjects for each of the languages, again revealed no significant differences among the groups and, thus, an analysis of co-variance was not completed.

A series of T-tests for independent samples were conducted to compare mean difference test scores for experimental and control subjects for each language and across all languages. The results of these tests, presented in Table 2, revealed no statistically significant differences.
Table 1: T-Test of Difference Scores on M.L.A. Listening Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Gain</th>
<th>St. Deviation</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>-.93</td>
<td>0.3614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>0.4652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: T-test of Difference Scores on Oral Proficiency Exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Gain</th>
<th>St Deviation</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.5159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.4357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from the Attitude Assessment Survey

Experimental and control subjects in the French and German language groups and the experimental subjects in the Spanish language group were administered a foreign language attitude assessment survey especially
developed for this project. Using a Likert-scale format, this survey, presented in Appendix A, consists of a number of items that ask the subjects to indicate their attitudes toward the course, the way in which the course was taught, and their progress in learning the target language during the course. For each item, subjects were asked to rate their attitude from most negative (1) to most positive (6). A total score for fourteen items and two cluster scores for each of three items were computed separately for each subject. The first cluster score assessed the subjects' general satisfaction with the method used to teach the course. The second cluster score assessed the subjects' perception of how well they are able to understand authentic texts such as newspapers and radio and TV broadcasts, as well as native speakers.

A one-way analysis of variance was employed to compare the pre-test scores of experimental and control subjects for each of the languages. A separate analysis was conducted for the total score and for each of the two cluster scores. This analysis revealed no statistically significant differences among the groups on any of the three pre-test attitude measures, and thus it was concluded that an analysis of co-variance was unnecessary.

A series of T-Tests for independent samples were conducted to compare the mean differences in attitude test scores for experimental and control subjects for each language and across all languages. Separate tests were conducted for the total score and for each of the cluster scores. The results of this analysis, presented in Tables 3-5, reveal no statistically significant differences between the experimental and control subjects for any of the languages or across all languages on any of the three attitude measures.
### Table 3: T-Test of Difference Scores on Total Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Gain</th>
<th>St Deviation</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>0.9144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>-1.31</td>
<td>0.2124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-4.0</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: T-Test of Difference Scores on Cluster 1 Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Gain</th>
<th>St Deviation</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.3490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>.1525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5: T-Test of Difference Scores on Cluster 2 Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Gain</th>
<th>St Deviation</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>- .90</td>
<td>.4165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>36.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.9562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Controls</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion and Conclusions

In regard to the results of the project testing we would like to make three points.

(1) The numbers in the study were small, especially in several of the control groups. This decreased the probability of obtaining statistically significant findings. Nevertheless, the data reveal some interesting trends, and the question arises as to whether those trends would be borne out, perhaps to the point of statistical significance, if this study were replicated using larger groups of subjects.

(2) There was one statistically significant finding: on the listening test in Spanish the experimental subjects outperformed the controls. Possible explanations for this might include the types of listening materials the Spanish subjects worked with during the study or the relative amount of emphasis placed on the skill of listening comprehension in the Spanish groups.

(3) In the attitude survey, some of the findings were rather surprising. While there were no statistically significant differences between experimentals and controls, it was noted that some of the greatest changes in attitude were registered among the control subjects. It would be interesting to see if this finding would be replicated with larger numbers of subjects.

We conclude by observing once again that the number of subjects in this study was small, and that the probability of achieving statistically significant results was therefore correspondingly diminished. Although not statistically significant, interesting differences were noted between the groups. To learn whether or not
those differences would be replicated using larger numbers of subjects should be the aim of a future project using authentic materials to teach foreign languages.
CONCLUSIONS

Our recommendation is that teachers augment liberally the use of authentic materials into their second-year classrooms. While the project testing results do not point to any statistically significant differences between the experimental and control groups, our experience with the experimental groups brings us these conclusions.

A) All students responded favorably to the absence of a traditional text and applauded the use of authentic materials. However, many bemoaned the fact that there was not a finite set of lexical items for each topic. In the second semester of the grant project, some students also missed a review of grammatical structure, which we had purposely avoided. Some thrived under the condition of total responsibility for their learning process, while others missed the disciplined structure of finite content and finite testing. By the end of the grant project, students in general were highly self-motivated and produced above their own expectations.

B) We would certainly encourage others to adapt this method of second-year foreign language teaching with the primary caution that any instructor allow considerable extra preparation time for the selection and preparation of suitable materials. Administrative support is also essential for the continual acquisition of costly, up-to-date authentic materials. While some material could be reused in another semester, we found students responded most favorably to current events, recently acquired realia, up-to-date schedules, etc. We would emphasize that the method, both in preparation time and materials acquisition, requires extensive
resources not typically available to an individual instructor.

C) Students were enthusiastic to acquaint themselves through realia with a small city and discover its infrastructure (transportation, cultural offerings, listing of hotels, price of real estate, source of employment). Instructors' personal slides and interviews with citizens that revealed their daily life involved the students directly with the cultural and sociological reality of the target country, providing an in-depth view appreciated by students. (Attitude Assessment Survey)

D) We caution the instructor or native informant to minimize his or her role as "authority" and to encourage the students to respond to the direct contact with the culture. By means of the authentic material, students are quite capable of drawing inferences from that material rather than relying on the instructor's interpretation or personal experience. We found that as students gained confidence and ability, they became quite adamant in opting for active involvement rather than settling for a passive listening role. In addition, controversial topics stimulated the students to pursue further reading on a subject although the length of articles or the lexical complexities were frequently beyond their reading level. We felt that students' requests for independent use of realia and non-excerpted newspaper copy indicated a level of motivation and self-confidence that confirmed one of the intentions of our project.

E) We are happy to report that approximately one-third of our second year students in the German and French experimental groups chose to continue their language study into the third year.
The majority of those continuing are not currently classified as foreign language majors. Several of the German students opted to take advantage of a Purdue University Calumet language program in East Germany and continue their language learning during the summer of 1986 in Erfurt.

In addition, we felt that one of the major advantages of the use of the authentic materials from other countries stemmed from the favorable student response to the current events selections. Newspaper editorials on American lifestyle and American foreign policy often made the students aware, albeit painfully, that the American way of life is not universally accepted as desirable. Students questioned their values, previously taken for granted, and subjected themselves to an analysis of other points of view. Student evaluations showed that 29 of 31 students in the French and German experimental groups agreed that the fourth-semester course fostered respect for new points of view and broadened the students' views greatly. (Table 6) Since we agree that the goal of teaching culture, as stated in the draft of a new syllabus for New York state schools, Modern Languages for Communication, "is to foster respect for and understanding of others, to reduce the negative effects of ethnocentrism, and to prepare students to participate sensitively in a culturally pluralistic world," then we applaud our students' reaction.

We would note also that the French and German fourth-semester experimental groups completed the Purdue cafeteria system Instructor and Course Appraisal, an evaluation system whereby the instructor chooses from some 200 cafeteria items. Of these 31 students (19 in
German and 12 in French; 23 female, 8 male), 26 students indicated that the course was required. We include those responses that point to the principal strengths of the grant experiment. (Table 6)
Table 6: Instructor and Course Appraisal: Cafeteria System
Purdue Research Foundation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This course supplies me with an effective range of challenges.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this course, many methods are used to involve me in learning.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course fosters respect for new points of view.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course stretched and broadened my views greatly.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My instructor encourages student creativity.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each student is encouraged to contribute to class learning.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media (films, TV, etc.) used in this course are well chosen.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media (films, TV, etc.) are an asset to this course.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods used in this course are well chosen.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I highly recommend this course.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the way the instructor conducts this course.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent attendance in this class is essential to good learning.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignments are relevant, interesting, and well-integrated.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My instructor has stimulated my thinking.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I feel I have learned a great deal in this course.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would enjoy taking another course from this instructor.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly Disagree
DISSEMINATION

The Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages ("Second Language Acquisition - Educating for the 21st Century," Milwaukee, Wisconsin, April 3-5, 1986) had invited us to give a report on the preliminary findings of the Title VI Grant. The audience was most enthusiastic, and we received requests to present a follow-up report at a later date. Also, several teachers asked us to come to their schools and conduct an in-service workshop for their staff.

A Title II Grant, "Pilot Evaluation of the Indiana Competency-Based Curriculum Guidelines for Modern Language Teachers," enabled us to direct much of the wealth of authentic material into high school teachers' foreign language classrooms and help them through training seminars to introduce the communicative method with authentic materials within the context of the Indiana Proficiency Guidelines.

The Goethe Institute New York requested a report on our testing procedures. An international forum to be held in New York, September 30, 1986, will have a report on the agenda on an aspect of our Grant. The report, "A Comprehensive Approach to Testing Communicative Proficiencies in the Foreign Language Classroom: Results from a Foreign Language Teaching Experiment Funded by Title VI, Department of Education, Washington, D.C.," will be considered for publication by the Goethe Institute.

Our final results, which will include a statistical analysis of the gained data, will be written up and presented to professional journals for publication.
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FOREIGN LANGUAGE
ATTITUDE ASSESSMENT SURVEY

Social Security Number: _____________________ Age: ________

Sex: __________ GPA: __________ Year in School: ________

Future career or profession: ________________________________

Language I am learning in this course: _______________________

Number of semesters I have studied this language: ____________

If a language other than English is spoken in your home, please state which language: ________________________________

If you have ever visited a country where the language you are learning is spoken, please state which country and for how long. Country: ________

Length of stay: __________________

DIRECTIONS: Please answer the items in this survey as they relate to the language you are learning in this course, to the native speakers of this language, and to the countries where this language is spoken.

Please read each statement carefully, and then circle the number that best describes how you feel.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
<th>Agree moderately</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Disagree moderately</th>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Because of this course I have a greater desire to travel to a country where this language is spoken. 6 5 4 3 2 1

2. I have more confidence now than I did at the start of the semester in my ability to watch a TV broadcast or listen to a radio program and understand the main idea. 6 5 4 3 2 1
3. With just a very few exceptions I felt coming to this class was worth my time.  

4. This course helped me to significantly increase my knowledge of grammar.  

5. I'll probably take more French/German/Spanish courses in the future.  

6. This course has helped me realize that learning this language can be a stimulating and rewarding experience.  

7. After having taken this course I can better understand everyday spoken French/German/Spanish.  

8. Few if any improvements could be made in this course.  

9. I have more confidence now than I did at the start of the semester in my ability to pick up a French/German/Spanish newspaper or magazine and understand the main ideas.  

10. The way this course was taught increased my interest in France/Germany/Spain and the French/Germans/Spanish.  

11. The texts, visuals (e.g. slides, posters), and tapes (audio & video) used to teach this course made the course more interesting.  

12. Provided that this course is again taught the way it was taught this semester, I believe other Purdue-Calumet students would be interested in taking this course.  

13. The way this course was taught is the way all French/German/Spanish courses should be taught.  

14. This course gave me a better understanding of the current life style in France/Germany/Spain.
15. Because of this course I am more likely to seek contact with native speakers whenever I happen to meet them.  
6 5 4 3 2 1

16. The time I spent in this course was time well spent.  
6 5 4 3 2 1

17. Through direct and indirect comparison this course has helped me gain a better understanding of American culture.  
6 5 4 3 2 1

18. For next semester, I think the instructor should employ the same teaching approach in this course.  
6 5 4 3 2 1

19. I have more confidence now than I did at the start of the semester in my ability to hold a conversation with a native speaker and get my main idea across.  
6 5 4 3 2 1

20. This course shows that learning French/German/Spanish can be interesting and relevant.  
6 5 4 3 2 1

21. If a friend asked me which French/German/Spanish course he should take, I would recommend this one.  
6 5 4 3 2 1

22. For next semester, I think the instructor should use the same, or similar, text materials in this course.  
6 5 4 3 2 1

23. I know more about current affairs (the current social and political scene) in France/Germany/Spain now than I did at the start of the semester.  
6 5 4 3 2 1

24. What do you consider to be the principal strength(s) of this course?  

25. What do you consider to be the principal weakness(es) of this course?
APPENDIX B

Oral Interview (pre-test)

1. How are you?
   What's your name?
   How old are you?

2. What's the weather like?

3. Talk a little about your family?

4. What are you wearing today?

5. What do you like to eat, to drink?

6. What do you do in your spare time?

7. What did you do this past summer?

8. What are your plans for the weekend?

9. Ask me some questions.

10. What do you like about Purdue? dislike?

Oral Interview (exit test)

1. Tell me a little about yourself.
   How are you feeling today?
   (Probe if response is weak. i.e. describe your daily routine.)

2. What do you like about spring?

3. What do you think about the people in _______ (country studied)?

4. What sort of hotel accommodations do you like?

5. If you were in _______ (country studied), what would you order to eat and drink? (breakfast, lunch or dinner).

6. What do you do in your leisure time?

7. How will you spend your summer?

8. What will you do with the language skills you have acquired?

9. What would you tell a prospective employer about yourself?

10. What did you like, dislike, about this course?
APPENDIX B (continued)

Evaluation Procedure for Oral Interview

0 -- no response.
1 -- fragmented response; grammar errors of such magnitude that they interfere with your comprehension.
2 -- short response (one sentence where you would like to have at least two) with some grammar errors; no major interference to your comprehension.
3 -- elaborate response to the question; only very minor grammar errors.