THE DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION OF A SET OF CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

By

THEODORE B. KALIVODA

Bachelor of Arts
Wheaton College
Wheaton, Illinois
1953

Master of Arts
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
1956

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1967

THE DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION OF A SET OF

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF UNDERGRADUATE

PROGRAMS OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Thesis Approved:

John E. Egermeier
Thesis Adviser

Charles E. Larsen

Roland Fass

Dan Selakovich

N. D. Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

Modern foreign language instruction in American colleges and universities in recent years has gained considerable importance and popularity. As a result, much has been published in the literature of the field to set forth recommendations for modern foreign language departments and their program efforts. The extensiveness of this literature, however, makes its consumption difficult. A first objective of this study, therefore, was to pull together into compact form recommendations which constituted the pulse of the literature so that they might serve as a handy resource for those involved in determining the direction of their institutions' modern foreign language programs.

A second objective was to determine through opinions of a sample of professionals the relative importance of the various recommendations selected from the literature. This provided for the establishment of a set of criteria which was used to pursue a final objective: to show the extent which current practices of modern foreign language departments compare with the set of criteria. Included in this objective was to compare the modern foreign language program of Oklahoma State University with both the set of criteria and its practice at other institutions.

The writer wishes to express his gratitude to his adviser, Dr. John C. Egermeier, whose suggestions and encouragement hastened the completion of this thesis. His entire committee, composed of Dr. Charles E. Larsen, Dr. Dan Selakovich, and Mr. Roland Grass, were an invaluable source of guidance and constructive criticism in the preparation and completion of this thesis.

Deep appreciation is expressed to Kay Isabel, the writer's wife, whose understanding and encouragement made the study a reality.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Historical Background

Attitudes in the United States towards the learning of foreign languages have fluctuated in accordance with the contemporary scene. In the early years of American higher education universities would not permit modern foreign languages in the curriculum. Education in these early years was for the elite only, for those who would give themselves to the pursuits of the ministry, law, and medicine. America at this time was not overly concerned about other countries. It had its own internal problems, its growing pains, and the universities taught what society wanted.

The central core of the early American university curriculum was the classical languages and literature. A knowledge of the classics was taken for granted as necessary for students in American universities of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Many considered the learning of Greek and Latin to be the mark of a gentleman. Even the most advanced critics of the established curriculum of the time, men like Jefferson and Franklin, spoke in favor of the value of the classics. Jefferson was one of the first innovators; he wanted to supplement the curriculum with more modern subjects, including modern languages.

In 1776, at the College of Philadelphia (later, the University of Pennsylvania), Provost William Smith instituted a broader and more

utilitarian curriculum, which Benjamin Franklin had proposed seven years earlier. This education was composed of three parts: one-third devoted to Latin and Greek; one third to mathematics and science; and, one-third to logic, ethics, and metaphysics. It was through this deviation from the pure classical curriculum that modern foreign languages gained a foothold in American colleges and universities. Recommendations were given for private, individual study to supplement the new curriculum. "The French language may be studied at leisure hours," it was suggested. (16, pp. 13-19) This provision, weak as it was, helped set the stage for inclusion of modern foreign languages in other universities. In 1779, for example, through the introduction of curricular changes by Governor Jefferson of Virginia, modern languages found a place in the curriculum at William and Mary College. (16, p. 14)

But it was not until 1815 that the teaching of modern foreign languages became significant in American higher education. At this time Harvard University was bequeathed $20,000 by an alumnus for the purpose of maintaining a professor of French and Spanish languages. Three men stand out as modern foreign language professors at Harvard during the following years: George Ticknor, who was destined to become the most distinguished Professor of Spanish in the United States; Henry Wadsworth Longfellow; and James Russell Lowell.

Throughout the nineteenth century modern foreign languages failed to experience much growth. Even at the University of Pennsylvania, where modern foreign languages first got a significant start, the 1839 catalogue stated that "Spanish, French and German may be pursued if required by parents." (43, p. 601) Modern foreign languages were taught at other institutions, but only modestly, with one professor often in charge of

several languages. Modern foreign languages were offered by apparently were not considered very important. (43)

The twentieth century brought about a complete change in the importance of modern foreign languages in higher education. As a result of the development of the elective curriculum, due primarily to the leadership of President Charles William Elliot of Harvard, a vast broadening of the curriculum was realized. Modern foreign languages were clamoring for more room, and they got it. They began to be accepted as an important part of education in American higher learning. (16, pp. 107-115)

Modern foreign languages made their most phenomenal gains after the second World War. At this time America found itself with increased responsibilities in world affairs and was forced to become concerned about international relations. So greatly did internationalism develop that a phenomenal surge of interest in modern foreign languages resulted. Consequently, America today is witnessing more than ever before in its history a revolutionary change in attitude toward language study. A definite trend has appeared toward a reassessment of educational roles for building better world citizens. As a consequence many schools are including and strengthening language in their curricula. Commercial language institutes are actively operating and are finding a fertile field for enrollment among those who have already finished their formal education. And learn-it-yourself foreign language schemes centered around pocket books and phonograph records are finding their way into thousands of homes for use by young and old alike.

Surveys of the Modern Language Association on foreign language entrance and graduation requirements (Wolfe, 1959; Plattel, 1960) clearly show the growing attitude change toward foreign languages. Of 899

colleges which granted the Bachelor of Arts degree a few years ago, 31.6 per cent had foreign language requirements for admission, and 85.9 per cent required a foreign language for the degree. (37) How radically different is this interest in modern foreign languages as compared to the indifference and even intolerance of colonial times.

Two factors loom large in this revolution in thinking. The second World War had hardly ended when new international tensions began to appear. Those who had thought that wars solved problems now began to understand that a new and different approach was needed for the curbing of international tensions. Soon to follow was the rapid technological development leading to awesome weapons of destruction. Thus, the American public found itself forced to follow a new approach--to take steps to maximize peace with other peoples through understanding each other. Enthusiasm for foreign language learning thus came into vogue. And rightly so, for through language study Americans can learn not only to communicate with other peoples but also to understand their culture and way of thinking.

The need for this is apparent. There exist about 3,000 languages and major dialects in the world today as well as unnumbered minor dialects. Scientific progress has brought into close physical contact the people who speak these languages. But the results have not always been desirable. (23) According to Freeman (23) men gather around the conference table, but the contact is often distasteful because they do not know each other linguistically or spiritually. That is, they are together physically but have not established real communication. They do not only lack understanding of what the other says, but of what he thinks, how he thinks, and why he thinks as he does. Real communion is lacking.

Freeman (23) believes that to a very large degree America's strength as a highly developed nation has been based upon its economic and industrial system--upon its wealth and its know-how in acquiring that wealth. But if America is to be a true leader, rather than one which is feared, envied, or hated, its leadership must place priority upon understanding of other peoples of the world, understanding which is to come from government leaders and citizens alike.

Learning another's language is a good first step towards improving relations. To spend time and effort in learning the other's language is an indication of sincere interest in friendship. It acknowledges the human trait of pride in and sensitivity to one's cultural patterns. It is a show of interest in all that the native speaker holds precious. Furthermore, it helps one to better understand the factors underlying the native speaker's thoughts and actions--that is, why he does what he does when he does it.

In 1958 the Federal Government officially entered the language scene by strongly supporting the strengthening of modern foreign language instruction in America's educational institutions. On September second of that year the National Defense Education Act was passed to provide substantial subsistence to strengthen the teaching of modern foreign languages, science and mathematics. Although at that time language study was already becoming more popular than perhaps ever before in America's history, "few of the languages spoken by more than three-fourths of the world's population were being taught in the Nation's schools and colleges . . . ." (54, p. 289) Furthermore, methods, materials, and curricula were largely unsuited to the national needs of preparing people to actually speak the languages they studied. (54)

Title VI of the National Defense Education Act was designed to begin to correct these deficiencies. Divided into four interrelated units the Language Development Section of the Title relates to the development of Language and Area Centers, Modern Foreign Language Fellowships, Research and Studies, and Language Institutes. (54)

During the first five years of its existence the National Defense Education Act spent $58 million to send 14,000 elementary and secondary school teachers of modern foreign languages to language institutes throughout the United States to improve professional competence and thus strengthen foreign language teaching in American schools.

In addition the NDEA provided for instruction in seventy critical languages in fifty-five Language and Area Centers on thirty-four campuses. Over 2,000 fellowships were granted for study of these languages and over 200 research grants were made available to study the development and improvement of foreign language teaching. (50)

Fellowships for college teachers in modern foreign languages (non-critical) were also provided for under Title IV of the NDEA.

Under Title III the NDEA provided additional funds for other language needs. The philosophy behind this legislation was:

> . . .students must be taught greater language competence to prepare them for world responsibilities. These changes require, among other things, modern laboratory equipment, audiovisual aids, and up-to-date instructional materials and methods to render teaching more effective and to conserve teacher time. (87, p. 9)

The NDEA was extended for a second five-year period to 1968. This provided an even greater allotment of funds and consequent span of operation for modern foreign languages.

Thus, modern foreign language instruction received the blessing of the Federal Government in both word and deed. Consequently its

popularity and respectability have been strengthened so as to give birth to a new era in foreign language learning in American education.

Because of these revolutionary changes in attitude toward modern foreign languages it was inevitable that questions be raised as to the best ways to teach. As a result, hundreds of books and articles have been written in an attempt to explain the importance of a new program component or to suggest a new approach to an old component. According to a survey of this literature

> A greater number of publications dealt with the nation's imperative need for a sound, defensible, and adequate program of foreign language instruction in the schools and colleges. The language teaching profession concerned itself with (a) audiolingual learning, especially with the aid of language laboratory facilities; (b) longer sequences of study; (c) application of linguistic science to language teaching; (d) use of films, television, teaching machines and other media; (e) study of major neglected languages; (f) preparation of teachers; and, (g) development of new methods, materials, and tests. (37, p. 188)

In May, 1963, the Modern Language Association convened a conference of foreign language experts to make recommendations on the preparation of college teachers of modern foreign languages. These specialists dealt primarily with graduate studies, but among their recommendations were those which could also be applied to undergraduate education. Recommendations were offered in areas of curricula, teaching methods, qualifications of teaching personnel, and special programs such as study abroad. (47)

Statement of the Problem

The heavy influx of new and valuable ideas in modern foreign language learning within the past few years demands that institutions of higher education determine whether their program efforts are adequate

and defensible. This writer found no existing set of criteria in the literature of the field which may be used for such an evaluation. It is believed that if such criteria were developed it could be used as an instrument to help determine a program's soundness. This study attempts to establish criteria by: (1) synthesizing program ideas which are recommended in the literature of the field; and (2) submitting these ideas in questionnaire form to a sample of department heads for rating of their importance.

Need for the Study

Committment to modern foreign language instruction in institutions of higher learning ranges from little or none to a mad rush into program expansion. This suggests the need to know what program components are important, why they are important, and how they are to be effectively utilized. This study attempts to present criteria for administration of a sound and effective program of modern foreign languages.

It is recognized that programs vary in emphasis from one institution to another. Some foreign language departments may have greater preference for a linguistic-centered program than others and consequently place more emphasis on oral language training. Other departments may be more oriented towards training elementary and secondary school teachers, while yet others may emphasize literature in preparing students for further literary study in graduate school.

In spite of these differences, it is believed that there is a type of program for undergraduate foreign language majors which is commonly accepted as essential. It is the rare student who knows exactly how he is to use his undergraduate language training after graduation.

Consequently, most foreign language departments gear their undergraduate programs to provide learning experiences which will meet the requirements of a variety of foreign language activities and which at the same time will contribute to the student's general knowledge of the culture of the language studied. The subject of this thesis is to identify the common elements which constitute such a program.

Such criteria once identified, may serve as a guideline for testing the strengths and weaknesses of any undergraduate program of modern foreign languages. The study should aid these institutions by:

1. providing standards by which they can assess their foreign language programs
2. justifying sound practices of their foreign language programs
3. suggesting practices which should be strengthened in their foreign language programs
4. suggesting practices which should be added to their foreign language programs
5. suggesting practices which should be deleted from their foreign language programs

Because of the writers personal interest in the state of foreign language instruction at Oklahoma State University, application of the established criteria for a sound program has been made to the program of that institution. It is hoped that through this application a clear picture is provided of the strengths and weaknesses of the foreign language program at Oklahoma State University. It should serve to illustrate, furthermore, how this study can be applied to any other particular institution.

Limitations of the Study

This study has been limited to an evaluation of French and Spanish programs on the undergraduate level.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Much has been written on the teaching of modern foreign languages as an aid to the administrator, practitioner, and the interested citizen alike. A synthesis of this literature is provided in this chapter under three major headings: Methods of Instruction, The Language Laboratory, and Program Organization.

Methods of Instruction

Literature of the field clearly shows that understanding the total composition of language and its pedagogical implications is an absolute prerequisite for the operation of a sound program of modern foreign languages. It is therefore necessary to look at what language is. Only after having gained insight into the nature of language can one fruitfully seek pedagogical answers on the way language should be taught.

The Nature of Language

The nature of language holds weighty implications for the teaching of modern foreign languages. Yet throughout the history of modern foreign language teaching in the United States this topic has received scant attention. Instead, teachers have moved from one method to another in an effort to improve their instruction. Bull (17), Politzer (72), Brooks (13), Lado (41) and many others agree that this practice is

a result of emphasis on "how" to teach rather than on "what" to teach. Teachers have failed to see that knowing how to teach a modern foreign language absolutely depends upon understanding what language is.

The confusion is clearly evident in the multitude of methods espoused on the teaching of modern foreign languages. The grammar method, the translation method, the direct method, the reading method, the eclectic method, and a host of other pedagogical inventions had their day in the language teaching scene. Emphasis today rests on insight obtained from the work of linguists, psychologists and cultural anthropologists, not in relation to any one methodology, but in connection with the nature of language itself.

What is language, then? Language is speech. (11) (13) (30) (72) It is made up of sounds which have been scientifically defined in phonemes, morphemes, allophones and other linguistic terms. These terms deal with basic units of sound and their organization into a sound system. They constitute the basic ingredients of language because language is basically sounds. Advanced societies have developed writing systems as a part of their language communication, but this is not to be confused with the real nature of language. Writing merely constitutes symbols to convey the meaning of speech. There would be no writing if there were no speech. Language, then, is primarily a system of spoken communication, and only secondarily a system of written communication. (62) (72, p. 1) (41, p. 18)

Understanding language primarily as speech is believed to be the basic prerequisite for any program of modern foreign language instruction. This is related to what is often referred to as the "four skills:" hearing, speaking, reading, and writing. Advocated is a teaching

approach which emphasizes a scientifically organized teaching of these four skills, first and primarily with stress on sound recognition and production, and later, as learners gain command of aural-oral skills, with an increasing amount of time devoted to the written word. (17) (72) (77) (81) This approach to language teaching seems to be in accord with public desires and expectations. Politzer (70), in a study in which 455 first and second year French and Spanish students were questioned about what they wanted to get from their courses, found that a heavy majority emphasized oral proficiency as their goal. They wanted to acquire language as a tool for communication. Reading ability was judged to be of secondary importance. The investigator concluded on page 21 that "our educational objectives must be reached and can only be reached by utilizing the existing motivation and interests and not by opposing them." Graphic language may be used to advantage to assist development of oral language skill, but Politzer believes that the teaching of these elements at the cost of maximum oral proficiency is poor pedagogical practice.

Brooks (13), O'Connor (65), Stack (81), Meras (53), Politzer (71), and numerous others recommend teaching the four skills separate from each other. The first step is to teach the student to hear the sounds of the new language. This is deemed necessary in that one cannot hope to pronounce a sound correctly before he can first hear it correctly. (71, p. 89) (65) Insisting that the student pronounce a sound before adequate recognition drill has been given is looked upon as a highly inefficient teaching procedure. Hearing new sounds can be a difficult experience without special instruction on phonemic differences. This is true because certain sounds of the target language may not be a part of the sound system of the student's native language.

Bull (17, p. 27) cautions that hearing in a foreign language does not merely involve sound waves striking the eardrums and being transmitted to the brain. It involves something much more complex. It is associated with the processes which take place in the brain as a result of sound transmission. Thus, hearing involves isolating individual sounds, discovering which sounds are similar and which are important to message sending, and classifying sounds according to some scheme (e.g., habla and hablo as representing Spanish tense changes).

Having provided a foundation in sound recognition the teacher proceeds with the teaching of sound production. Teaching the student to articulate the sounds is believed necessary because the teacher has no assurance that the student who has learned to hear a sound can automatically pronounce it. (71, p. 89) For example, a native speaker of English, although he has learned to hear a sound in Spanish, may not be able to articulate that sound because he carries over English speech habits to the Spanish language. Thus, he must first receive instruction which facilitates his articulation. This may require various kinds of illustrations such as tongue positioning, lip formation, or cheek expansion and retraction. (19, pp. 1069-1070) (72, pp. 45-68)

The need for teaching muscular coordination can be seen through analogy of how children learn to pronounce their native language. For lack of muscular coordination children fail to control all the sounds of their own language until about five years of age. Until this age baby talk is a natural phenomenon. The adult learner of the foreign language is in many ways like the child speaking baby talk. He needs to learn muscular coordination to be able to articulate in a way which is not required of him in his native language. And certainly he cannot

take five years to do it. He must be given a more efficient way. (17) Bowen and Stockwell (12) (83) have contributed two entire volumes on how to teach Spanish pronunciation, including related aspects of stress, pitch, juncture and rhythm.

The next stage is teaching to read. The ability to say things in a language does not necessarily mean that one can read them. This is obvious when dealing with a language which uses an alphabet different from that of one's native language. But even with languages which employ the same alphabet reading is considered a skill separate from speaking. (17, pp. 28-31) (65) Lado (41) and Stack (81) present especially noteworthy instruction on processes for teaching to read a foreign language.

Related to written language is a controversy over the effects of seeing the written word on the student's pronunciation. It is argued that in seeing the foreign language in writing in the early stages of learning and before mastery of the oral material one unconsciously carries over pronunciation habits from his native language to the target language. (65) (30) (38) Results of experimentation, however, have been inconclusive. Richards and Appel (76), for example, show that better pronunciation results from withholding the graphic symbol. But a study by the Associated Colleges of the Midwest (3), on the other hand, shows no consistent pattern in results from withholding graphic symbols.

Rivers (77, pp. 158-160) offers some mediating thoughts in the controversy. She believes that interference of the native language will occur in any case at any stage the written word is introduced. She also contends that the spoken language without the aid of the written language places severe tension upon the learner, especially in the case of the student with poor auditory discrimination who, as a result of not having

the written word to back up the spoken word, becomes frustrated and develops an aversion to the language. Thus, she concludes that the written word can be used to advantage, but that there is no question of its interference-producing potential. According to Rivers, to reduce interference means that the student in the early stages of language instruction should not be allowed to read material which he has not previously pronounced or which he is not hearing at the same time which he is reading it silently. With this safeguard it is believed that the written word can have real advantages. It gives the learner something to which he can refer when his aural memory fails him.

In summary, the teacher as he presents the book to the students no longer says, "Let's see how these words are pronounced." Rather he suggests, "Let's see how these sounds are represented in writing." (38, p. 15) It places emphasis upon language in its natural order: speech first and then writing.

Closely associated with reading a foreign language is writing. As in reading, writing a modern language which uses an alphabet different from that of the student's native tongue presents obvious difficulties. But even with a language like Spanish the English-speaking learner is faced with problems of special punctuation symbols, spelling, and word spacing. Bull (17, p. 30) points out, for example, that the student who has learned to pronounce deste must learn that this sound is graphically produced as de este.

Three phases of teaching writing are advocated: the controlled e.g., dictation on material previously practiced orally); the directed (e.g., composition with a series of simple ideas provided by the teacher); and, the free composition. (20, p. 53) (41, pp. 178-183) (81, pp. 178-183)

In summary, the learner in his exposure to the four skills of the beginning language course "is to hear much more than he speaks, he is to speak only on the basis of what he has heard, he is to read only what has been spoken, he is to write only what he has read . . . . ." (13, p. 50)

The final area of discussion belonging to the nature of language and its pedagogical implications is that of culture. Just as language is speech, so is language culture. That is, language is culture, not in the humanistic viewpoint of art, literature and music, but in the anthropological sense in which man expresses through language his relationship to the environment around him. (20, pp. 55-56) (41, pp. 23-31) (63) (81, pp. vii-viii) A basic tenet of professional literature is that one cannot talk about language without referring to culture.

Hall (27) gives a host of examples of how culture is inextricably bound to language. Words (or sounds) have meaning only within their cultural contexts. Therefore, for language to be correctly understood, the common situations in which it operates within the culture must be understood. The uninitiated American who is invited to an 8 PM dinner in Spanish America, for example, follows his own cultural patterns of promptness and arrives on or slightly before the cited hour. He does not understand the cues of the culture which dictate the accepted arrival time to be a few hours later. This is exemplary of the many cultural situations which need to be taught, not only for the sake of the student's linguistic competence but also for his awareness of different cultural values and for his understanding and appreciation of the peoples whose lives are tied to these values.

Politzer (72, p. 127) believes that

> Language is part of culture, perhaps its most central part, because it is largely language that makes the learning and sharing of behavior possible. Being the central part of culture, it is probably also the best key to that culture. Once more, since it operates within a culture, it should be learned within contexts and situations which are part of that culture .... cultural patterns, (for example, the structure of family life, child rearing, attitude toward parents and children, etc., and basic similarities in points of view which reappear in different forms in all of those areas) should ultimately become apparent to the student of the foreign language. Those patterns should receive special attention. Not only is the understanding of Spanish a key to the understanding of Hispanic culture, but the reverse is also true.

Stack (81, p. vii) points out how the "Hurray its Thursday" of the French boy means nothing to an American student whose school holiday is Saturday. Equally puzzled is the American who learns that a week in French or Spanish is referred to as huit jours or ocho dias. He does not recognize that the French and Spanish systems count Monday to Monday--eight days.

Lado (41, p. 152) shows that the Spanish word desayuno describes something quite different than does the American word breakfast. Likewise, "vino in Spain and wine in the United States have a different function and a different connotation."

Perhaps the most obvious example of the relation between language and culture is the idiom. Every foreign language student sooner or later realizes the futility of trying to translate idioms word for word from one language to another. Belyayev (10, p. 51), in this regard, believes

> . . . all concepts and all human thought arise from one's experience and practical life. It would be a miracle if different peoples, who have such widely different living conditions, were to think with the aid of a system of completely identical concepts. It follows that the psychological characteristics of thinking in one's native language and in a foreign language cannot be identical.

Teaching a student how a native speaker thinks in his own language, therefore, is considered an absolute necessity in language instruction. Even in the learning of individual words one should adhere to this concept. Belyayev (10, p. 66) states that "to try to combine thinking in the native language with the use of foreign words is to attempt the impossible, since such a combination is contrary to nature and therefore under no circumstances attainable." Memorizing words in vocabulary lists, therefore, is believed to be irrational, for words have meaning only in context with other words, not in isolation. A given word in one context may have an entirely different meaning in another. For example the word time may be expressed in a number of different ways in Spanish, depending on the context in which it is used, e.g., tiempo, hora, vez, plazo, divertirse, en punto, de vez en cuando. Politzer (72, pp. 115-126) cites a number of examples on this phenomenon.

Osgood (66, pp. 725-726) refers to different kinds of contexts which are inherent in language communication. In addition to the context of words and their interrelationship with each other contexts of attitudes, gestures, facial expressions, and emotional states affect meaning.

Carroll (19, pp. 1085-1087) illustrates the phenomena of culture in language through the concept of bilingualism. He points out two different kinds of bilingual systems: a compound system, which is possessed by a person who "learns two languages in the same context, or who learns a new language through the medium of another (usually his native language)" and a coordinate system, which is possessed by a person whose second language learning has been done in a context completely separate from that of his first language. It is expected that the

bilingual individual who has learned his two languages through a compound system has learned "two different ways of encoding the same set of referential meanings." On the other hand, it is expected that bilingualism learned through a coordinate system makes "the referential meanings encoded in the two languages differ to a considerable extent." This individual uses both languages in their respective semantic contexts.

The nature of language in its linguistic sense of a coordinate system as well as in its anthropological sense of a culture-bound set of symbols holds weighty implications for the structuring of a teaching methodology. If language is speech, then oral behavior is believed to deserve prime attention. Likewise, if language is culture, it is to be taught, and can only be truly taught, in allusion to the culture which controls the expression system of the native speaker. (77)

These thoughts offer the modern foreign language profession a rationale for planning its teaching methodology. From them proceed the concept of habit formation as the major device for attainment of automaticity and development of skill.

Habit Formation and Language Skill

Charges have been made that Americans are not able to learn foreign languages. With tongue in cheek leading professionals agree with this indictment. They believe that because of the way languages have been taught in the United States few persons indeed could learn them. Gaarder (24) points out that students have taken foreign language courses, have done their assignments, have earned good grades, but yet have not learned foreign languages.

The problem is believed to be related to a misunderstanding of what

modern foreign language learning is. Teachers have tended to talk about the language, and in English on top of it, rather than to consider language acquisition as a skill which requires practice and overlearning. Because it is a skill and not a body of content, it is believed that its methodology should be differentiated from that used with subject matters requiring problem solving techniques. (24) (30) (31) (57) Language, consequently, is not to be looked upon as something one learns, as in learning to solve problems, but rather as something one learns to do. Learning to play a musical instrument is considered analogous, for it is a skill which requires practice for learning. The more one talks about piano playing, for example, instead of actually practicing the instrument the longer it will take him to learn to play it. (24)

Teaching about the language is considered tempting because of its ease to carry out. It requires little linguistic competence on the part of the teacher. (28, p. 255) Such a teacher characteristic is believed to fit in well with a grammar approach which emphasizes memorization of grammatical rules with little or no facilitation for practical use. It is treating living languages as dead languages. Halliday (28, p. 254) points out that emphasis on grammar "turns a 'skill' subject into a 'content' subject, one in which the teacher can teach facts instead of imparting skills."

A new approach is needed, one which gives a working command of foreign languages and an understanding and appreciation of the cultural phenomena behind them. This does not suggest that there exists a miracle method. Foreign language learning will always be hard work requiring much time and effort on the part of the learner. It does suggest, however, a reorientation in thinking of what language learning is--

a habit formation process which requires drill, drill, drill.

> In our customary thinking about language, we tend to concentrate on our conscious, voluntary use of it, and to forget the immense proportion of unconscious, habitually determined action that is called into play every time we listen or speak, read or write. Linguistics, by analyzing the totality of our language behavior, makes us aware of its habitual nature. To achieve real mastery of a language, a mere knowledge of its rules is not enough, nor should rules come before habits; we must practice, practice, and then again practice every pattern of the language, until the habits of the language have become second nature to us. (62, p. 6)

This concept existed at least as far back as the 1940's. Bloomfield (11, p. 12) understood it when he said "the command of a language is not a matter of knowledge; the speakers are quite unable to describe the habits which make up their language. The command of a language is a matter of practice."

Description of drills. To facilitate language acquisition in this manner, drills based on a scientific analysis of the basic composition of a given language came into being. Developed in the late forties and early fifties largely by J. Donald Bowen and Robert Stockwell the drills were named pattern drills. (32, p. 33) They are formed out of the basic structural elements of a language and involve "a series of stimuli (problems) and responses (answers) in which there is a consistent relationship between stimulus and response over a series of about eight items. The word pattern implies that there will be several items all of the same type." (81, p. 114)

The most common structuring of the pattern drill involves four phases: stimulus by teacher; response by student; repetition of response by teacher; repetition of response by student. In learning the Spanish direct object and its position in a sentence, for example, a student might follow a four-phase drill as follows: Yo veo el coche; yo

lo veo; yo lo veo; yo lo veo. Before being presented with a new grammatical feature he would practice the direct object a number of times, only with a substitute noun in the masculine gender for coche. This would be followed by practice with feminine as well as plural forms of the direct object.

Inherent in this procedure is the psychological principle of providing for a response to be emitted and to be subsequently reinforced. (77, pp. 38-39) Stack (81, pp. 115-116) explains the particular advantages of the four-phase drill:

> It requires creative thinking on the part of the student, rather than ordinary mimicry, because, the stimulus (phase 1) cannot merely be repeated; it also requires action. This puts the exchange on the basis of context conversational style in most cases. The drill is self-correcting; that is, the student is enabled to compare his initial response (phase 2) with the correct native response (phase 3). Any error will result in a striking contrast. The student repeats the correct answer in phase 4 in any case. It provides further practice in correct structure and pronunciation.

Experiments in psychology have shown that if a subject receives information on the results of his performance he will more greatly approximate the desired behavior. (40) (77) The four-phase drill which provides a model for the student to imitate and then another model to which he can compare his response is believed to meet these requirements. (77)

Politzer (72, p. 13) believes that "the real skill of the teacher lies not in correcting and punishing wrong responses but in creating situations in which the student is induced to respond correctly." The drill approach (especially the four-phase drill), with its provision for low probability of error by minimizing the possibility of incorrect responses, is consistent with this theory. Rivers (77, p. 61) suggests a number of pattern drill techniques which lend themselves to low probability of error, including drills and exercises in which small but very

evident changes are made, question-and-answer procedures in which the student is to respond by repeating most of the material contained in the question, and the use of memorized dialogues in recreating everyday situations.

Perhaps the most fundamental psychological basis for the concept of pattern drills stems from observation of young children as they manipulate their native language. Children become quickly aware of basic structures peculiar to their language by observing the forms which tend to recur over and over again. Hence, it is not uncommon for a child to misapply an oft-occuring pattern to a situation which requires a different structure. The English-speaking child does just this when he learns the pattern ed to represent past tense, as in showed, and then applies it to an irregular verb to produce goed. The same tendency is seen in the fixing of the morphemic pattern s to form plurals, as in the regular pattern arms and the incorrect carry-over foots. This is believed to apply to the learning of a second language in the sense that recurring structural elements of the target language can be learned in the initial stages of language study and thus enable the student to employ the learned patterns in other situations. Carroll (19, p. 1073) cites studies which demonstrate that language learners tend to follow such analogic patterns in their use of the language. Politzer (72) has devoted an entire book to this phenomenon.

Learning a foreign language by patterns is not looked upon as a pedagogical invention which will experience the fate of many short-lived methods schemes. Morton (57) points out that practically all of language involve pattern learning or conditioned response. Verb conjugations, and adverbs all fit into the patterned-response category. Thus,

grammar, so much abused by the traditionalist, is to be taught inductively through systematic organization and presentation of language patterns. Stack (80, p. 76) explains that

> Inductive teaching requires that the teacher organize evidence systematically in such a way that the student may compare a new feature with a known one. Such teaching usually occupies class-time preceding an intensive practice session in the language laboratory. A new grammatical feature is first taught inductively, explained, and tried in class with pattern drills. The class next meets in the laboratory for drilling on the new feature, so that linguistic habits will be ingrained through repetitive practice.

Brooks (13, p. 49) states, ". . . a student learns grammar . . . by familiarizing himself with structural patterns from which he can generalize, applying them to whatever linguistic needs he may have in the future." Politzer (72, pp. 72-114) gives lengthy instruction on identification of Spanish morphemes, i.e., their similarity and differences, and the most desirable way for them "to be hammered home in appropriate pattern drills."

Because of the emphasis on language structures in beginning stages of study, vocabulary learning is held to a minimum so as not to complicate learning the structures. (72, p. 155) (41, p. 52) (65, p. 14) (13, p. 224) Enough vocabulary is presented only "to make the structures work . . . ." (72, p. 127) Presentation of vocabulary is increased as basic structures are learned. This provides for use of learned patterns in several contextual situations. Politzer (72, pp. 115-127) gives several pages over to how this is done in the Spanish language.

A basic classroom procedure recommended for pattern-drill practice is that of oral modeling of a structure by the teacher followed by choral response by the entire class. The argument for this choral practice is its provision for all members of the class to practice the language

during the entire drill period. Individuals are singled out only for spot checking of correct responses and for personal stimulation toward active participation. (12) (65) (77, p. 61) (81, p. 147) Through this approach all students actually practice the language by speaking it throughout the entire drill period, whereas in the conventional classroom, which is centered around teacher-individual student practice, students are fortunate if they get in a minute of oral practice.

Another aspect of the habit-formation process which is somewhat different from that of pattern drills is dialogue memorization. It stems from the need for authentic use of the language at an early stage of learning rather than on the practice of structures which may not represent complete thoughts. Involving the memorization of brief conversations on everyday real-life situations, dialogue learning is believed to be the best way to break into the foreign language. Dialogues are carried out between the teacher and the class, the teacher and an individual student, two students, or chorally between two groups of students (e.g., one half of the class speaking to the other half of the class. (65) (81, pp. 155-156) (77, pp. 16-17)

The dialogue as a learning device is looked upon with favor because of its motivational value. It involves the basic items for communication centering around direct address, it encourages the student to be personally interested in what he is saying (assuming appropriate material is used), and it holds a dramatic potential which can be exploited. (13, p. 141-142)

Problems of drills. Non-judicious use of drill and dialogue memorization as teaching devices can lead to many problems. The biggest danger is believed to be student fatigue and boredom which result in

loss of attention. (77, p. 39) When one introduces drill he is cautioned to limit its length in relation to the students' span of attention. Almost invariably, studies related to drill have shown that distributed practice renders the best results. (40, p. 375) Various activities interwoven with drill sessions, therefore, are recommended to make the classroom experience as interesting as possible. Rivers (77, p. 58) points out that variation

> . . . may not theoretically be as efficient as drills and memorization, but the gain in maintaining students' enthusiasm and personal enjoyment will lead to greater attainment as students work with a will at the more tedious aspects of the subject.

Belyayev (10, p. 4) refers to two types of attention, voluntary and involuntary. The teacher is to strive for voluntary attention on the part of the student, but since a conscious attitude toward the material is not possible for long periods of time he must make use of involuntary attention attractors, such as visual aids and modulation of the teacher's voice in speed and in pitch. Kingsley and Garry (40, p. 380) suggest that variation of work improves retention.

Criticism of drills. Criticism leveled at pattern drills and dialogue memorization stem primarily from the idea that these activities represent the sum of what goes on in the classroom without any instruction devoted to grammar at all. (21) (29) (9) Obviously, a classroom so constituted could lead students into mere parroting of their foreign language model without understanding the meaning of what they say. Limited understanding of the structural approach tempts one to argue for decreased emphasis on speech and increased emphasis on grammar analysis. (9) Rivers (77) believes such thinking can be avoided if one understands language learning in the context of two levels: a mechanical or

manipulatory level, acquired through drill; and, a level of communication, acquired through practice in true conversational situations. In the initial stage of coming-to-grips with the new expression system the student needs to accept the language for what it is and not to analyze it in terms of his native language. With pattern drills, a simple explanation by the teacher of the meaning of the particular item being learned is considered sufficient to satisfy the student's need for knowing what he is doing. After the student has learned the item through adequate drill, he can be given opportunity to apply it to several different conversational situations, which give him "the pleasure of using the language to make himself understood in communication." (77, p. 35) Without a foundation on the mechanical level, however, the student has no material from which to draw for producing his utterance. Hartsook (30) shows that lack of foundation on the mechanical level forces the student to think in his native language and then to translate into the target language. If the student is asked a question in the target language, he translates the question into the native language, thinks his reply in the native language, and translates the reply into the target language. This approach is obviously time-consuming and furthermore violates the phenomena of imbedded cultural meanings.

Barrutia (9, p. 445) believes that some criticize the linguistic or structural approach because "they simply have not been made aware of the many advances in the field . . . . They resist mainly because of an inability to change basic concepts and techniques, which have become a part of their professional beings."

The goal of drills. Although drill on language patterns as well as memorization of dialogues are believed to form a solid foundation in

giving the learner a feel for the language, they do not constitute the whole of language learning. Rather than being ends in themselves they lead to the ultimate goal of acquisition of skill in language usage. (72, p. 26) Habit-formation procedures, therefore, are to be viewed as a tool for the development of skill. A student is considered to have acquired skill in the language when he can use the language by thinking in it. (10, p. 39) Teaching a student to acquire language skill, therefore, is inseparable from teaching him to think in the language. That is, he must be helped to acquire an ability to think his own thoughts within the structural framework peculiar to the language. (63) (10) (20) (41) (72) When he has learned to do this without native language influences he can say that he has acquired second-language skill.

It follows, then, that the classroom environment should be such as to facilitate the process of learning to think in the foreign language. That the foreign language be the dominating tongue in the classroom is judged essential. (65, p. 7) (24) (13, pp. 180-181) (81, p. 138) Care has been given not to endorse total use of the foreign language out of recognition that it often requires the teacher to artificially circumvent the native language through motions, objects, pictures, and the like. Besides bordering on a circus performance this practice is deemed undesirable because it falsely assumes that the adult student must learn a foreign language in the exact same way a child learns his native language. The adult has already acquired the concepts behind the second-language terms and therefore simply needs to be told the new verbal symbols of these concepts. Circumventing the native language by the teacher through ridiculous motions and other inventions to get across meaning is believed unnecessary. (4) In one of its official statements

the Modern Language Association (55, p. 165) recommends that the target language dominate the classroom, but also that when a word in the native language can clarify a point of instruction and be more time-saving than a lengthy paraphrase in the target language, the native language might well be employed. Brooks (13, pp. 180-181), as well as Politzer and Staubach (72, p. 23), give a similar view.

How fast the teacher should speak the foreign language in the classroom is another concern. Speaking the language at the normal speed of the native speaker causes the student to react negatively because he hears a blurred mass of sound rather than individual words which he wants to hear. On the other hand, the teacher who responds to this situation by reducing the speed of his speech is believed to be giving the student an erroneous introduction to the foreign language. "What results is usually a series of citation forms which have no speech unity, no natural intonation contours, and, frequently, no intonational clues to meaning." (17, p. 82) Rivers (77, p. 201) offers an answer to the dilema in her definition of what constitutes normal speed.

> Normal speed does not mean rapid native speech, but a speed of delivery which would not appear to a native speaker to be unduly labored - a speed which retains normal word groupings, elisions, liaisons, consonant assimilations, natural rhythm and intonation.

Use of the foreign language in the literature course. The foreign literature course likewise does not escape questioning in regard to foreign language usage. Just as the dominance of the foreign language is deemed important in the language course proper, so is it considered for the foreign literature course. (56) (13, p. 98) (41, pp. 141-142) In a conference of the Modern Language Association, convened for making recommendation on training college teachers of foreign languages,

scholars and teachers went on record that

> . . . the concept of the unitary nature of the work of art, so easily lost sight of when the work is the product of another culture, can be more consistently realized and better preserved if the work is treated in the context of its own language. The Conference therefore urged that all upper-division courses in literature be given in the foreign language. It noted also that disappointment and dissatisfaction with the use of English in advanced foreign-language courses has often been a large factor in the loss of prospective foreign-language majors. (47, p. 33)

Likewise the National Education Association (59, p. 35) in its concern for proper training of prospective teachers of modern foreign languages, holds that the student "has the right to expect that his college courses in language, literature, and culture will be conducted in the foreign language."

Brooks (13, pp. 100-101) minces no words on the literature course.

> For a wholesale reversion to English at this point is not only an inglorious admission of defeat on the part of the teacher but a betrayal of the very principles upon which the study of contemporary language is founded. Psychologically, it is the re-establishment of a compound system in the learner's head, a short-circuiting of the bilingual process which the student has been at pains to develop. In a word, it is effectively, even though inadvertently, disloyal.

A dissenting voice is heard in Owen (68, p. 239) who believes that

> . . . the student's level of comprehension is in no sense adequate. On the one hand, all of the stimulating and persuasive resources of a fine lecturer are needed to infuse what is essentially a problem of aesthetics with the passion and conviction required to gain converts. Wit, subtlety, the dramatic, and an apt and colorful vocabulary embracing the mores of several centuries are needed. Yet facing him is a benighted student audience with little more than a moronic grasp of the language, straining to understand names and dates let alone the main theme of the lecture. Given on this level such a course puts an intolerable restraint upon the professor who is perforce reduced to the most basic recital of simple biographic data, commonplace observations on history and thought, and a constant "talking down" which devastate the cause of literature.

There is no doubt that the language proficiency the student has acquired through lower division instruction will affect the linguistic tone of the literature course. This emphasizes the need for excellence in programming the foundation courses in the language, and then coordinating them with other courses in the department's curriculum. It is believed that if the beginning language courses are properly taught, the student should have little difficulty understanding lectures in the foreign language when he enters the upper-division courses in literature. Around such thinking are the recommendations of the Modern Language Association (47) centered. The Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (61), in fact, recommends that students not be permitted to enroll in literature courses unless they demonstrate "functional control" of the language.

Finally, one cannot talk about language and teaching techniques without mentioning their relation to a program of testing. Consistent with the theory of student immersion in the language in the classroom is the recommendation for testing which employs the foreign language without native-language influences. Through this kind of evaluation, it is believed, the student continues his learned pattern of thinking in the foreign language and is thus appropriately examined on course objectives. Testing which makes the student revert to his native language either in its questions or in its requirement for answers is believed to contradict basic theory on the nature of language as a coordinate system. (81, p. 190) (13, p. 191) Lado (42) felt so concerned about this subject that he devoted an entire book on proper test construction.

In addition to knowing how to test is knowing what to test. Again, consistency with the language skills taught and the varying degrees of

emphasis which they receive in the course is considered important. If learning to speak and understand the language are primary goals, then aural-oral testing would be complementary. On the other hand, emphasizing reading and writing on tests is looked upon as defeating the objectives of the audio-lingual course.

> If we are to teach students to speak and understand the language, we must be prepared to examine them on those skills periodically. Students will never learn to speak if they know the final examinations will test nothing but their ability to write. (24, p. 34)

This does not mean that there is no place for written tests. What is argued for is that the nature of tests be true to course objectives.

The literature investigated clearly indicates that if habit formation and language skill are to be facilitated the foreign language must dominate the classroom. This means that the target language should be consistently employed in all instructional techniques, whether they be drill or examination sessions.

The language laboratory plays an important role in this kind of instructional program. Its function is described in the following section.

The Language Laboratory

The language laboratory, a system of varying kinds of electronic equipment, is found today in thousands of American colleges and universities. Locke (44) reports that in 1965, twelve thousand or more language laboratories existed in institutions of higher learning.

Although audio equipment in teaching modern foreign languages dates back as far as 1904, when an Edison cylinder was used in teaching a French course at Yale University, it made its greatest advances in the

1940's, when recording equipment developed from the mirophone to the wire recorder and finally to the more sophisticated magnetic tape recorder. (32)

Language laboratories today center around the magnetic tape recorder. The student receives the taped program through headphones. If program source and headphones constitute the sum of the basic electronic equipment the student is limited to a passive role in that he can listen only. Provision for speaking is made by adding a microphone which carries the student's voice into his headphones and allows the student to hear what he says. Further sophistication can be given to the laboratory by providing the student with a recorder which he can use to record his voice and to play it back for comparison with the voice on the master program.

Holton (33), Gaudin (26), Stack (81) and others regard the recorder highly. Locke (45) looks upon it as an absolute necessity, because when one simultaneously listens as he speaks he does not hear his true sound production. Locke believes that when one speaks he hears his voice differently than others hear it. This accounts for one's surprise when he hears his recorded voice for the first time. He is amazed that his voice sounds "so different." This phenomenon is due to "the transmission of sound from the resonance cavities of the mouth through the bones and tissues of the head to the inner ear. . . . Bone conduction affects every sound heard by the student as he speaks." (45, p. 278) When we talk, we get two simultaneous images in our inner ear, one through the head and the other from our lips through the air. A double exposure results. Through a recorder, however, the sound heard is largely that which the machine produces and transmits through the air. (45)

Another argument for the recorder is that one improves his pronunciation by steps.

> You hear the model and you hear your own imitation. You estimate the difference. You try again and narrow the gap, each time setting your sights higher, so to speak. In time the individual reaches a plateau, his natural limit at the moment. This may be raised by further practice over a period of time up to another plateau which seems the best he can do unaided. (44, p. 300)

Two kinds of systems are possible with individual student recorders, the group study and the library study. With the former, the student must listen to the program as it is controlled by a master system. In the library-study approach the student is given his own tape to play in his student position. The tape has the master program on one track to which the student listens, and a blank area on the other track on which the student records his response during the pauses provided. Thus he is able to control the lesson to the extent that he can stop it at any time for review. If he makes an error in his answer he can stop the machine and record again his answer. As he does this the old recording is automatically erased. When another student uses the same tape later on his recordings erase those of the student who used the tape before him. The master lesson on the other track remains unaffected.

A library-type laboratory is believed to be advantageous because it allows students to learn at their own pace, according to their own ability. (31) (81, p. 9) (90) Walsh (90) goes a step further. He would have the laboratory treated like the university library by keeping it open twelve to fifteen hours a day and letting the students go in at their free time. He believes this to be important because the laboratory, where some students are fast listeners and some are slow listeners, is analogous to the university library, where students vary in reading

speed and may frequent as often and as long as they want.

Some questions about student recording cannot be overlooked. As the beginning student practices the language with a recorder, for example, is he capable of recognizing and correcting his errors? And as he listens to his own responses, does he negatively reinforce himself through his less-than-native pronunciation? Furthermore, could the extra time used in playback be used more effectively in additional aural-oral practice without recording?

Studies on the effectiveness of individual student recorders on language learning have been inconclusive. For example, one study compared proficiency of students having practiced with only activated headphones. In the French language group students with recorders outperformed on all tests those who used only listening equipment. In the German and Spanish groups students with recording equipment were superior on the speaking tests, but not on the reading and writing tests. (3) Another study, however, showed no significant advantages to having student recording equipment. (32, pp. 63-64)

No matter what type of laboratory is used, some type of student station must be provided. Most popular is the individual booth, designed for visual privacy, superior, acoustical effect, and noise cancellation from other students. (31) (48) (32) (81) Hayes (31) believes that because of undesirable psychological effects caused by conspicuousness the student needs to be isolated as he practices the strange and bizarre sounds of a foreign language. For Brooks (13, p. 150), on the other hand, earphones (headphones) provide the best means of isolating the student. Rather than spend money on the booth, whose "cost is usually all out of proportion to its worth," he would purchase good quality earphones.

Another questionable piece of equipment is that for providing monitoring of students who perform in the laboratory. With this equipment the teacher can listen to students as well as communicate with them individually or as a group. (81) (31) (32) (48) This can be an aid to the student, especially in pronunciation, but it is a difficult task indeed in the college laboratory where professors seldom frequent. Nevertheless, Rivers (77, p. 53) believes monitoring to be an absolute necessity if we are to take seriously the importance of Skinner's theory of successive approximation. ". . .otherwise unmonitored students will be reinforcing the sound they make with the satisfaction of accomplishment long before they have reached an acceptable approximation of the native-language sound." However, tests on monitoring versus non-monitoring do not back this idea. The Associated Colleges of the Midwest (3, pp. 149-150), in evaluating its experiment on monitoring, concluded as follows:

> Until more extensive and carefully controlled studies do undermine the hypothesis [null] it is appropriate to doubt whether it is worthwhile to install equipment that is to be used solely for monitoring and to use any substantial amount of the time of faculty members in this way.

The opinion of faculty members who participated as instructors in the experiment was that after anywhere from fifty to two hundred repetitions in pronunciation a student learns to correct himself without the intervention of a monitor. They also believed that

> . . .gains from intervention did not compensate for the time taken away from the more meaningful repetition and drill, and the practice was in fact counter-productive in terms of the distraction and the increased tension induced in the student. (3, pp. 140-141)

More important than the equipment of the laboratory is believed to be the program which the equipment transmits. Parker (69, p. 9) shows

that thousands of dollars can be spent on a new language laboratory, but its effectiveness depends upon "the programmed material being fed into it." A laboratory using taped material which is unrelated to that used in the classroom is viewed as limited in effectiveness and likely to frustrate the student listeners to the point of aversion to the laboratory. The Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (60, p. 54) strongly asserts that "laboratory work must be fully integrated with classroom work." Brooks (13, p. 152) charges that without "integration between laboratory and classroom the investment in equipment is largely wasted."

After integration of laboratory and classroom material the next step is to decide on the order of presentation of material. Should the material first be presented in the classroom or in the laboratory? Stack (81, p. 84) believes "it is impractical to expect the student to learn new principles in the laboratory unless rigorously complete and carefully tested programmed materials are available for full self-instruction." Likewise the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (60, p. 54) holds that "the laboratory should under no circumstances introduce new materials . . . ." In other words it is more practical to use the laboratory to reinforce and help make automatic material already presented in the classroom. On the other hand, there can be motivational value to be taken advantage of by using the laboratory first. Going to class without first having gone to the laboratory would be a waste of the student's time. (32, p. 90)

Duration of each lesson of the taped program must also be considered for maximum effectiveness of the laboratory. Limiting drill to about 20 minutes is believed to render the best results. (31, p. 20)

(33, p. 20) (38, pp. 24-26) (41, p. 190) Longer drill periods tend to lead to student fatigue and diminishing returns.

In view of the emphasis which the laboratory commands as an aid to language instruction today, it is believed senseless to overlook its place in the testing program. Utmost importance is attributed to the use of material from the laboratory tapes in examinations. (5, p. 51) (32, p. 91) (42) (81, pp. 190-194) It is believed appropriate that students expect the material which they have drilled on in the laboratory to appear in examinations. When testing has nothing to do with laboratory material, students cannot be expected to look at laboratory work with any great enthusiasm.

The second function recommended for the laboratory in the testing program is its testing oral achievement. (32) (35) (42) (81) Individual student recorders are needed to make this possible. Students tape their oral responses to questions on the master program and then hand their tapes over to the professor for grading. Admittedly, listening to a stack of tapes is no little chore for the professor, but oral testing of students in a group rather than individually may be a great enough gain to warrant its use. At any rate oral testing is consistent with goals for acquisition of oral skill. A foreign language program which on one hand emphasizes oral skill and then does its testing through the written word is believed to be contradictory. (35) (42)

Another role attributed to the laboratory is to complement courses which go beyond those of lower division instruction. Students in advanced language courses can practice in the laboratory with advanced-level exercises as well as listen to speeches and other oral language presentation which help perfect language proficiency. (34) Likewise

students in literature courses can complement their classroom material by listening to plays and poetry in the laboratory. (26) (34) (44) By this means they are able to hear oral presentation of the drama and poetry being studied, for which this type of literature was written in the first place. Walsh (90, p. 84) believes that "to read a work of literature without any idea of what it sounded like to the writer is to be as handicapped as the tone-deaf listening to music or the colour-blind looking at a painting."

Up to now the discussion has been limited to the aural-oral aspects of the laboratory. Is there a part to be played by the visual? Holton (33, p. 119) thinks there is. "It would be highly desirable to see an overhead projector in every laboratory . . . ." he states. However, he fails to explain how he would integrate this visual aid with the laboratory. Claudel (21) criticizes laboratories which do not provide the visual element. Comparing students with young children who learn their native language from their mothers, he contends that language is learned in a meaningful way primarily through visual elements.

Administration of the laboratory is another concern in laboratory operation. The appointment of a laboratory director is believed necessary for this purpose. The director may be given responsibility for selection, operation, and maintenance of equipment, supervision of student assistants, making of policy decisions on the day-to-day use of the laboratory, and coordination of program materials employed in the laboratory for each language course. If the director is to be primarily an electronics expert, uninvolved in the academic aspects of the language program, he may well be hired in a purely staff position. However, if he is to be directly concerned with the academic functioning of the

laboratory, that is, to coordinate the integration of laboratory material with the total foreign language program, he should obviously be a member of the foreign language faculty. If the latter is the case, a reduced teaching load in proportion to laboratory duties is accepted as reasonable. (33, p. 17) (81, p. 66) (86)

In summary, the language laboratory has been accepted as a permanent part of foreign language instruction. It has been recognized as the tireless drill master which provides opportunity for additional practice with the language and which helps instill automatic speech habits. Through the taped programs students experience an ideal situation in hearing native speakers in a variety of voices through high fidelity sound production. Furthermore, the student is provided with several psychological advantages: he speaks without inhibitions as he practices alone in his booth; he is positively reinforced as he responds to the carefully designed master program which elicits correct responses and immediately confirms their correctness; and, if he is equipped with a recorder, he practices in accordance with his individual needs and advances at his own pace. Today's students of modern foreign languages are believed to have through the medium of the language laboratory an invaluable aid for the acquisition of a foreign language. (30) (31) (38) Stack (81), Marty (48), and Hocking (32) have contributed whole books on this subject.

Program Organization

Program organization is defined here as program composition, which includes courses of instruction, special enrichment programs, and certain policy practices which affect the student's foreign language study.

Placement Exams

Before a student enrolls in a foreign language course, some estimate of his language proficiency is considered essential to determine his readiness for the course. (64, p. 109) (56) A major question is whether the student who has studied one year of a foreign language in high school is to be permitted to start over again in a beginning course in college. If not, how should his placement be determined? His high school grades, his conversation with the department head in the foreign language, and his one year of foreign language study in high school being equated with one semester of foreign language study in college represent common ways of determining placement. These procedures can be invalidated by some commonly-occuring situations. Jones (39) shows that the student may have had a poor teacher in high school and thus may not have learned as much as would be expected under competent instruction. Or he may not have studied the foreign language since his sophomore year and consequently may have forgotten a great deal of the language in the intervening years.

The placement exam avoids hit or miss procedures. It may give a more reliable estimate on where the student with high school credits should be placed. (64) In his study for the Modern Language Association Andersson (2) suggests that placement be made on the basis of the student's score as it compares with those of college students who have finished a certain semester of college study. The student's college program in foreign languages should start at that point.

The MLA Cooperative Foreign Language Tests, which measure all four language skills, are a highly publicized set of instruments for use in placement.

Courses of Instruction

For the improvement of lower division language instruction two types of courses have been suggested: the intensive course, covering a major block of time each day; and, the programmed or teaching machine course.

The intensive course was developed during World War II when Armed Forces Personnel needed to be taught modern foreign languages within a short period of time. This type of instruction was characterized by a classroom methodology which emphasized aural-oral training centering around drill, an eight-hour working day in the classroom, and out-of-class practice with native informants. This provided for total immersion in the foreign language leading to aural-oral proficiency in the language. (73) Wilson (91) believes that studying a modern foreign language in college is unrealistic if it does not provide for this type of intensive instruction and immersion. He fears that audio-lingual methodology is being used as a substitute for, rather than as an element of, intensive training.

The Association of Assistant Masters (36, p. 21) in England believes that language study which fails to give the student a command of the language is a waste of time.

> There are some subjects of study in which a little knowledge is better than nothing: geography, music, and botany are diffidently suggested as examples. There are others where a little knowledge is very dangerous: medicine and surgery. There are yet others in the middle position, where a smattering is futile: such are Modern Languages.

Gaarder (25) believes college language courses today are unrealistic in character in their insistence upon teaching within the time framework of other college courses. He recognizes the impracticality of

trying to structure the college course in modern foreign languages after that of the Army Language School, but he feels there is need for structure which provides the same 690 contact hours (as in the Army Language School) in three semesters of college study. He believes this can be accomplished through a five-hour per week course, but using as contact time the two hours per class which the student normally uses for study. This would provide fifteen hours of contact work per week, or 810 contact hours over a period of three 18-week semesters. The structure of the fifteen hour per week schedule would include:

> a) 13 hours of completely individualized study and drill with electromechanical language learning equipment; b) 1 hour per week of explication in English to facilitate analysis by the student (this in large groups of a hundred or more students); c) 2 half-hour quasi-private sessions with the instructor meeting with either two or three students at a time. (25, p. 171)

Strevens (84, p. 39) holds that "the greater the intensity of teaching, the more effective and rapid the learning. Maximum intensity should always be sought for adults. . . ." He states that "one important aspect of intensive teaching is that it offers many fewer opportunities for forgetting."

Programmed instruction differs from the intensive course in being centered around a machine and in emphasizing learning through small sequential steps at one's own rate of speed. The subject matter is broken down into simple concepts which lead to more difficult ones. Morton (57, p. 3) explains that

> Once the student has indicated he understands this initial piece of information, the machine presents him with a problem based on it. The problem may be in the form of a completion response statement in which the student fills in the blank, or a multiple choice question in which the student must select one answer from several. The question or problem is stated in such a way as to suggest (through any number of means) <u>what the right answer should be</u>.

> (A problem which the student cannot answer correctly on the first try is, by definition, a poor problem). Next, the machine exposes to the student the correct answer or tells him that his choice of answers was right or wrong. Thus the student is immediately reinforced (that is, rewarded) by the knowledge that he has been right, or he is shown immediately that he was wrong. He then proceeds to the next question and follows the same procedure. Once he has completed a certain number of problems. . . he begins again. Now, only the problems he failed to answer correctly on the first try are presented. He will continue until he has answered all correctly.

An important advantage of programmed instruction is that the student cannot finish the program and not know the material. The student is assured of success in the course. He knows the material simply because he has finished the course. (32, p. 107)

Another advantage is believed to be the impersonality of the machine.

> The machine makes no compromise, gives no grades for "effort," and in fact removes the very subject of grades. Sooner or later the student completes the course, and that's that. By definition, he knows the course or he could not have completed it. Meanwhile he may rage at the machine or himself; he may shut it off and go fishing; but it always waits for him, as ineluctable as death and taxes. Trying to beat the machine is like cheating at solitaire. (32, p. 107)

In this regard, however, it is interesting to note that after a trial of one year of programmed instruction at Hollins College, it was learned that the absence of a professor was a distinct disadvantage. Pure mechanical programming had drawbacks in teaching pronunciation and in lack of opportunity for free student expression. Furthermore, the machine, in spite of its reinforcing qualities, did not provide high motivation, it spent too much time in noting errors, and it led students to feel a need for supplementary material. (18) Hocking (32, pp. 105-106) considers the ideal programmed instruction to include a professor. The machine would have the burden of presenting the fundamentals of the

language, but the professor would make a unique contribution by helping the learner whenever he was needed.

Beyond lower-division instruction several courses are considered basic to a sound program of modern foreign languages. Moulton (58) believes much of language teaching today is done by improvisation and intuition rather than with the aid of a comprehensive theory on which to base daily teaching practices. He considers the field of linquistics to hold the key to such a theory.

In an official statement on teacher education programs the Modern Language Association (56) listed study in linquistics to be important for every future teacher of modern foreign languages. In a statement on qualifications for secondary-school teachers of modern foreign languages it set down the following standards in relation to knowlege of linquistics:

> Minimal - A working command of the sound patterns and grammar patterns of the foreign language, and a knowlege of its main differences from English.
> Good - A basic knowledge of the historical development and present characteristics of the language, and an awareness of the difference between the language as spoken and as written.
> Superior - Ability to apply knowledge of descriptive, comparative, and historical linquistics to the language-teaching situation. (53, pp. 344-345).

Meras (53) points out that every language teachers' association in the United States endorsed this statement.

Linguistics can aid the teacher by providing: (1) means for scientific analysis of the language he teaches and thus give him an understanding of phonemes, grammar, various meanings embodied in the vocabulary of the language, and of various forms, levels and dialects of the language and when they are used; (2) understanding of the contrasts between the native and the target languages; (3) understanding of the

physiology of sound production for the proper teaching of pronunciation; (4) discernment of the writing system and its relation to the spoken language which it represents; and, (5) insight into the nature of language and its important characteristic of being primarily a means of human communication through the spoken word. (4)

Another subject area believed important for prospective teachers is that of methods in teaching modern foreign languages. The Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (60, p. 27) included among its recommendations that "it is the responsibility of the language department to assure that such a course is offered." This course, offered in the junior or senior year, generally includes instruction on: (1) the nature of language and its relation to objectives of language study; (2) the four skills and the psychological principles involved in their teaching; (3) materials of instruction, including the language laboratory, test preparation and grading, professional relationships with professional organizations and publications; and, (4) practice teaching. (60) (75)

Brooks (15, p. 139) breaks down the content of the methods course to twenty items:

1. How to manipulate the dosage, sequence, and proportion of the four language skills. . .
2. How to model the learnings that are desired
3. How to conduct drill in mimicry and memorization
4. How to make effective use of choral response
5. How to teach structure thru the practice of pattern substitution
6. How to prepare oral questionnaires for class use
7. How to teach vocabulary thru the learning of sentences related to a situation
8. How to compensate for the inadequacies of the textbook
9. How to use English (if any) in the language classroom
10. How to help the pupil prevent English from dominating his consciousness
11. How to devise homework that is not automatically followed by wrong learning

12. How to convey to the pupil the difficult concept that meaning in the second language is supremely independent of meaning in his mother tongue
13. How to reward trials in such a way that learning is maximized
14. How to prepare and coach simultaneous group conversation
15. How to use a language laboratory and to integrate lab activities with work in the classroom
16. How to devise effective instruments for measuring achievement in all four language skills
17. How to establish and maintain a "cultural island"
18. How to create situations for using the language in and out of class
19. How to present literature in the language classroom so that the pupils may feel a sense of reward and accomplishment rather than boredom and dismay
20. How to keep abreast of activities in his field. . . .

Practice teaching, the practical aspect of the methods course, provides the internship necessary for putting learned theory into practice. None deny its pedagogical importance. Even though the student may have been fortunate to learn under a methods teacher who demanded practice with mock classroom situations, he is expected to find the actual school classroom presenting situations which he had not anticipated.

Certain policy considerations enter into practice teaching. Concern has developed over such issues as requirements which should be made of the master teacher with whom the student teacher is to be placed, and who from the college should be responsible for supervising the student teacher. Commenting on the first, Schmitz (79, p. 104) believes that "working with a master teacher, who is well trained in his field, is probably the most valuable part of the practice teaching program. Brooks (14) shares this view. Likewise the National Education Association (59, p. 39) believes "it is absolutely essential that this student teaching be carefully supervised by master teachers who use the new methods of language teaching and who are capable of offering constructive criticism." The Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Language (60) shares this view.

With regard to the college supervisor, Schmitz (79) holds that the ideal supervisor is the professor who conducts the course in foreign language methodology and who thus understands the problems peculiar to foreign language teaching. The Modern Language Association (56) shares this view. Likewise the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (60, p. 28) holds that "throughout the period of practice teaching, the instructor in methods should be responsible "to visit and supervise each student teacher on the job and to arrange evaluation conferences with the student teacher and the critic teacher."

Other areas of instruction recommended, not only for the prospective foreign language teacher but also for students preparing for other pursuits in foreign languages or in other fields, are those classified in the advanced level of undergraduate instruction. These consist of: (1) conversation and composition, a course on the four skills, more sophisticated in nature than those of lower division instruction; (2) culture and civilization, a type of survey course on the country and its people; (3) phonetics, a specialized course in sound production for developing native pronunciation; and, (4) surveys of literature (both peninsular and Spanish American in the case of literature of the Spanish language), a course of broad comprehensive scope designed to familiarize the student with literary genres, major and secondary writers and important movements. (22) (47) (56) (85) Mead (51) recommends that all these courses be taught in the foreign language so that basic language skills already learned may be used and improved.

Study Abroad

Some colleges and universities provide programs of instruction for

their students in foreign countries. These programs, called study abroad, have experienced popularity of such proportion that some institutions have come to offer them merely out of competition with other schools without careful appraisal of their academic purpose. Consequently, academic respectability of study abroad programs have come into question. However, sound programs do exist and are praised for their linguistic as well as humanizing contribution to the developing undergraduate student. (64)

The Modern Language Association (55, p. 165) believes as follows:

> A year's study in a foreign country can both broaden and deepen the education of an American student. Whether this period should be the junior year or a post-graduate year will depend upon the students' background, language preparation, purposes, and field of specialization.

Maza (49), Mead (51), and London (46) all give strong recommendation to a study experience abroad.

For the language major Babridge (7, p. 18) goes so far as to insist that study abroad be a required part of the curriculum.

> Why do we not, in fact, build in study abroad as a component of language majors? Is it, in an education sense, different from laboratory requirements? You say there is no room for it or time for it? What's wrong with summers, or junior years abroad? Or, for that matter, why be outdone by engineers and pharmacists who solve the problem by requiring a fifth year for the first degree? If, in fact, direct exposure to the culture that has spawned the language is important to the mastery of the language . . . . then it is too important to be left to the vagaries of personal inclination, wealth or other accidental forces.

Out-of-class Programs

Because of financial and other personal reasons which may prevent a student from study abroad, some institutions have attempted to substitute the foreign experiences with special out-of-class activities on

the main campus. This has resulted in the practice of: (1) language tables, where a special dining area is facilitated for students to practice their languages with each other at meal times; (2) language houses, where only students of a given foreign language may live and converse together in the target language; and, (3) language clubs, where foreign language students, through programs of a cultural nature, may gain further insight into the people and country of the language they are studying. Orwen (67) believes the language club has its place on the college campus, and if properly organized can grant real benefit to the foreign language learner. With regard to language tables and language houses the Modern Language Association (56) believes the institution should provide such opportunities for reinforcement of the students' classroom learning.

Policy Practices

A popular practice is the use of graduate assistants to teach lower-division courses. It allows the graduate student who is aspiring towards membership in the teaching profession to undergo a practical internship. However, the underlying motive is believed to be not entirely the pedagogical benefits accrued by the graduate assistant but rather the economizing of budget funds by the department and the institution. Stein (82, p. 13) believes that the result of such a move for economy to be sub-standard education. He contends that "it is surely not the function of the foreign language departments to engage in marginal educational practices in order to save the university money."

For reasons of motivation it is believed important to expose the student in the most effective way possible to the new language he is

about to study. Barrutia (8, p. 118) believes

> the first course can cause the worst or the best psychological attitude toward foreign languages. It either motivates the student and starts the chain reaction of aroused interest, which will produce a language scholar, or it produces frustration, boredom, and psychological blocks that may never be overcome.

A group of experienced teachers and scholars convened by the Modern Language Association to make recommendations on teacher preparation, stated:

> freshmen, having not long before put away childish things, are anxious to show their ability to operate on an intellectual plane; yet a modern language must be learned first as a motor skill, a process more attractive to children than to adolescents. The resultant pedagogical problems call for all the resources of skilled and experienced teachers instead of the untrained and inexperienced assistants . . . . (47, p. 32)

When compromise is necessary because of peculiar exigencies of the local situation, the department is encouraged to establish policy practices for instruction and supervision of graduate teaching assistants. Waas (89) recommends enrollment in the department's course in methods of teaching. Likewise he encourages the personal conference in which the teaching performance of the graduate assistant may be periodically discussed. This allows for the graduate assistant to grow in teaching effectiveness through a planned program of instruction and supervision rather than through trial and error procedures at the expense of the student. (89)

Class size is also believed to affect the student's gain in the foreign language course. Obviously, the smaller the class the greater the provision for individual attention. The Modern Language Association (47, p. 32) states that "in the conventional course, experience has shown that satisfactory results can rarely be accomplished with groups

of more than 15. If the lecture-demonstration-drill type of course is used, the number of students in drill sections should not exceed 10." A group of experienced Hispanists who met in May, 1956, to establish criteria for a college textbook in beginning Spanish indicated that a maximum of twenty students should be permitted in a class, but that a maximum of twelve students would allow for greater classroom efficiency. (52) Belyayev (10, p. 5) points out a psychological advantage of the small class: the student realizes his need to keep attentive because of the increased likelihood of being called upon.

A policy practice is also recommended specifically for the foreign language major in regard to the number of languages which he studies simultaneously. Remer (74, p. 4) believes that "a second foreign language should not be added . . . until the sequence of study in the first has been long enough to assure a reasonable control of its structure and sound system." Azarian (6) contends that any second-foreign language whatsoever is inappropriate for the undergraduate student. To really learn a foreign language he believes one must live it both in and out of the classroom. With the many demands of college life this "living the language" is hard enough to do when the study of one foreign language is involved, let alone that of two languages. Thus, he believes that a student who is encouraged to study two languages as a double major or as a major and a minor is doomed to minimum proficiency in either. The Modern Language Association (47, p. 34) however, looks upon simultaneous study of two foreign languages as perfectly acceptable in view of "the improved language-learning techniques now available (which) encourage this practice."

Finally, there exists a policy consideration for the faculty member, that of residence abroad as a prerequisite for appointment. One of the qualifications believed important for the college teacher of foreign languages when he begins his career is "knowledge of the literature and other aspects of the foreign culture and civilization, attained in part by residence in the foreign country." (55, p. 328) The requirement may not be unusual when one considers the responsibility placed upon the professor for linguistic competence as well as extensive understanding of cultural phenomena.

CHAPTER III

ESTABLISHMENT OF CRITERIA

Identification of Program Elements

Professional literature in the modern foreign language field is replete with descriptions of elements for foreign language programs as well as recommendations for their adoption for program improvement. However, the extensiveness of this literature makes its consumption difficult.

No indication was found that any attempt had been made toward pulling together into compact form program ideas of this professional literature. It is believed that if such a synthesis were made it could serve as an important resource, especially for college and university administrators who lack time to investigate personally the mass of material written by foreign language educators but who are responsible for direction of their institutions' modern foreign language programs.

Therefore, an attempt has been made to synthesize program recommendations by means of extracting from the professional literature those program elements which are currently being advanced. Certain program elements are repeatedly endorsed in the literature of the modern foreign language field and suggest through their repeated recommendation their theoretical importance to a program. These components and practices, therefore, were used as a first step in establishing the set of criteria. It should be kept in mind, however, that no claim is being

made of the criteria as being completely exhaustive and therefore absolute and final. The establishing of the set of criteria represents an attempt to compile a list of principal elements to which the literature of the contemporary field gives emphasis. These elements have been described in the review of the literature of the preceding chapter.

Rating of Program Elements

From the synthesis of components and practices which dominated the literature a listing was made to represent important elements currently being advocated for modern foreign language programs on the undergraduate level. It can be assumed that these elements vary in degree of importance, and that information on their relative importance would be useful to administrators in establishing priorities in programming. An attempt was made, therefore, to determine the relative importance of the recommended program elements by listing them in questionnaire form for submission to heads of foreign language departments throughout the United States. Department heads were asked to rate the items solely on the basis of their relative importance to a program on the undergraduate level. They were specifically asked not to judge items in relation to feasibility in budget matters. A five-point rating scale from "no importance" to "absolute importance" was used to determine degrees of importance of each item. Items were listed in three categories: Methods of Instruction, the Language Laboratory, and Program Organization.

An attempt was made to state items concisely in accordance with the meaning implied by their detailed description in the literature. However, it is recognized that the way items were worded could have some effect upon their rating.

Certain other limitations should be taken into account when using this analysis as an indicator of elements essential to a program. No attempt has been made in this study to determine if a student who is taught under the influence of a given item or a given combination of items learns more than a student who is taught in a different manner.

Recognizing the rating as being derived solely from expert opinion rather than from controlled experimental tests, and therefore only tentative, an attempt is made in Chapter IV to utilize these ratings in appraising practices found at selected institutions, including Oklahoma State University.

The Sample

Colleges and universities which represented various types of institutions of higher learning were desired for the sample. This characteristic was met through institutions which according to latest available data conferred the most degrees in French and Spanish in 1962-63. (88) A total of 120 institutions were selected, thirty from each of four categories: private universities, state universities, liberal arts colleges, and state colleges. The sampled institutions represented thirty-five states plus the District of Columbia.

This selection procedure was adopted for lack of available data which distinguished between degree-granting institutions in modern foreign languages and those whose modern foreign language programs were not sufficiently developed to offer degrees. Therefore, data was used which identified degree-granting institutions in modern foreign languages.

It was recognized that although quantity of degrees conferred was by no means an absolute determiner of an institution's qualifications

for inclusion in the sample, it was felt that this characteristic gave some indication of the institution's experience in foreign language teaching and consequent competence to render judgments on components which make up a quality program.

Heads of departments, because of their having responsibility in directing the many facets of their programs and thus being more likely to have recent experience in making judgments on desirable program elements, were selected as respondents for the questionnaire. Among the respondents were those who are commonly recognized as distinguished scholars in modern foreign language pedagogy.

A total of 108 department heads held a doctor's degree. Among the rest, twelve held a master's degree and two held a bachelor's degree as their highest degree.

Information on professional experience of department heads covering the period 1961-1965 was obtained from lists of departmental chairmen of the Modern Language Association as well as from membership lists of the American Association of Teachers of French, the American Association of Teachers of German, the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese, and the Linguistic Society of America. These lists showed that over the five-year period with which they dealt, 101 of the 122 department heads of the study had professional experience in higher education for the total five-year period, thirteen had experience from two to four years of the five-year period, and eight appeared to have had one year of experience only. Ratings on program elements made by the latter eight department heads showed no appreciable difference from those of the other department heads. A detailed breakdown on the years of experience of department heads is shown in Appendix B.

In interpreting these data on professional experience of department heads it should be kept in mind that professional experience was measured for a period of five years only and should therefore not be interpreted as indicative of the respondents' total professional experience.

More questionnaires were employed than the number of sampled institutions. This was necessary because of multiple departments of modern foreign languages which existed in some institutions. For example, some institutions had separate departments for Spanish and French. A total of 155 department heads, therefore, were sent questionnaires. Of this number, 122, or 78.8 per cent, completed and returned questionnaires.

A separate section was included at the end of the questionnaire to determine any possible bias which a department head might show in rendering judgments on item importance. For example, a department head specializing in literature might rate high those items which pertained to literature but low those items which pertained to linguistics and teacher education. Likewise a department head could show bias towards certain items because of departmental emphasis on a certain area of learning.

It was found that a total of 59.8 per cent of department heads listed their field of personal interest to be literature. Linguistics[1] and teacher education ranked a low 6.6 and 5.7 per cent respectively. A total of 27.9 per cent indicated personal interest in a combination of two or three of the areas.

In departmental emphasis a total of 68.9 per cent of the department heads indicated that their departments stressed combined programs of two

---

[1]The term is used in its broadest sense of historical, descriptive, and applied linguistics.

or three areas (literature, linguistics, teacher education). Literature ranked second (28.7 per cent) in departmental emphasis while linguistics and teacher education ranked 1.6 and 0.8 per cent respectively.

No statistical analysis was made to determine the possible bias of department heads in their rating of items. However, through observation it did not appear that any department head showed bias by rating high all items pertaining to the field of his personal interest or to the area emphasized by his department and low those items representing another area.

Treatment of Data

Under analysis of the five-point system of rating, the importance of each item in the questionnaire was determined by a mean score. Verbal description of these scores as established by the questionnaire is: of absolute importance (5.00); of great importance (4.00); of medium importance (3.00); of little importance (2.00); and, of no importance (1.00).

One item--number 25 (related to the use of graduate teaching assistants)--was dropped from the listing because it received a rating below two (between "little importance" and "no importance"). It was arbitrarily decided that items with ratings below two were of too little importance to include in the criteria of important items. Remaining items and their mean scores were used in Chapter IV to compare the criteria (what ought to exist) to actual practice (what does exist). Results of ratings on each item are listed below.

Item No.	Item Importance	Item Description
1	3.22	Undergraduate course in linguistics.[1]
2	4.15	Undergraduate course for future teachers in methods of teaching a foreign language.
3	4.15	Undergraduate course in French phonetics.
4	3.86	Undergraduate course in Spanish phonetics.
5	4.36	Undergraduate course in the culture and civilization of the foreign country.
6	4.75	Undergraduate course in "conversation and composition" (beyond elementary and intermediate language courses).
7	4.34	Undergraduate survey course in French literature.
8	4.33	Undergraduate survey courses for Spanish majors in both the literature of Spain and of Hispanic America.
9	4.58	Proficiency exams to determine placement of students who have studied foreign languages in high school.
10	4.06	First-year language classes limited to approximately fifteen students.
11	2.97	Undergraduate student majoring in only one foreign language as opposed to carrying a double major in two languages simultaneously.
12	3.53	Laboratory drill for first-year students limited to approximately twenty minutes at one sitting.
13	3.41	Faculty member designated as laboratory director.

[1]The generally understood idea in foreign language circles of an undergraduate course in linguistics to be a course in descriptive linguistics is meant here.

14	4.76	Laboratory director, if member of teaching faculty, given reduced teaching load.
15	3.18	A special intensive language course which doubles or triples the time ordinarily spent in the conventional language course.
16	2.56	A beginning language course based on "programmed learning" so that students may work at their own pace.
17	3.47	Foreign language clubs.
18	3.73	Language house or residential unit in which only the foreign language being studied is permitted.
19	3.66	Language tables for language practice during meals.
20	4.04	Study or residence abroad for undergraduate majors.
21	3.45	Placement of students preparing for teaching careers in practice teaching assignments only under school teachers whose teaching methods closely approximate those advocated by the college.
22	4.71	Supervision of practice teachers by a Foreign Language Specialist as opposed to an Education Specialist.
23	4.70	Supvervision of graduate teaching assistants (if employed) in their teaching duties.
24	4.01	Graduate teaching assistants (if employed) required to take a course in methods of teaching a foreign language.
25	1.88	Graduate teaching assistants not to be employed.
26	3.56	Residence abroad as a prerequisite for appointment of faculty members.
27	4.29	Electronic equipment ("language laboratory") for student drill.

28	4.13	Activated headphones to permit each student to hear more clearly his own sound production.
29	4.10	Individual tape recorders which permit each student to record his answers to the master voice.
30	4.18	A library system of tapes whereby each student may play his own tape and stop it at any time for review.
31	4.55	Individual booths in the laboratory.
32	4.76	Taped material in the laboratory integrated with material presented in the classroom.
33	4.11	Laboratory used for testing oral achievement.
34	4.30	Monitoring facilities in the laboratory.
35	3.30	Overhead projector integrated with the laboratory to provide audio-visual experiences.
36	4.12	Teaching language skills in the following order: listening, speaking, reading, writing.
37	3.88	Specially designed lessons in ear training for beginning students.
38	4.26	Specially designed lessons for teaching pronunciation to beginning students.
39	3.75	Specially designed lessons for teaching reading.
40	3.78	Specially designed lessons for teaching writing.
41	3.13	Withholding graphic symbols until the student has had a chance to hear and pronounce the material.
42	3.92	Emphasizing drills on language patterns.
43	3.23	Choral recitation as a major device for learning patterns.
44	3.69	Teaching grammatical principles inductively.

45	3.43	Minimizing vocabulary until common structures of the language have been learned.
46	4.10	Teaching vocabulary only in context.
47	3.65	Using dialogs as a major drill device.
48	3.66	Using target language at speed of native speakers.
49	3.91	Conducting beginning language classes almost totally in the target language.
50	4.27	Teaching writing with a high degree of control at first as opposed to free composition.
51	4.26	Conducting undergraduate courses of literature in the foreign language as opposed to the native language.
52	4.32	Emphasizing teaching the culture of the foreign country in addition to teaching the language.
53	3.92	Using the laboratory for listening to plays and poetry as a part of literature courses.
54	3.79	Using the laboratory for listening to speeches, symposia, and the like as a part of advanced language courses.
55	4.08	Using tests which avoid making the student revert to his native language.
56	3.42	Testing beginning language students primarily on listening comprehension and speaking.
57	3.80	Relating language testing to drills done in the Laboratory
58	3.77	Using the laboratory primarily for drill on material already covered in the classroom.

59	2.34	Using the laboratory primarily to prepare students with new material for classroom recitation.
60	4.47	Reducing the tendency of beginning students from thinking in their native language as they use the foreign language.

CHAPTER IV

APPLICATION OF CRITERIA

Development of Instrument

Items from the first instrument were used to develop a second instrument (Appendix C) for the purpose of evaluating foreign language programs in relation to the criteria developed. One item (item 9) was added to the list of items by making two questions of number 8 (survey courses in both peninsular and Hispanic American literature). One item (item 25) was dropped because it was believed to be of too little importance for retention (below a rating of "two").

Items were divided into three sections: Program Organization, the Language Laboratory, and Methods of Instruction. In the first two sections items were to be checked either yes or no as to whether they were currently a part of the department's program. Items in the final section were to be checked according to the extent which they were currently practiced by the department's teaching personnel. That is, items either were (1) practiced to a large extent (regularly practiced by 50 per cent or more of the teaching personnel), (2) practiced to a limited extent (regularly practiced by less than 50 per cent of the teaching personnel, or (3) not practiced by any of the teaching personnel.

The Sample

The 122 departments which responded to the first instrument

comprised the sample for the second instrument. Of these departments 108, or 88.5 per cent, returned questionnaires. This number includes those which responded to a follow-up request. Twenty of these questionnaires did not yield responses to all items and were consequently eliminated from the study so that they would not throw off scoring. A total of eighty-eight questionnaires, or 72.13 per cent of the sample, therefore, was used. Departments excluded represented both colleges and universities. A review of items to which the excluded departments responded did not indicate any different pattern of responses than that of questionnaires which were employed.

A questionnaire completed by Oklahoma State University was added to those of the sampled institutions to allow for evaluation of Oklahoma State University against the criteria and for comparison of practices between Oklahoma State University and other institutions. Thus, a total of eighty-nine questionnaires were involved in the application of the criteria.

Treatment of Data

In analyzing responses it was seen that five items were inappropriate for inclusion in the study. Item 15 (laboratory director given a reduced teaching load if a member of the teaching faculty) had to be excluded because it was negatively affected by a "no" response to item 14 (faculty member designated as laboratory director). Items 24 and 25 (dealing with graduate assistants) had to be excluded because some colleges did not have graduate programs and consequently could not answer these items. Items 55 and 56, referred to in the literature of the field as opposing practices, were expected to yield responses which would

cancel out one or the other. However, the items were generally misunderstood and were replied to in a number of combinations. Some respondents gave both items "1" ratings (regularly practiced by 50 per cent or more of the teaching personnel), some gave both items "2" ratings (regularly practiced by less than 50 per cent of the teaching personnel), some gave a "2" rating to one item and a "3" rating (not practiced by any of the teaching personnel) to the other, and some gave a "1" rating to one item and a "2" or "3" rating to the second. Thus, it seemed appropriate to exclude these items from the study so that they would not affect scoring of departments on the basis of a pre-determined maximum score.

In order to evaluate a department's program in relation to the criteria mean scores established for items of the first instrument were used to score items of the second instrument. For example, a department found to have item 1 in its program was given a mean score of 3.22 for that item, which is the mean importance rating established for that item by the first instrument. A final mean score rating for each department on all items of the study was determined by obtaining a total mean score of all the item scores.

Mean score ratings for each department on each of the three sections of the study were also obtained. Mean scores for the Program Organization and Language Laboratory sections were determined by obtaining a total mean score of all the items in each section. The same procedure was followed in determining a mean score for Methods of Instruction except that weights were assigned each item to allow for the various degrees which each item could be practiced in a given department. Therefore, items marked "1" (regularly practiced by 50 per cent or more of the teaching personnel), "2" (regularly practiced by less than 50 per

cent of the teaching personnel), and "3" (not practiced by any of the teaching personnel) were assigned weights of one (1), one-half (.5), and zero (0) respectively. Final weighted values for each item were determined by the product of importance rating times the extent to which it was present in the department in question.

The maximum score possible for a department on all items was 3.91. No department obtained this score. The highest score obtained, as indicated in Table I, was 3.50. A total of twenty-nine other departments obtained scores between 3.50 and 3.00. The lowest score obtained was 1.62. The foreign language department of Oklahoma State University placed in the lower one-third of all departments in the total scale with a mean score of 2.53 and a department rank of sixty-one out of eighty-nine.

The maximum score possible for Program Organization was 3.84. Table II indicates a mean of 3.25 as the highest score obtained in this section. The department which obtained this score was the same department which obtained the highest score in the total score for all items of the study. A total of nineteen other departments obtained scores between 3.25 and 2.76, which represent departments which came within one-half of one point of the highest score obtained. The lowest score obtained was 0.72. Oklahoma State University placed in the lower one-third in Program Organization with a mean score of 2.10 and a department rank of sixty-nine out of eighty-nine.

The maximum score possible for the Language Laboratory was 4.19. Table III shows that nineteen departments obtained this maximum score. A total of thirty-six other departments closely approximated this score with a mean score of 3.82. The lowest score obtained was 1.97. Oklahoma State University placed in the lower one-third on the Language

TABLE I

MEAN SCORES OF DEPARTMENTS RANKED ON TOTAL SCORE

Dept. No.	Rank	Program Organization Score	Lang. Lab. Score	Methods of Instruction Score	TOTAL
63	1	3.25	3.82	3.63	3.50
37	2.5 (tie)	3.23	3.82	3.53	3.45
56	2.5 (tie)	2.74	4.19	3.86	3.45
9	4	2.54	4.19	3.77	3.33
35	5	3.23	2.79	3.61	3.32
51	6	2.82	4.19	3.46	3.31
4	7	3.13	3.73	3.22	3.27
40	8	2.60	3.82	3.70	3.26
7	9	2.84	4.19	3.30	3.25
33	10.5 (tie)	2.64	4.19	3.44	3.23
67	10.5 (tie)	2.45	4.19	3.65	3.23
82	12	2.89	3.36	3.48	3.22
22	13.5 (tie)	2.78	3.82	3.35	3.19
77	13.5 (tie)	2.76	3.82	3.37	3.19
24	15.5 (tie)	3.12	3.82	2.97	3.17
73	15.5 (tie)	3.17	2.90	3.26	3.17
34	17	2.78	3.82	3.22	3.14
27	18.5 (tie)	2.68	3.73	3.28	3.11
55	18.5 (tie)	2.67	3.37	3.44	3.11
54	20	2.65	3.82	3.28	3.10
17	21	2.30	4.19	3.45	3.09
38	22.5 (tie)	2.96	3.27	3.07	3.06
31	22.5 (tie)	2.29	3.82	3.53	3.06
19	24	2.72	2.90	3.44	3.05
60	25.5 (tie)	2.77	3.73	3.05	3.04
23	25.5 (tie)	2.43	4.19	3.20	3.04
58	27	2.49	3.82	3.25	3.03
30	28	2.48	3.82	3.22	3.01
84	29.5 (tie)	2.51	4.19	3.03	3.00
29	29.5 (tie)	3.00	3.36	2.87	3.00
70	31	2.45	3.82	3.21	2.99
8	32	2.32	4.19	3.16	2.98
88	33	2.54	3.37	3.24	2.97
36	34	3.15	4.19	2.26	2.95
72	35	2.32	4.19	3.02	2.92
79	36	2.42	3.82	3.05	2.91
12	37.5 (tie)	2.33	4.19	2.90	2.87
15	37.5 (tie)	2.05	3.82	3.32	2.87
43	39.5 (tie)	3.05	4.19	2.15	2.86
59	39.5 (tie)	2.46	3.82	2.89	2.86
5	41	2.38	3.73	2.92	2.83
69	42	2.45	4.19	2.65	2.82
25	43	2.27	3.82	2.95	2.81
42	45 (tie)	2.25	3.82	2.92	2.79
47	45 (tie)	2.67	3.82	2.50	2.79

TABLE I (continued)

Dept. No.	Rank	Program Organization Score	Lang. Lab. Score	Methods of Instruction Score	TOTAL
66	45 (tie)	1.91	3.82	3.27	2.79
18	47	2.09	3.82	3.06	2.78
57	48.5 (tie)	2.20	3.36	3.07	2.75
76	48.5 (tie)	2.06	3.82	3.02	2.75
41	50.5 (tie)	2.76	3.82	2.29	2.74
50	50.5 (tie)	2.23	3.82	2.83	2.74
28	52	2.47	3.73	2.51	2.69
83	53	2.19	3.82	2.70	2.67
71	54	2.65	4.19	2.09	2.66
32	55	2.38	3.82	2.40	2.62
53	56	2.02	3.82	2.73	2.61
14	57.5 (tie)	2.90	3.82	1.81	2.60
65	57.5 (tie)	2.23	3.82	2.48	2.60
64	59	2.23	3.37	2.63	2.59
2	60	2.97	1.97	2.40	2.57
OSU	61	2.10	3.37	2.63	2.53
45	62	2.06	2.90	2.81	2.51
10	63	2.40	4.19	1.92	2.49
11	64.5 (tie)	2.41	3.82	2.01	2.47
49	64.5 (tie)	2.37	3.82	2.04	2.47
81	66	1.39	3.82	2.98	2.45
16	67.5 (tie)	2.21	3.36	2.30	2.43
39	67.5 (tie)	1.91	3.37	2.58	2.43
6	69	1.54	3.82	2.67	2.39
48	70	2.46	1.97	2.47	2.38
68	71	2.44	2.36	1.88	2.36
21	73 (tie)	2.40	3.82	1.73	2.35
26	73 (tie)	2.44	2.43	2.22	2.35
75	73 (tie)	1.75	4.19	2.24	2.35
20	75	2.25	4.19	1.71	2.34
3	76	2.48	3.82	1.59	2.33
74	77	2.30	3.37	1.85	2.29
52	78	1.94	3.37	2.02	2.21
85	79	1.58	2.90	2.47	2.17
44	80	1.90	3.73	1.74	2.13
86	81	1.31	2.90	2.55	2.09
80	82	1.97	2.91	1.86	2.08
87	83	2.46	2.45	1.47	2.05
1	84	1.62	3.82	1.72	2.02
46	85	2.49	2.90	0.94	1.91
61	86	1.12	2.90	2.11	1.83
78	87	1.44	2.90	1.71	1.79
13	88	1.85	2.89	1.24	1.76
62	89	0.72	3.82	1.66	1.62

TABLE II

MEAN SCORES OF DEPARTMENTS RANKED ON PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

Dept. No.	Rank	Mean Score	Dept. No.	Rank	Mean Score
63	1	3.25	23	46	2.43
37	2.5 (tie)	3.23	79	47	2.42
35	2.5 (tie)	3.23	11	48	2.41
73	4	3.17	10	49.5 (tie)	2.40
36	5	3.15	21	49.5 (tie)	2.40
4	6	3.13	32	51.5 (tie)	2.38
24	7	3.12	5	51.5 (tie)	2.38
43	8	3.05	49	53	2.37
29	9	3.00	12	54	2.33
2	10	2.97	72	55.5 (tie)	2.32
38	11	2.96	8	55.5 (tie)	2.32
14	12	2.90	74	57.5 (tie)	2.30
82	13	2.89	17	57.5 (tie)	2.30
7	14	2.84	31	59	2.29
51	15	2.82	25	60	2.27
34	16.5 (tie)	2.78	42	61.5 (tie)	2.25
22	16.5 (tie)	2.78	20	61.5 (tie)	2.25
60	18	2.77	65	64 (tie)	2.23
77	19.5 (tie)	2.76	64	64 (tie)	2.23
41	19.5 (tie)	2.76	50	64 (tie)	2.23
56	21	2.74	16	66	2.21
19	22	2.72	57	67	2.20
27	23	2.68	83	68	2.19
55	24.5 (tie)	2.67	OSU	69	2.10
47	24.5 (tie)	2.67	18	70	2.09
71	26.5 (tie)	2.65	76	71.5 (tie)	2.06
54	26.5 (tie)	2.65	45	71.5 (tie)	2.06
33	28	2.64	15	73	2.05
40	29	2.60	53	74	2.02
88	30.5 (tie)	2.54	80	75	1.97
9	30.5 (tie)	2.54	52	76	1.94
84	32	2.51	66	77.5 (tie)	1.91
58	33.5 (tie)	2.49	39	77.5 (tie)	1.91
46	33.5 (tie)	2.49	44	79	1.90
3	35.5 (tie)	2.48	13	80	1.85
30	35.5 (tie)	2.48	75	81	1.75
28	37	2.47	1	82	1.62
59	39 (tie)	2.46	85	83	1.58
48	39 (tie)	2.46	6	84	1.54
87	39 (tie)	2.46	78	85	1.44
69	42 (tie)	2.45	81	86	1.39
70	42 (tie)	2.45	86	87	1.31
67	42 (tie)	2.45	61	88	1.12
68	44.5 (tie)	2.44	62	89	0.72
26	44.5 (tie)	2.44			

TABLE III

MEAN SCORES OF DEPARTMENTS RANKED ON THE LANGUAGE LABORATORY

Dept. No.	Rank	Mean Score	Dept. No.	Rank	Mean Score
75	10	4.19	47	37.5	3.82
17	10	4.19	77	37.5	3.82
8	10	4.19	22	37.5	3.82
72	10	4.19	34	37.5	3.82
12	10	4.19	54	37.5	3.82
10	10	4.19	70	37.5	3.82
23	10	4.19	66	37.5	3.82
67	10	4.19	24	37.5	3.82
69	10	4.19	37	37.5	3.82
20	10	4.19	3	37.5	3.82
84	10	4.19	27	58.5	3.73
9	10	4.19	60	58.5	3.73
33	10	4.19	28	58.5	3.73
71	10	4.19	44	58.5	3.73
56	10	4.19	5	58.5	3.73
51	10	4.19	4	58.5	3.73
7	10	4.19	88	65	3.37
43	10	4.19	74	65	3.37
36	10	4.19	OSU	65	3.37
62	37.5	3.82	39	65	3.37
83	37.5	3.82	52	65	3.37
21	37.5	3.82	64	65	3.37
32	37.5	3.82	55	65	3.37
53	37.5	3.82	68	71	3.36
81	37.5	3.82	82	71	3.36
15	37.5	3.82	57	71	3.36
6	37.5	3.82	16	71	3.36
76	37.5	3.82	29	71	3.36
18	37.5	3.82	38	74	3.27
49	37.5	3.82	80	75	2.91
59	37.5	3.82	19	79.5	2.90
42	37.5	3.82	46	79.5	2.90
25	37.5	3.82	45	79.5	2.90
65	37.5	3.82	61	79.5	2.90
31	37.5	3.82	86	79.5	2.90
50	37.5	3.82	78	79.5	2.90
1	37.5	3.82	85	79.5	2.90
30	37.5	3.82	73	79.5	2.90
63	37.5	3.82	13	84	2.89
79	37.5	3.82	35	85	2.79
11	37.5	3.82	87	86	2.45
40	37.5	3.82	26	87	2.43
58	37.5	3.82	48	88.5	1.97
14	37.5	3.82	2	88.5	1.97
41	37.5	3.82			

Laboratory with a mean score of 3.37 and was tied with six other departments for the rank of sixty-five out of eighty-nine.

Certain limitations should be borne in mind in interpreting the Language Laboratory section. The large number of departments (nineteen) which obtained the maximum score in this section and the large number of departments (thirty-six) which closely approximated the maximum score suggest that the Language Laboratory section did not work well in evaluating language laboratory components. Increased effectiveness of the section might be gained by increasing the number of items (the present section contained only nine) and by raising the difficulty level of the items.

The maximum score possible for Methods of Instruction was 3.86. Table IV shows that one department obtained this maximum score. A total of fourteen other departments obtained scores between 3.86 and 3.37. Oklahoma State University placed in the middle one-third in Methods of Instruction with a mean score of 2.63 and was tied with one other department for the rank of 53.5 out of eighty-nine.

In comparing Oklahoma State University with other institutions Tables I-IV rank Oklahoma State University inferior to most of the sampled institutions. If a department's soundness were judged on the basis of which third of the departments in which it ranked, the foreign language department of Oklahoma State University would have to be considered of low quality because of its third division rank in total score as well as in Program Organization and in the Language Laboratory, and its second division rank in Methods of Instruction. In making this comparison, however, it should be borne in mind that the departments to which Oklahoma State University is compared represent departments which granted the greatest number of degrees in French and Spanish in the

United States in 1962-63 and thus would be expected to be more developed, especially in Program Organization.

Percentages of all departments which have individual items under Program Organization existing in their programs are listed in Table V. The greatest number of departments (89.89 per cent) was found to have item 6 (course in conversation and composition) in their programs, established by the criteria as an item of "great importance." The least number of departments (6.74 per cent) was found to have item 17 (beginning course in programmed learning) in their programs. Item number 17, however, was given an importance rating by the criteria between "medium" and "little importance." The next to the least number of departments (19.10 per cent), however, was found to have item 11 (first year classes limited to approximately fifteen students) in their programs, established by the criteria as an item of "great importance." The large gap between criteria and actual practice of item 11 may be due to budgetary considerations. A department may see great importance in small classes but may not have sufficient funds to maintain a teaching staff large enough to handle them.

Further analysis of departments as they relate to individual items in Program Organization was made by dividing departments into categories of High, Medium, and Low. Each of these categories represents roughly one-third of all sampled departments. An exact division into thirds was not possible because of ties in rank among some departments. Table V shows percentages under each category representing departments which have the item in their programs. It is seen that Oklahoma State University lacked eleven items in Program Organization. These items and their mean importance ratings are listed below.

TABLE IV

MEAN SCORES OF DEPARTMENTS RANKED ON METHODS OF INSTRUCTION

Dept. No.	Rank	Mean Score	Dept. No.	Rank	Mean Score
56	1	3.86	29	46	2.87
9	2	3.77	50	47	2.83
40	3	3.70	45	48	2.81
67	4	3.65	53	49	2.73
63	5	3.63	83	50	2.70
35	6	3.61	6	51	2.67
37	7.5 (tie)	3.53	69	52	2.65
31	7.5 (tie)	3.53	64	53.5 (tie)	2.63
82	9	3.48	OSU	53.5 (tie)	2.63
51	10	3.46	39	55	2.58
17	11	3.45	86	56	2.55
19	13 (tie)	3.44	28	57	2.51
55	13 (tie)	3.44	47	58	2.50
33	13 (tie)	3.44	65	59	2.48
77	15	3.37	48	60.5 (tie)	2.47
22	16	3.35	85	60.5 (tie)	2.47
15	17	3.32	2	62.5 (tie)	2.40
7	18	3.30	32	62.5 (tie)	2.40
27	19.5 (tie)	3.28	16	64	2.30
54	19.5 (tie)	3.28	41	65	2.29
66	21	3.27	36	66	2.26
73	22	3.26	75	67	2.24
58	23	3.25	26	68	2.22
88	24	3.24	43	69	2.15
4	26 (tie)	3.22	61	70	2.11
34	26 (tie)	3.22	71	71	2.09
30	26 (tie)	3.22	49	72	2.04
70	28	3.21	52	73	2.02
23	29	3.20	11	74	2.01
8	30	3.16	10	75	1.92
38	31.5 (tie)	3.07	68	76	1.88
57	31.5 (tie)	3.07	80	77	1.86
18	33	3.06	74	78	1.85
60	34.5 (tie)	3.05	14	79	1.81
79	34.5 (tie)	3.05	44	80	1.74
84	36	3.03	21	81	1.73
72	37.5 (tie)	3.02	1	82	1.72
76	37.5 (tie)	3.02	78	83.5 (tie)	1.71
81	39	2.98	20	83.5 (tie)	1.71
24	40	2.97	62	85	1.66
25	41	2.95	3	86	1.59
5	42.5 (tie)	2.92	87	87	1.47
42	42.5 (tie)	2.92	13	88	1.24
12	44	2.90	46	89	0.94
59	45	2.89			

TABLE V

PERCENTAGES OF DEPARTMENTS HAVING ITEMS IN PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

Item No.	Item Importance	All Departments	High[1]	Medium[2]	Low[3]	OSU
1	3.22	58.43	75.86	58.07	41.38	No
2	4.15	79.78	89.66	83.87	65.52	Yes
3	4.15	68.54	96.55	83.87	24.14	No
4	3.86	50.56	75.86	54.84	20.69	No
5	4.36	77.53	96.55	70.97	65.52	Yes
6	4.75	89.89	100.00	90.32	79.31	Yes
7	4.34	79.78	82.76	90.32	65.52	Yes
8	4.33	79.78	89.66	87.10	62.07	Yes
9	4.33	83.15	93.10	96.77	58.62	Yes
10	4.58	68.54	93.10	70.97	41.38	No
11	4.06	19.10	34.48	16.13	6.90	No
12	2.97	65.17	75.86	61.29	58.62	Yes
13	3.53	56.18	68.97	54.84	44.83	Yes
14	3.41	62.92	75.86	67.74	44.83	Yes
16	3.18	23.60	34.48	32.26	3.45	No
17	2.56	6.74	13.79	6.45	0	No
18	3.47	79.78	93.10	77.42	68.97	Yes
19	3.73	19.10	31.03	12.90	13.79	No
20	3.66	34.83	58.62	29.32	17.24	No
21	4.04	71.91	93.10	70.97	51.72	Yes
22	3.45	50.56	72.41	48.39	31.03	No
23	4.71	60.67	86.21	67.74	27.59	Yes
26	3.56	28.09	41.38	38.71	3.45	No

[1]Represents 29 departments
[2]Represents 31 departments
[3]Represents 29 departments

Item No.	Mean Importance Rating	Item Description
1	3.22	Undergraduate course in linguistics.
3	4.15	Undergraduate course in French phonetics.
4	3.86	Undergraduate course in Spanish phonetics.
10	4.58	Proficiency exams to determine placement of students who have studied foreign languages in high school.
11	4.06	First-year language classes limited to approximately

		fifteen students.
16	3.18	A special intensive language course which doubles or triples the time ordinarily spent in the conventional language course.
17	2.56	A beginning language course based on "programmed learning" so that students may work at their own pace.
19	3.73	Language house or residential unit in which only the foreign language being studied is permitted.
20	3.66	Language tables for language practice during meals.
22	3.45	Placement of students preparing for teaching careers in practice teaching assignments only under school teachers whose teaching methods closely approximate those advocated by the college.
26	3.56	Residence abroad as a prerequisite for appointment of faculty members.

A total of seven of the items listed above (1, 3, 4, 16, 17, 19, 20) relate to curriculum. Items 1, 3, 4, and 20 were a part of the programs of the majority of departments in the High category. Items 16 and 19 were a part of the programs of roughly one-third of the High departments. Item 17 was found in 13.79 per cent of the High departments.

In reference to the other items under Program Organization which were found lacking at Oklahoma State University, items 10 and 22 were a part of the programs of a majority of all departments as well as a majority of High departments. Items 11 and 26 were a part of the programs of over one-third of the High departments.

In the Language Laboratory section (Table VI) all departments were found to have items 27, 31, and 32 (electronic language laboratory,

TABLE VI

PERCENTAGES OF DEPARTMENTS HAVING ITEMS IN THE LANGUAGE LABORATORY

Item No.	Item Importance	All Departments	High[1]	Medium[2]	Low[3]	OSU
27	4.29	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	Yes
28	4.13	98.88	100.00	100.00	97.06	Yes
29	4.10	87.64	100.00	100.00	67.65	Yes
30	4.18	76.40	100.00	100.00	38.24	Yes
31	4.55	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	Yes
32	4.76	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	Yes
33	4.11	78.65	100.00	100.00	44.12	No
34	4.30	94.38	100.00	100.00	85.29	Yes
35	3.30	30.34	100.00	0	23.53	No

[1]Represents 19 departments
[2]Represents 36 departments
[3]Represents 34 departments

individual booths, and taped material integrated with classroom material). The least number of departments (30.34 per cent) was found to have item 35 (overhead projector).

Close adherence to division of departments in thirds was not possible in the Language Laboratory section because of the large number of tie scores among departments. Thus, High departments (nineteen departments) were considered those which had all items in the Language Laboratory section. Medium departments (thirty-six departments) were considered those which lacked only one item. Low departments (thirty-four departments) were considered those which lacked three or more items.

In the Language Laboratory Oklahoma State University lacked two items out of nine, items 33 (laboratory used for testing oral achievement) and 35 (overhead projector). These items had mean importance ratings of 4.11 and 3.30 respectively. Item 33 was a part of the programs of 78.65 per cent of all departments, and item 35 was a part of

the programs of 30.34 per cent of all departments. Both of these items were found in 100 per cent of the High departments. Item 33 was found in 100 per cent of the Medium departments as well.

In Methods of Instruction (Table VII) sixteen out of twenty-three items were practiced to a "large extent" (by 50 per cent or more of the teaching personnel) in all departments combined. Item 58 (conducting undergraduate courses of literature in the foreign language rather than in the native language) was practiced by the greatest number of teaching personnel in all departments combined. Item 60 (use of the laboratory for advanced language courses) was the most non-practiced item among all departments combined.

Further analysis of departments as they relate to individual items in Methods of Instruction was made by dividing departments into High, Medium, and Low categories. Each of these categories represent one-third of the departments. Table VII shows percentages under each category representing departments and the extent which they practiced each item. The majority of teaching personnel at Oklahoma State University practiced ten out of twenty-three items. No one at Oklahoma State University practiced two of the items (59 and 60). Less than one-half of the teaching personnel at Oklahoma State University practiced eleven of the items. The items not practiced at all at Oklahoma State University and those practiced by only a portion of the teaching personnel are listed below with their mean importance ratings.

Item No.	Item Importance Rating	Item Description
37	3.88	Specially designed lessons in ear training for beginning students.

39	3.75	Specially designed lessons for teaching reading.
40	3.78	Specially designed lessons for teaching writing.
41	3.13	Withholding graphic symbols until the student has had a chance to hear and pronounce the material.
42	3.92	Emphasizing drills on language patterns.
44	3.69	Teaching grammatical principles inductively.
48	3.66	Using target language at speed of native speakers.
49	3.91	Conducting beginning language classes almost totally in the target language.
51	4.32	Emphasizing teaching the culture of the foreign country in addition to teaching the language.
52	4.08	Using tests which avoid making the student revert to his native language.
53	3.42	Testing beginning language students primarily on listening comprehension and speaking.
59	3.92	Using the laboratory for listening to plays and poetry as a part of literature courses.
60	3.79	Using the laboratory for listening to speeches, symposia, and the like as a part of advanced language courses.

A total of six of these items (42, 44, 48, 49, 51, 52) were practiced to a "large extent" by the majority of teaching personnel of all departments combined; three of the items (37, 41, 53) were practiced to a "large extent" by the majority of teaching personnel of more than one-third of all departments combined; two of the items, (40, 59) were practiced to a "large extent" by the majority of teaching personnel of more than one-fourth of all departments combined; and, two of the items, (39,

60) were practiced to a "large extent" by the majority of teaching personnel of more than one-fifth of all departments combined. In more than 50 per cent of all High departments the majority of teaching personnel practiced to a "large extent" all items above with the exception of item 60, which was practiced to a "large extent" by 43.33 per cent of the teaching personnel.

TABLE VII

PERCENTAGES OF DEPARTMENTS HAVING ITEMS IN METHODS OF INSTRUCTION

Item No.	Item Importance	Extent of Item's Practice	All Departments	High[1]	Medium[2]	Low[3]	OSU
36	4.12	Large	74.16	100.00	75.86	46.67	Yes
		Limited	17.98	0	13.79	40.00	---
		None	7.87	0	10.34	13.33	---
37	3.88	Large	49.44	80.00	58.62	46.67	---
		Limited	17.98	20.00	24.14	53.33	Yes
		None	7.87	0	17.24	36.67	---
38	4.26	Large	61.80	93.33	65.52	26.67	Yes
		Limited	23.60	6.67	20.69	43.33	---
		None	14.61	0	13.79	30.00	---
39	3.75	Large	24.72	53.33	13.79	6.67	---
		Limited	41.57	43.33	51.72	33.33	Yes
		None	32.58	3.33	34.48	60.00	---
40	3.78	Large	30.34	53.33	24.14	13.33	---
		Limited	39.33	43.33	44.83	30.00	Yes
		None	30.34	3.33	31.03	56.67	---
41	3.13	Large	37.08	70.00	31.03	10.00	---
		Limited	23.60	16.67	31.03	23.33	Yes
		None	39.33	13.33	37.93	66.67	---
42	3.92	Large	74.16	86.67	86.21	50.00	---
		Limited	17.98	6.67	13.79	33.33	Yes
		None	7.87	6.67	0	16.67	---
43	3.23	Large	59.55	83.33	72.41	23.33	Yes
		Limited	30.34	16.67	24.14	50.00	---
		None	10.11	0	3.45	26.67	---
44	3.69	Large	61.80	100.00	58.62	26.67	---
		Limited	31.46	0	37.93	56.67	Yes
		None	6.74	0	3.45	16.67	---
45	3.43	Large	61.80	93.33	72.41	20.00	Yes
		Limited	25.84	6.67	17.24	53.33	---
		None	12.36	0	0	26.67	---

[1]Represents 30 departments
[2]Represents 29 departments
[3]Represents 30 departments

TABLE VII (Continued)

Item No.	Item Importance	Extent of Item's Practice	All Departments	High[1]	Medium[2]	Low[3]	OSU
46	4.10	Large	66.29	90.00	75.86	33.33	Yes
		Limited	26.97	6.67	24.14	50.00	---
		None	6.74	3.33	0	16.67	---
47	3.65	Large	68.54	86.67	82.76	36.67	Yes
		Limited	24.72	13.33	10.34	50.00	---
		None	6.74	0	6.90	13.33	---
48	3.66	Large	64.04	83.33	65.52	43.33	---
		Limited	26.97	13.33	31.03	36.67	Yes
		None	8.99	3.33	3.45	20.00	---
49	3.91	Large	55.06	83.33	51.72	30.00	---
		Limited	29.21	13.33	41.38	33.33	Yes
		None	15.73	3.33	6.90	36.67	---
50	4.27	Large	75.28	100.00	75.86	50.00	Yes
		Limited	19.10	0	20.69	36.67	---
		None	5.62	0	3.45	13.33	---
51	4.32	Large	59.55	73.33	62.07	43.33	---
		Limited	35.96	20.00	34.48	53.33	Yes
		None	4.49	6.67	3.45	3.33	---
52	4.08	Large	50.56	83.33	55.17	13.33	---
		Limited	42.70	16.67	37.93	73.33	Yes
		None	6.74	0	6.90	13.33	---
53	3.42	Large	38.20	73.33	24.14	16.67	---
		Limited	44.94	16.67	62.07	50.00	Yes
		None	19.10	10.00	13.79	33.33	---
54	3.80	Large	55.06	83.33	55.17	26.67	Yes
		Limited	31.46	13.33	41.38	40.00	---
		None	13.48	3.33	3.45	33.33	---
57	4.47	Large	62.92	90.00	72.41	26.67	Yes
		Limited	31.46	10.00	27.59	56.67	---
		None	5.62	0	0	16.67	---

[1]Represents 30 departments
[2]Represents 29 departments
[3]Represents 30 departments

TABLE VII (Continued)

Item No.	Item Importance	Extent of Item's Practice	All Departments	High[1]	Medium[2]	Low[3]	OSU
58	4.26	Large	78.65	90.00	82.76	63.33	Yes
		Limited	16.85	10.00	13.79	26.67	---
		None	4.49	0	3.35	10.00	---
59	3.92	Large	31.46	53.33	31.03	10.00	---
		Limited	42.70	30.00	34.48	63.33	---
		None	25.84	16.67	34.48	26.67	Yes
60	3.79	Large	24.72	43.33	20.69	10.00	---
		Limited	33.71	26.67	44.83	30.00	---
		None	41.57	30.00	34.48	60.00	Yes

[1]Represents 30 departments
[2]Represents 29 departments
[3]Represents 30 departments

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to establish a set of criteria which could be used as an instrument for appraising practices of modern foreign languages on the undergraduate level, and to apply the criteria to the foreign language program of Oklahoma State University.

The criteria was established through (1) a search of the literature of the field and a synthesizing of that literature into a list of recommended practices, and, (2) a rating of the importance of these recommended practices on a questionnaire by 122 department heads.

Application of the criteria was made by placing on a second questionnaire the items judged important by eighty-eight department heads who responded to the questionnaire, and by obtaining from the department heads an indication of the existence or absence of the items in their programs. This same procedure for application was followed with the head of the foreign language department of Oklahoma State University so that the program of this institution could be measured against the established criteria as well as against foreign language programs of other institutions. Rating scores for departmental programs against the criteria were determined through mean scores which were established on each item by the first instrument, and then through a total mean of these

scores for the entire study as well as for sections of the study entitled Program Organization, Language Laboratory, and Methods of Instruction.

Conclusions

Results of this investigation show that none of the departments met the established criteria in the entire study and that few of the departments met the criteria in each of the three sections. Oklahoma State University failed to meet the overall criteria in twenty-six out of fifty-five items. In Program Organization it lacked eleven items and in the Language Laboratory it lacked two items. In Methods of Instruction less than 50 per cent of its teaching personnel did not practice eleven items and none of the teaching personnel practiced two items. This ranked Oklahoma State University in the lower one-third in the entire study as well as in Program Organization and in the Language Laboratory, and in the middle one-third in Methods of Instruction.

Thus, because a large number of recommended program elements were missing the foreign language department of Oklahoma State University rated relatively low against the experimental criteria as well as against the sampled institutions and their practices. It must be recognized, however, that the recommended program elements were not all tested under controlled experimental conditions. Nevertheless, to the extent that one can assume that each recommended element does add to the quality of a modern foreign language department, it appears that the Oklahoma State University program is deficient to a considerable extent. Limitations of the Language Laboratory section, however, should be kept in mind in evaluating the soundness of the program at Oklahoma State University. The large number of departments (nineteen) which

obtained the maximum score in the Language Laboratory section and the large number of departments (thirty-six) which closely approximated the maximum score suggest that the section did not work well in evaluating language laboratory components. Increased effectivenss of the section might be gained by increasing the number of items and by raising the difficulty level of the items.

Another limitation to be considered in evaluating the foreign language program of Oklahoma State University is that the departments to which Oklahoma State University is compared represent departments which granted the greatest number of degrees in French and in Spanish in the United States in 1962-63. These departments would be expected to be more developed, especially in program organization.

Other general limitations likewise should be kept in mind. It should be recognized that the study deals specifically with programs in French and Spanish and may not be applicable to programs involving other languages, especially in curriculum. Also, it should be borne in mind that when persons indicate practices of programs which they direct there is always a possibility that their responses may be biased in a favorable direction. However, this latter point does not appear to be a serious problem in this study in view of the rather weak ratings which most departments gave themselves. Finally it should be kept in mind that no attempt was made in this study to determine if a student who is taught under the influence of a given item or a given combination of items learns more than a student who is taught in a different manner.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(1) American Council of Learned Societies. "The Role of Linguistics and Linguistic Analysis in Programs Under Title VI of the National Defense Education Act of 1958." Hispania, XLIII (December, 1960), 604-606.

(2) Andersson, Theodore. "A Program for the Foreign Language Major." Reports of Surveys and Studies in the Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages, Modern Language Association (1959-61), 174-175.

(3) Associated Colleges of the Midwest. Experimental Refining and Strengthening of Undergraduate Foreign Language Curricula With Supporting Research in Teaching Techniques. United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Contract No. 8833. 1964.

(4) Ausubel, David B. "Adults Versus Children in Second-Language Learning: Psychological Considerations." Modern Language Journal, XLVIII (November, 1964), 420-424.

(5) Axelrod, Joseph and Donald N. Bigelow. Resources for Language and Area Studies. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1962.

(6) Azarian, Garo S. "Major and Minor Fields." Modern Language Journal, XLIV (January, 1960), 5-6.

(7) Babridge, Homer D. "Thoughts for the Future." Modern Language Journal, XLIX (January, 1965), 15-19.

(8) Barrutia, Richard. "Why Are Foreign Languages Better Taught At the High School Level Than At the College Level," Hispania LXVII (March, 1964), 117-119.

(9) _____. "Some Misconceptions About the Fundamental Skills Method." Hispania, XLIX (September, 1966), 440-446.

(10) Belyayev, B. V. The Psychology of Teaching Foreign Languages, tr. R. F. Hingley. New York: MacMillan Co., 1964.

(11) Bloomfield, Leonard. Outline Guide For The Practical Study of Languages. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America, 1942.

(12) Bowen, Donald J. and Robert P. Stockwell. Patterns of Spanish Pronunciation. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

(13) Brooks, Nelson. Language and Language Learning. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1960.

(14) _____. "The Ideal Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers." Modern Language Journal, L (February, 1966), 71-78.

(15) _____. "Preservice Training for Language Teachers." Modern Foreign Languages in the High School. Ed. Marjorie C. Johnston. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin No. 16. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1958. 135-139.

(16) Brubacker, John S. and Rudy Willis. Higher Education in Transition. New York: Harper, 1958.

(17) Bull, William E. Spanish For Teachers. New York: Ronald Press, 1965.

(18) Carroll, John B. "What the Foreign Language Teacher-Trainer or Supervisor Should Know About Programmed Instruction in the Foreign Language Field." Seminar in Language and Language Learning, Seattle: University of Washington, Department of Romance Languages and Literature, 1962, 10-38.

(19) _____. "Research on Teaching Foreign Languages." Handbook of Research on Teaching, Ed. N. L. Gage. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963, 1060-1100.

(20) Childers, J. Wesley. Foreign Language Teaching. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1964.

(21) Claudel, Calvin Andre. "Parroting and Progressive French Teaching." French Review, XXXIX (October, 1965), 120-123.

(22) De La Harpe, Jacqueline E. "The Teacher of Literature." Seminar in Language and Language Learning, Seattle: University of Washington, Department of Romance Languages and Literature, 1962, 39-47.

(23) Freeman, Stephen A. "Modern Languages for a Changing World." Curricular Change in the Foreign Languages, Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1963, 6-14.

(24) Gaarder, A. Bruce. "Possibilities and Problems of the Foreign Language Laboratory." Modern Techniques in Foreign Language Teaching. Ed. Elliott H. Kone. Bulletin of the Connecticut Audio-Visual Education Association, 19, 1959-60, 31-35.

(25) _____. "The Basic Course in Modern Foreign Languages." Reports of Surveys and Studies in the Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages, Modern Language Association, 1959-61, 168-172.

(26) Gaudin, Lois S. "The Language Laboratory and Advanced Work." Modern Language Journal, XLVI (February, 1962), 79-81.

(27) Hall, E. T. The Silent Language. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1959.

(28) Halliday, M. A. K. et al. The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.

(29) Hamilton, Earle. "The Audio-Lingual Method in the University: Fad or Panacea." Hispania, XLIX (September, 1966), 434-439.

(30) Hartsook, John H. "The Function and Techniques of the Foreign Language Laboratory." Modern Techniques in Teaching Foreign Languages. Ed. Elliot H. Kone. Bulletin of the Connecticut Audio-Visual Education Association, 19, 1959-60, 15-27.

(31) Hayes, Alfred S. Language Laboratory Facilities: Technical Guide for the Selection, Purchase, Use, and Maintenance. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin No. 37. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.

(32) Hocking, Elton. Language Laboratory and Language Learning. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1963.

(33) Holton, James S. et al. Sound Language Teaching. New York: University Publishers, 1961.

(34) Hutchinson, Joseph C. "The Technology of Modern Language Learning." Curricular Change in the Foreign Languages, Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1963, 53-61.

(35) _____. "The Language Laboratory, How Effective Is It?" School Life, (January-February, 1964), 14-41.

(36) Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools. The Teaching of Modern Languages. London: University of London Press, 1956.

(37) Johnston, Marjorie C. "Foreign Language Instruction." Review of Educational Research. 31 (April, 1961), 188-196.

(38) _____, and Catherine C. Seerley. Foreign Language Laboratories In Schools and Colleges. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin No. 3. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959.

(39) Jones, Willis Knapp. "Placement Tests in Spanish: Why and How." Hispania, XL (September, 1957), 321-325.

(40) Kingsley, Howard L. and Ralph Garry. The Nature and Conditions of Learning. 2nd Ed., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1957.

(41) Lado, Robert. Language Teaching, A Scientific Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

(42) _____. Language Testing. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

(43) Leavitt, Sturgis E. "The Teaching of Spanish in the United States." Hispania, XLIV (December, 1961) 591-625.

(44) Locke, William N. "The Future of Language Laboratories." Modern Language Journal, XLIX (May, 1965) 294-304.

(45) _____. "To Record or Not." Modern Language Journal, XLIV (October, 1960), 278-279.

(46) London, G. H. and Robert G. J. Mead. "A Program of Hispanic Studies for the College Student." Hispania, XLIV (May, 1961), 383-406.

(47) MacAllister, Archibald, T. "The Preparation of College Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXIX (May, 1964), 29-43.

(48) Marty, Fernand L. Methods and Equipment For The Language Laboratory. Middlebury, Vermont: Audio Visual Publications, 1956.

(49) Maza, Herbert. "American Students Abroad: A Proposal for Standards." Modern Language Journal, XLVII (January, 1963), 4-7.

(50) Mead, Robert G., Jr. "NDEA 1958-63." Hispania, XLVII (May, 1964), 371.

(51) _____. "Foreign Language Teaching in College: A Set of Recommendations." Hispania, XLIV (May, 1961), 327-329.

(52) _____. "When Is A Language Class Too Big." Hispania, XLI (December, 1958), 502-503.

(53) Meras, Edmond A. A Language Teacher's Guide. New York: Harper, 1962.

(54) Mildenburger, Kenneth W. "Three Years of the Language Development Program (NDEA) Title VI." Modern Language Journal, XLVI (November, 1961), 289.

(55) Modern Language Association. "Foreign Language Teaching in College: A Set of Recommendations and Workpapers." Reports of Surveys and Studies in the Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages. 1959-61.

(56) _____. "Guidelines for Teacher Education Programs in Modern Foreign Languages." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXXI (May, 1966), A2-A3.

(57) Morton, F. Rand. "The Teaching Machine and the Teaching of Languages: A Report on Tomorrow." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXV (September, 1960) 1-6.

(58) Moulton, William G. "Applied Linguistics in the Classroom." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXVI (May, 1961), 1-6.

(59) National Education Association. Modern Foreign Languages and the Academically Talented Student. New York, 1960.

(60) Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1961. Modern Language Teaching in School and College. Ed. Seymour L. Flaxman. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.

(61) _____, 1964. Reports of the Working Committees. Ed. George Fenwick Jones. Baltimore: Waverly Press, 1964.

(62) _____, 1962. Reports on the Working Committees. Ed. William F. Bottiglia. Manchester, New Hampshire: Lew A. Cummings Co., 1962.

(63) _____, 1960. Culture in Language Learning. Ed. G. Reginald Bishop, Jr. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960.

(64) _____, 1965. Foreign Language Teaching: Challenges to the Profession. Ed. G. Reginald Bishop, Jr. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.

(65) O'Connor, Patricia. Modern Foreign Languages In High School: Pre-Reading Instruction. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin No. 9, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

(66) Osgood, C. E. Method and Theory in Experimental Psychology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.

(67) Orwen, Gifford P. "The Fate of the Foreign Language Club." Modern Language Journal, XLVIII (April, 1964), 234-236.

(68) Owen, Gifford. "Housecleaning in the Literature Department." Modern Language Journal, XLV (October, 1961), 239-243.

(69) Parker, William Riley. The National Interest and Foreign Languages. 3rd Ed., Department of State, U.S. National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1962.

(70) Politzer, Robert L. "Student Motivation and Interest in Elementary Language Courses." Language Learning, V (1953-54), 15-21.

(71) _____. Foreign Language Learning. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1965.

(72) _____, and Charles N. Staubach. Teaching Spanish: A Linguistic Orientation. New York: Ginn, 1961.

(73) Reindorp, Reginald C. "The Role of the Laboratory in the Foreign Language Program." Hispania, XLV (December, 1962), 829-836.

(74) Remer, Ilo. A Handbook for Guiding Students in Modern Foreign Languages. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin No. 26. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.

(75) Reynolds, F. Leon. "A Teachers' Course in Methods." Modern Language Journal, XXXVI (April, 1952), 184-185.

(76) Richards, S. E. and Joan E. Appel. "The Effects of Written Words In Beginning Spanish." Modern Language Journal, XL (March, 1956), 129-133.

(77) Rivers, Wilga M. The Psychologist and the Foreign Language Teacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

(78) _____. "Listening Comprehension." Modern Language Journal, L (April, 1966), 196-204.

(79) Schmitz, John Robert. "The Role of Practice Teaching in the Preparation of High School Foreign Language Teachers." Hispania, XLIX (March, 1966), 101-107.

(80) Stack, Edward M. "Advances in Language Teaching in the United States." Advances in the Teaching of Modern Languages. Vol. 1. Ed. B. Libbish. New York: MacMillan Co., 1964, 66-82.

(81) _____. The Language Laboratory and Modern Language Teaching. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

(82) Stein, Jack. "Preparation of College and University Language Teachers." Publications of the Modern Language Association, LXXVI (May, 1961), 12-14.

(83) Stockwell, Robert P. and J. Donald Bowen. The Sounds of English and Spanish. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

(84) Strevens, Peter. Papers in Language and Language Teaching. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.

(85) Tilles, Solomon H. "A Revised Spanish Major." Hispania, XLVIII (December, 1965), 869-870.

(86) Turner, Daymond. "Occupation: Language Laboratory Director." Modern Language Journal, XLVIII (March, 1964), 151-154.

(87) U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Report on the National Defense Education Act Fiscal Years 1961 and 1962. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.

(88) _____. Earned Degrees Conferred, 1962-63. Circular No. 719. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.

(89) Waas, Glenn. "College-High School Conferences on Foreign Language Teaching." Modern Language Journal, XLVIII (April, 1964), 236-238.

(90) Walsh, Donald D. "The Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages in the United States." Advances in the Teaching of Modern Languages. Vol. 1, Ed. B. Libbish. New York: MacMillan Co., 1964, 83-90.

(91) Wilson, Jacques M. P. "Time, A Constant Factor in Second Language Learning." Hispania, XLVIII (May, 1965), 311-313.

APPENDIX A

Code Number ___

Explanation: This study contains a list of components and practices which could be a part of an undergraduate program of modern foreign languages. You are to rate the items as you judge them to be important to a sound program on the undergraduate level. You are not to be concerned about feasibility of the component in relation to budget but rather about judging the component solely for its importance to a sound program. You are to make your ratings by circling one of the five responses provided. A space has been provided after each item should you wish to explain your answer.

PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

Answer Key:
5 - of absolute importance
4 - of great importance
3 - of medium importance
2 - of little importance
1 - of no importance

Items:	Circle One Number:
1. Undergraduate course in linguistics.	[1 2 3 4 5]
2. Undergraduate course for future teachers in methods of teaching a foreign language.	[1 2 3 4 5]
3. Undergraduate course in French phonetics.	[1 2 3 4 5]
4. Undergraduate course in Spanish phonetics.	[1 2 3 4 5]
5. Undergraduate course in the culture and civilization of the foreign country.	[1 2 3 4 5]
6. Undergraduate course in "conversation and composition" (beyond elementary and intermediate language courses).	[1 2 3 4 5]
7. Undergraduate survey course in French literature.	[1 2 3 4 5]
8. Undergraduate survey courses for Spanish majors in both the literatures of Spain and of Hispanic America.	[1 2 3 4 5]
9. Proficiency exams to determine placement of students who have studied foreign languages in high school.	[1 2 3 4 5]
10. First-year language classes limited to approximately fifteen students.	[1 2 3 4 5]

Answer Key:
5 - of absolute importance
4 - of great importance
3 - of medium importance
2 - of little importance
1 - of no importance

11.	Undergraduate student majoring in only one foreign language as opposed to carrying a double major in two languages simultaneously.	[1 2 3 4 5]
12.	Lab drill for first-year students limited to approximately 20 minutes at one sitting.	[1 2 3 4 5]
13.	Faculty member designated as lab director.	[1 2 3 4 5]
14.	Lab director, if member of teaching faculty, given reduced teaching load.	[1 2 3 4 5]
15.	A special intensive language course which doubles or triples the time ordinarily spent in the conventional language course.	[1 2 3 4 5]
16.	A beginning language course based on "programmed learning" so that students may work at their own pace.	[1 2 3 4 5]
17.	Foreign language clubs.	[1 2 3 4 5]
18.	Language house or residential unit in which only the foreign language being studied is permitted.	[1 2 3 4 5]
19.	Language tables for language practice during meals.	[1 2 3 4 5]
20.	Study or residence abroad for undergraduate majors.	[1 2 3 4 5]
21.	Placement of students preparing for teaching careers in practice teaching assignments only under school teachers whose teaching methods closely approximate those advocated by the college.	[1 2 3 4 5]
22.	Supervision of practice teachers by a Foreign Language Specialist as opposed to an Education Specialist.	[1 2 3 4 5]
23.	Supervision of graduate teaching assistants (if employed) in their teaching duties.	[1 2 3 4 5]

Answer Key:
5 - of absolute importance
4 - of great importance
3 - of medium importance
2 - of little importance
1 - of no importance

24.	Graduate Teaching Assistants (if employed) required to take a course in methods of teaching a foreign language.	[1 2 3 4 5]
25.	Graduate Teaching Assistants not to be employed.	[1 2 3 4 5]
26.	Residence abroad as a prerequisite for appointment of faculty members.	[1 2 3 4 5]

THE LANGUAGE LABORATORY

27.	Electronic equipment ("language lab") for student drill.	[1 2 3 4 5]
28.	Activated headphones to permit each student to hear more clearly his own sound production.	[1 2 3 4 5]
29.	Individual tape recorders which permit each student to record his answers to the master voice.	[1 2 3 4 5]
30.	A library system of tapes whereby each student may play his own tape and stop it at any time for review.	[1 2 3 4 5]
31.	Individual booths in the lab.	[1 2 3 4 5]
32.	Taped material in the lab integrated with material presented in the classroom.	[1 2 3 4 5]
33.	Lab used for testing oral achievement.	[1 2 3 4 5]
34.	Monitoring facilities in the lab.	[1 2 3 4 5]
35.	Overhead projector integrated with the lab to provide audio-visual experiences.	[1 2 3 4 5]

METHODS OF INSTRUCTION

36.	Teaching language skills in the following order: listening, speaking, reading, writing.	[1 2 3 4 5]

Answer Key:
5 - of absolute importance
4 - of great importance
3 - of medium importance
2 - of little importance
1 - of no importance

37. Specially designed lessons in ear training for beginning students. [1 2 3 4 5]

38. Specially designed lessons for teaching pronunciation to beginning students. [1 2 3 4 5]

39. Specially designed lessons for teaching reading. [1 2 3 4 5]

40. Specially designed lessons for teaching writing. [1 2 3 4 5]

41. Withholding graphic symbols until the student has had a chance to hear and pronounce the material. [1 2 3 4 5]

42. Emphasizing drills on language patterns. [1 2 3 4 5]

43. Choral recitation as a major device for learning patterns. [1 2 3 4 5]

44. Teaching grammatical principles inductively. [1 2 3 4 5]

45. Minimizing vocabulary until common structures of the language have been learned. [1 2 3 4 5]

46. Teaching vocabulary only in context. [1 2 3 4 5]

47. Using dialogs as a major drill device. [1 2 3 4 5]

48. Using target language at speed of native speakers. [1 2 3 4 5]

49. Conducting beginning language classes almost totally in the target language. [1 2 3 4 5]

50. Teaching writing with a high degree of control at first as opposed to free composition. [1 2 3 4 5]

51. Conducting undergraduate courses of literature in the foreign language as opposed to the native language. [1 2 3 4 5]

52. Emphasizing teaching the culture of the foreign country in addition to teaching the language. [1 2 3 4 5]

Answer Key:
5 - of absolute importance
4 - of great importance
3 - of medium importance
2 - of little importance
1 - of no importance

53. Using the lab for listening to plays and poetry as a part of literature courses. [1 2 3 4 5]

54. Using the lab for listening to speeches, symposia, and the like as a part of advanced language courses. [1 2 3 4 5]

55. Using tests which avoid making the student revert to his native language. [1 2 3 4 5]

56. Testing beginning language students primarily on listening comprehension and speaking. [1 2 3 4 5]

57. Relating language testing to drills done in the lab. [1 2 3 4 5]

58. Using the lab primarily for drill on material already covered in the classroom. [1 2 3 4 5]

59. Using the lab primarily to prepare students with new material for classroom recitation. [1 2 3 4 5]

60. Reducing the tendency of beginning students from thinking in their native language as they use the foreign language. [1 2 3 4 5]

GENERAL INFORMATION

Please check the appropriate space:

1. What is your major area of interest?

___ Literature
___ Linguistics
___ Training of elementary and secondary school teachers
___ Other (please indicate area)

2. Does your department emphasize one area over another?
___ Yes
___ No

If Yes, which area?

___ Literature
___ Linguistics
___ Training of elementary and secondary school teachers
___ Other (please indicate area)

3. What is your highest degree as department head?

___ Bachelor
___ Master
___ Doctor

NAME OF RESPONDENT _____

INSTITUTION _____

APPENDIX B

TABLE VIII

YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE OF DEPARTMENT HEADS
FROM 1961 THROUGH 1965

Number of Department Heads	Years of Experience	
66	Administrative:	5
	Teaching:	-
1	Administrative:	4
	Teaching:	1
5	Administrative:	3
	Teaching:	2
2	Administrative:	3
	Teaching	1
8	Administrative:	2
	Teaching:	3
6	Administrative:	2
	Teaching:	1
21	Administrative:	1
	Teaching:	4
5	Administrative:	1
	Teaching:	1
8	Administrative:	1
	Teaching:	0

APPENDIX C

Code Number ___

INSTRUCTIONS: CHECK YES OR NO AS TO WHETHER THE ITEM IS CURRENTLY A PART OF YOUR PROGRAM OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES ON THE UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL.

PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

1. Undergraduate course in linguistics. [YES___NO___]
2. Undergraduate course for future teachers in methods of teaching a foreign language. [YES___NO___]
3. Undergraduate course in French phonetics. [YES___NO___]
4. Undergraduate course in Spanish phonetics. [YES___NO___]
5. Undergraduate course in the culture and civilization of the foreign country. [YES___NO___]
6. Undergraduate course(s) in "conversation and composition" (beyond elementary and intermediate language courses). [YES___NO___]
7. Undergraduate survey course in French literature. (If NO, please list French literature courses offered on the undergraduate level). [YES___NO___]
8. Undergraduate survey course in literature of Spain. (If NO, please list Spanish literature courses offered on the undergraduate level). [YES___NO___]
9. Undergraduate survey course in Hispanic American Literature. (If NO, please list Hispanic American literature courses offered on the undergraduate level). [YES___NO___]
10. Proficiency exams to determine placement of students who have studied foreign languages in high school. [YES___NO___]
11. First-year language classes limited to approximately fifteen students. [YES___NO___]
12. Undergraduate students encouraged to major in only one foreign language rather than to carry a double major in two languages simultaneously. [YES___NO___]
13. Lab drill for first-year students limited to approximately 20 minutes at one sitting. [YES___NO___]
14. Faculty member designated as lab director. [YES___NO___]

15. Lab director, if member of teaching faculty, given reduced teaching load. [YES___NO___]

16. A special intensive language course which doubles or triples the time ordinarily spent in the conventional language course. [YES___NO___]

17. A beginning language course based on "programmed learning" so that students may work at their own pace. [YES___NO___]

18. Foreign language clubs. [YES___NO___]

19. Language house or residential unit in which only the foreign language being studied is permitted. [YES___NO___]

20. Language tables for language practice during meals. [YES___NO___]

21. Study abroad program for undergraduate students. (If YES, please check one of these: Summer Study ___; Academic Year Study ___; Both ___). [YES___NO___]

22. Placement of prospective teachers in practice teaching assignments only under school teachers whose teaching methods closely approximate those advocated by the college. [YES___NO___]

23. Supervision of practice teachers by a Foreign Language Specialist rather than by an Education Specialist. [YES___NO___]

24. Supervision of graduate teaching assistants (if employed) in their teaching duties. [YES___NO___]

25. Graduate teaching assistants (if employed) required to take a course in methods of teaching a foreign language. [YES___NO___]

26. Residence abroad as a prerequisite for appointment of faculty members. [YES___NO___]

THE LANGUAGE LABORATORY

27. Electronic equipment ("language lab") for student drill. [YES___NO___]

28. Activated headphones to permit each student to hear more clearly his own sound production. [YES___NO___]

29. Individual tape recorders which permit each student to record his answers to the master voice. [YES___NO___]

30. A library system of tapes whereby each student may play his own tape and stop it any time for review. [YES___NO___]

31. Individual booths in the lab. [YES___NO___]

32. Taped material in the lab integrated with material presented in the classroom. [YES___NO___]

33. Lab used for testing oral achievement. [YES___NO___]

34. Monitoring facilities in the lab. [YES___NO___]

35. Overhead projector integrated with the lab to provide audio-visual experiences. [YES___NO___]

METHODS OF INSTRUCTION

INSTRUCTIONS: ON THIS SECTION YOU ARE ASKED TO MAKE AS ACCURATE AN ESTIMATE AS YOU CAN AS TO THE EXTENT WHICH EACH ITEM IS CURRENTLY PRACTICED BY YOUR TEACHING PERSONNEL. PLEASE BE SURE TO INDICATE ONLY WHAT YOU BELIEVE TO BE PRACTICED, AND NOT WHAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO SEE PRACTICED. INDICATE BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER.

Key:

1 - Practiced to a large extent (by 50% or more of teaching personnel).
2 - Practiced to a limited extent (by less than 50% of teaching personnel).
3 - Not practiced (by any teaching personnel).

Items having to do with practices of teaching personnel in beginning courses in modern foreign languages:

36. Teaching language skills in the following order: listening, speaking, reading, writing. [1 2 3]

37. Specially designed lessons in ear training for beginning students. [1 2 3]

38. Specially designed lessons for teaching pronunciation to beginning students. [1 2 3]

39. Specially designed lessons for teaching reading. [1 2 3]

40. Specially designed lessons for teaching writing. [1 2 3]

41. Withholding graphic symbols until the student has had a chance to hear and pronounce the material. [1 2 3]

42. Emphasizing drills on language patterns. [1 2 3]

Key:

1 - Practiced to a large extent (by 50% or more of teaching personnel).
2 - Practiced to a limited extent (by less than 50% of teaching personnel).
3 - Not practiced (by any of teaching personnel).

43. Choral recitation as a major device for learning patterns. [1 2 3]

44. Teaching grammatical principles inductively. [1 2 3]

45. Minimizing vocabulary until common structures of the language have been learned. [1 2 3]

46. Teaching vocabulary only in context. [1 2 3]

47. Using dialogs as a major drill device. [1 2 3]

48. Using target language at speed of native speakers. [1 2 3]

49. Conducting beginning language classes almost totally in the target language. [1 2 3]

50. Teaching writing with a high degree of control at first rather than through free composition. [1 2 3]

51. Emphasizing teaching the culture of the foreign country in addition to teaching the language. [1 2 3]

52. Using tests which avoid making the student revert to his native language. [1 2 3]

53. Testing beginning language students primarily on listening comprehension and speaking. [1 2 3]

54. Relating language testing to drills done in the lab. [1 2 3]

55. Using the lab primarily for drill on material already covered in the classroom. [1 2 3]

56. Using the lab primarily to prepare students with new material for classroom recitation. [1 2 3]

57. Reducing the tendency of beginning students from thinking in their native language as they use the foreign language. [1 2 3]

Items having to do with practices of teaching personnel in undergraduate courses in literature of modern foreign language:

58. Conducting undergraduate courses of literature in the foreign language rather than in the native language. [1 2 3]

Key:

1 - Practiced to a large extent (by 50% or more of teaching personnel).
2 - Practiced to a limited extent (by less than 50% of teaching personnel).
3 - Not practiced (by any of teaching personnel).

59. Using the lab for listening to plays and poetry as a part of literature courses. [1 2 3]

Items having to do with practices of teaching personnel in advanced language courses:

60. Using the lab for listening to speeches, symposia, and the like as a part of advanced language courses. [1 2 3]

NAME OF RESPONDENT _____

APPENDIX D

TABLE IX

SCORES OF ITEMS BY DEPARTMENTS IN PROGRAM ORGANIZATION

Dept. 1		Dept. 2		Dept. 3		Dept. 4		Dept. 5		Dept. 6		Dept. 7		Dept. 8	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
1	0	1	0	1	3.22	1	3.22	1	3.22	1	0	1	0	1	3.22
2	0	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	0	2	0	2	0
3	0	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	0
4	0	4	3.86	4	0	4	3.86	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	0
5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	0	5	0	5	4.36	5	0
6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75
7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	0	7	4.34
8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	0	8	0	8	0	8	4.33
9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	0	9	0	9	4.33	9	4.33
10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58
11	4.06	11	0	11	0	11	4.06	11	4.06	11	0	11	4.06	11	4.06
12	2.97	12	2.97	12	0	12	0	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97
13	0	13	3.53	13	0	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	3.53
14	0	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41
16	0	16	0	16	0	16	3.18	16	3.18	16	0	16	0	16	3.18
17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	2.56	17	0
18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	0	18	0	18	3.47	18	3.47
19	0	19	3.73	19	3.73	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	3.73	19	0
20	0	20	3.66	20	0	20	0	20	0	20	3.66	20	3.66	20	3.66
21	0	21	4.04	21	0	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	0
22	0	22	0	22	3.45	22	3.45	22	0	22	0	22	3.45	22	0
23	0	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	0	23	4.71	23	0
26	0	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	3.56	26	0	26	3.56	26	3.56

TABLE IX (Continued)

Dept. 9		Dept. 10		Dept. 11		Dept. 12		Dept. 13		Dept. 14		Dept. 15		Dept. 16	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
1	3.22	1	3.22	1	3.22	1	0	1	0	1	3.22	1	0	1	3.22
2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15
3	0	3	4.15	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15
4	0	4	3.86	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86
5	0	5	4.36	5	0	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36
6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75
7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	0	7	4.34
8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	0	8	0
9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	0	9	0
10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58
11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	4.06	11	0	11	0
12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	0	12	0	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97
13	0	13	0	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	3.53
14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	0	14	3.41	14	0	14	0
16	3.18	16	3.18	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	3.18	16	3.18	16	0
17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0
18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47
19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0
20	0	20	0	20	0	20	0	20	0	20	0	20	0	20	0
21	4.04	21	0	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	0	21	4.04	21	0	21	4.04
22	3.45	22	0	22	0	22	3.45	22	0	22	0	22	3.45	22	3.45
23	4.71	23	0	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	0	23	4.71	23	0
26	3.56	26	0	26	3.56	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	0

TABLE IX (Continued)

Dept. 17		Dept. 18		Dept. 19		Dept. 20		Dept. 21		Dept. 22		Dept. 23		Dept. 24	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
1	3.22	1	0	1	3.22	1	0	1	3.22	1	3.22	1	0	1	3.22
2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	0	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15
3	0	3	0	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15
4	0	4	0	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86
5	0	5	4.36	5	0	5	0	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36
6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75
7	0	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34
8	0	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33
9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33
10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	0	10	4.58
11	4.06	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	4.06
12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	0	12	0	12	2.97
13	3.53	13	0	13	3.53	13	0	13	0	13	0	13	0	13	0
14	3.41	14	0	14	0	14	0	14	0	14	3.41	14	0	14	0
16	0	16	3.18	16	0	16	3.18	16	3.18	16	3.18	16	3.18	16	3.18
17	2.56	17	0	17	2.56	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0
18	3.47	18	3.47	18	0	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47
19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	3.73	19	3.73
20	3.66	20	3.66	20	0	20	3.66	20	0	20	3.66	20	3.66	20	0
21	0	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	0	21	4.04	21	4.04
22	3.45	22	0	22	3.45	22	0	22	0	22	3.45	22	3.45	22	3.45
23	4.71	23	0	23	4.71	23	0	23	0	23	4.71	23	0	23	4.71
26	0	26	0	26	3.56	26	0	26	3.56	26	0	26	0	26	0

TABLE IX (Continued)

Dept. 25		Dept. 26		Dept. 27		Dept. 28		Dept. 29		Dept. 30		Dept. 31		Dept. 32	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
1	0	1	3.22	1	3.22	1	0	1	3.22	1	3.22	1	0	1	3.22
2	0	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15
3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15
4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	0	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86
5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	0	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36
6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75
7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34
8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	0	8	0
9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33
10	0	10	0	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58
11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	4.06	11	0	11	0	11	0
12	2.97	12	2.97	12	0	12	2.97	12	0	12	0	12	0	12	2.97
13	0	13	3.53	13	0	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	0	13	0	13	3.53
14	3.41	14	3.41	14	0	14	0	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41
16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	3.18	16	0
17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0
18	3.47	18	0	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47
19	0	19	0	19	3.73	19	3.73	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0
20	0	20	0	20	3.66	20	3.66	20	3.66	20	0	20	0	20	0
21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	0	21	0	21	0
22	0	22	0	22	0	22	0	22	0	22	3.45	22	3.45	22	0
23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	0
26	3.56	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	3.56

TABLE IX (Continued)

Dept. 33		Dept. 34		Dept. 35		Dept. 36		Dept. 37		Dept. 38		Dept. 39		Dept. 40	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
1	3.22	1	3.22	1	3.22	1	0	1	3.22	1	3.22	1	3.22	1	0
2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15
3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	0	3	4.15
4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	0	4	3.86
5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36
6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75
7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34
8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33
9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33
10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	0	10	0
11	0	11	0	11	4.06	11	4.06	11	4.06	11	0	11	0	11	0
12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	0	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	0	12	2.97
13	3.53	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	0	13	3.53	13	3.53
14	0	14	0	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41
16	0	16	3.18	16	0	16	3.18	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0
17	0	17	0	17	2.56	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0
18	0	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47
19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	3.73	19	3.73	19	0	19	0
20	0	20	0	20	0	20	3.66	20	0	20	3.66	20	0	20	0
21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04
22	3.45	22	0	22	3.45	22	3.45	22	3.45	22	0	22	0	22	3.45
23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	0	23	4.71	23	0	23	4.71
26	0	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	3.56	26	0	26	0	26	0

TABLE IX (Continued)

Dept. 41		Dept. 42		Dept. 43		Dept. 44		Dept. 45		Dept. 46		Dept. 47		Dept. 48	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
1	3.22	1	0	1	3.22	1	0	1	3.22	1	0	1	3.22	1	3.22
2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	0	2	0	2	4.15	2	4.15
3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15
4	3.86	4	3.86	4	0	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86
5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	0	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36
6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75
7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34
8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33
9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33
10	0	10	0	10	4.58	10	0	10	0	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58
11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0
12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	0	12	0	12	2.97
13	0	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	0	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	0	13	0
14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	0	14	0	14	0	14	3.41
16	0	16	0	16	3.18	16	0	16	0	16	3.18	16	0	16	0
17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0
18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	0
19	3.73	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0
20	3.66	20	0	20	3.66	20	0	20	0	20	3.66	20	3.66	20	0
21	4.04	21	4.04	21	0	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	0
22	0	22	0	22	3.45	22	0	22	0	22	0	22	0	22	3.45
23	4.71	23	0	23	4.71	23	0	23	0	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71
26	0	26	0	26	3.56	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	3.56	26	0

TABLE IX (Continued)

Dept. 49		Dept. 50		Dept. 51		Dept. 52		Dept. 53		Dept. 54		Dept. 55		Dept. 56	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
1	0	1	3.22	1	0	1	3.22	1	3.22	1	0	1	3.22	1	3.22
2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15
3	4.15	3	0	3	4.15	3	0	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15
4	3.86	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	0
5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36
6	4.75	6	0	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75
7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	0	7	0	7	0	7	0
8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	0	8	0	8	0	8	4.33
9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	0	9	0	9	0	9	4.33
10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	0	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58
11	0	11	0	11	4.06	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0
12	0	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97
13	0	13	0	13	0	13	0	13	3.53	13	0	13	3.53	13	3.53
14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	0	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41
16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	3.18	16	3.18	16	0
17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	2.56	17	0	17	0
18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47
19	0	19	3.73	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0
20	0	20	3.66	20	3.66	20	0	20	0	20	3.66	20	3.66	20	0
21	4.04	21	0	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04
22	0	22	0	22	3.45	22	0	22	0	22	3.45	22	3.45	22	3.45
23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	0	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71
26	0	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	3.56	26	0	26	3.56

TABLE IX (Continued)

Dept. 57		Dept. 58		Dept. 59		Dept. 60		Dept. 61		Dept. 62		Dept. 63		Dept. 64	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
1	3.22	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.22	1	0	1	3.22	1	3.22
2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0
3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	4.15	3	0
4	3.86	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	0
5	0	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	0	5	4.36	5	4.36
6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75
7	0	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	0	7	0	7	4.34	7	4.34
8	0	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	0	8	0	8	4.33	8	4.33
9	0	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	0	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33
10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	0	10	0	10	4.58	10	4.58
11	0	11	0	11	4.06	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	4.06	11	4.06
12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	0	12	2.97	12	2.97
13	0	13	3.53	13	0	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	0	13	3.53	13	3.53
14	3.41	14	3.41	14	0	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	0	14	3.41	14	3.41
16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0
17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0
18	0	18	0	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	0	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47
19	3.73	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	3.73	19	0
20	3.66	20	3.66	20	0	20	3.66	20	0	20	0	20	3.66	20	0
21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	0	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04
22	3.45	22	0	22	3.45	22	3.45	22	0	22	0	22	3.45	22	0
23	4.71	23	4.71	23	0	23	4.71	23	0	23	0	23	4.71	23	0
26	0	26	0	26	3.56	26	3.56	26	3.56	26	0	26	3.56	26	0

TABLE IX (Continued)

Dept. 65		Dept. 66		Dept. 67		Dept. 68		Dept. 69		Dept. 70		Dept. 71		Dept. 72	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
1	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.22	1	0	1	0	1	3.22	1	0
2	4.15	2	4.15	2	0	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15
3	0	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	4.15
4	0	4	3.86	4	0	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	3.86	4	0	4	3.86
5	0	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	0	5	4.36	5	4.36
6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75
7	4.34	7	0	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34
8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33
9	4.33	9	0	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33
10	4.58	10	4.58	10	4.58	10	0	10	0	10	0	10	4.58	10	0
11	0	11	0	11	4.06	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0
12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	0	12	0	12	0
13	3.53	13	0	13	3.53	13	0	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	0	13	3.53
14	3.41	14	0	14	0	14	0	14	0	14	0	14	3.41	14	3.41
16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0
17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0
18	3.47	18	0	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47
19	3.73	19	3.73	19	3.73	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0
20	3.66	20	3.66	20	3.66	20	0	20	0	20	3.66	20	0	20	0
21	4.04	21	0	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04
22	0	22	3.45	22	0	22	3.45	22	3.45	22	3.45	22	3.45	22	0
23	0	23	0	23	0	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	4.71
26	0	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	3.56	26	3.56	26	0

TABLE IX (Continued)

Dept. 73		Dept. 74		Dept. 75		Dept. 76		Dept. 77		Dept. 78		Dept. 79		Dept. 80	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
1	3.22	1	3.22	1	0	1	3.22	1	3.22	1	0	1	3.22	1	3.22
2	0	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15
3	4.15	3	4.15	3	0	3	0	3	4.15	3	0	3	4.15	3	0
4	3.86	4	0	4	0	4	0	4	3.86	4	0	4	0	4	0
5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	0
6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75
7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	0	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34
8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33
9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33
10	4.58	10	0	10	0	10	0	10	4.58	10	0	10	4.58	10	4.58
11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0
12	2.97	12	0	12	2.97	12	0	12	2.97	12	0	12	0	12	0
13	3.53	13	3.53	13	0	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	0	13	3.53	13	0
14	3.41	14	0	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	0	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	0
16	3.18	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	0
17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0
18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47
19	3.73	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0
20	3.66	20	0	20	0	20	0	20	3.66	20	0	20	0	20	0
21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	0	21	0	21	4.04
22	3.45	22	0	22	0	22	3.45	22	3.45	22	0	22	3.45	22	3.45
23	0	23	4.71	23	0	23	0	23	4.71	23	0	23	0	23	4.71
26	3.56	26	3.56	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	3.56	26	0

TABLE IX (Continued)

Dept. 81		Dept. 82		Dept. 83		Dept. 84		Dept. 85		Dept. 86		Dept. 87		Dept. 88	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
1	0	1	3.22	1	3.22	1	3.22	1	0	1	0	1	3.22	1	3.22
2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15	2	4.15
3	0	3	4.15	3	0	3	4.15	3	4.15	3	0	3	4.15	3	4.15
4	0	4	3.86	4	0	4	0	4	3.86	4	0	4	3.86	4	3.86
5	4.36	5	4.36	5	4.36	5	0	5	4.36	5	0	5	4.36	5	0
6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	4.75	6	0	6	4.75	6	0	6	4.75
7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34	7	4.34
8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33	8	4.33
9	0	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33	9	4.33
10	0	10	4.58	10	0	10	0	10	0	10	0	10	4.58	10	4.58
11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0	11	0
12	2.97	12	2.97	12	2.97	12	0	12	0	12	0	12	0	12	2.97
13	3.53	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	3.53	13	0	13	0	13	0	13	0
14	0	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	3.41	14	0	14	0	14	3.41	14	3.41
16	0	16	0	16	0	16	3.18	16	0	16	0	16	0	16	3.18
17	0	17	0	17	0	17	2.56	17	0	17	0	17	0	17	0
18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	3.47	18	0	18	3.47	18	3.47
19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0	19	0
20	0	20	0	20	0	20	0	20	0	20	0	20	3.66	20	0
21	0	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	4.04	21	0	21	0	21	4.04	21	4.04
22	0	22	3.45	22	3.45	22	3.45	22	3.45	22	3.45	22	0	22	0
23	0	23	0	23	0	23	4.71	23	0	23	4.71	23	4.71	23	0
26	0	26	3.56	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	0	26	3.56

TABLE IX (Continued)

OSU	
Item	Score
1	0
2	4.15
3	0
4	0
5	4.36
6	4.75
7	4.34
8	4.33
9	4.33
10	0
11	0
12	2.97
13	3.53
14	3.41
16	0
17	0
18	3.47
19	0
20	0
21	4.04
22	0
23	4.71
26	0

APPENDIX E

TABLE X

SCORES OF ITEMS BY DEPARTMENTS IN THE LANGUAGE LABORATORY

Dept. 1		Dept. 2		Dept. 3		Dept. 4		Dept. 5		Dept. 6		Dept. 7		Dept. 8	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29
28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13
29	4.10	29	0	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10
30	4.18	30	0	30	4.18	30	0	30	0	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18
31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55
32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76
33	4.11	33	0	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11
34	4.30	34	0	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30
35	0	35	0	35	0	35	3.30	35	3.30	35	0	35	3.30	35	3.30

TABLE X (Continued)

Dept. 9		Dept. 10		Dept. 11		Dept. 12		Dept. 13		Dept. 14		Dept. 15		Dept. 16	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29
28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13
29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10
30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	0
31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55
32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76
33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	0	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11
34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	0	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30
35	3.30	35	3.30	35	0	35	3.30	35	0	35	0	35	0	35	0

TABLE X (Continued)

Dept. 17		Dept. 18		Dept. 19		Dept. 20		Dept. 21		Dept. 22		Dept. 23		Dept. 24	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29
28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13
29	4.10	29	4.10	29	0	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10
30	4.18	30	4.18	30	0	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18
31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55
32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76
33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11
34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30
35	3.30	35	0	35	0	35	3.30	35	0	35	0	35	3.30	35	0

TABLE X (Continued)

Dept. 25		Dept. 26		Dept. 27		Dept. 28		Dept. 29		Dept. 30		Dept. 31		Dept. 32	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29
28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13
29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10
30	4.18	30	0	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	0	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18
31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55
32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76
33	4.11	33	0	33	0	33	0	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11
34	4.30	34	0	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30
35	0	35	0	35	3.30	35	3.30	35	0	35	0	35	0	35	0

TABLE X (Continued)

Dept. 33		Dept. 34		Dept. 35		Dept. 36		Dept. 37		Dept. 38		Dept. 39		Dept. 40	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29
28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13
29	4.10	29	4.10	29	0	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	0	29	4.10	29	4.10
30	4.18	30	4.18	30	0	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	0	30	4.18	30	4.18
31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55
32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76
33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	0	33	4.11
34	4.30	34	4.30	34	0	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30
35	3.30	35	0	35	3.30	35	3.30	35	0	35	3.30	35	0	35	0

TABLE X (Continued)

Dept. 41		Dept. 42		Dept. 43		Dept. 44		Dept. 45		Dept. 46		Dept. 47		Dept. 48	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29
28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	0
29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	0
30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	0	30	0	30	4.18	30	0
31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55
32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76
33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	0	33	0	33	0	33	4.11	33	4.11
34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	0
35	0	35	0	35	3.30	35	3.30	35	0	35	0	35	0	35	0

TABLE X (Continued)

Dept. 49		Dept. 50		Dept. 51		Dept. 52		Dept. 53		Dept. 54		Dept. 55		Dept. 56	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29
28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13
29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	0	29	4.10
30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18
31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55
32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76
33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	0	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11
34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30
35	0	35	0	35	3.30	35	0	35	0	35	0	35	0	35	3.30

TABLE X (Continued)

Dept. 57		Dept. 58		Dept. 59		Dept. 60		Dept. 61		Dept. 62		Dept. 63		Dept. 64	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29
28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13
29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	0	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10
30	0	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	0	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18
31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55
32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76
33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	0	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	0
34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30
35	0	35	0	35	0	35	3.30	35	0	35	0	35	0	35	0

TABLE X (Continued)

Dept. 65		Dept. 66		Dept. 67		Dept. 68		Dept. 69		Dept. 70		Dept. 71		Dept. 72	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29
28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13
29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10
30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	0	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18
31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55
32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76
33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11
34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30
35	0	35	0	35	3.30	35	0	35	3.30	35	0	35	3.30	35	3.30

TABLE X (Continued)

Dept. 73		Dept. 74		Dept. 75		Dept. 76		Dept. 77		Dept. 78		Dept. 79		Dept. 80	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29
28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13
29	0	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	0
30	0	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	0	30	4.18	30	4.18
31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55
32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76
33	4.11	33	0	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	0	33	4.11	33	0
34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30
35	0	35	0	35	3.30	35	0	35	0	35	0	35	0	35	0

TABLE X (Continued)

Dept. 81		Dept. 82		Dept. 83		Dept. 84		Dept. 85		Dept. 86		Dept. 87		Dept. 88	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29	27	4.29
28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13	28	4.13
29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	4.10	29	0	29	0	29	4.10
30	4.18	30	0	30	4.18	30	4.18	30	0	30	0	30	0	30	4.18
31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55	31	4.55
32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76	32	4.76
33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	4.11	33	0	33	4.11	33	0	33	0
34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30	34	4.30
35	0	35	0	35	0	35	3.30	35	0	35	0	35	0	35	0

TABLE X (Continued)

OSU	
Item	Score
27	4.29
28	4.13
29	4.10
30	4.18
31	4.55
32	4.76
33	0
34	4.30
35	0

APPENDIX F

TABLE XI

SCORES OF ITEMS BY DEPARTMENTS IN METHODS OF INSTRUCTION

Dept. 1		Dept. 2		Dept. 3		Dept. 4		Dept. 5		Dept. 6		Dept. 7		Dept. 8	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
36	4.12	36	2.06	36	2.06	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12
37	0	37	1.94	37	1.94	37	3.88	37	3.88	37	0	37	1.94	37	3.88
38	0	38	4.26	38	0	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	0	38	4.26	38	4.26
39	0	39	1.88	39	0	39	1.88	39	0	39	0	39	1.88	39	3.75
40	0	40	1.89	40	0	40	1.89	40	0	40	0	40	1.89	40	3.78
41	0	41	0	41	1.57	41	0	41	0	41	3.13	41	3.13	41	0
42	0	42	3.92	42	1.96	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	1.96	42	3.92
43	1.62	43	1.62	43	1.62	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	0	43	1.62	43	1.62
44	3.69	44	1.85	44	1.85	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	3.69
45	1.72	45	1.72	45	1.72	45	1.72	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43
46	4.10	46	0	46	2.05	46	2.05	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	0
47	0	47	1.83	47	1.83	47	3.65	47	0	47	3.65	47	1.83	47	3.65
48	3.66	48	1.83	48	1.83	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	3.66
49	0	49	3.91	49	1.96	49	3.91	49	0	49	3.91	49	3.91	49	3.91
50	2.14	50	4.27	50	2.14	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	0	50	4.27	50	4.27
51	2.16	51	4.32	51	2.16	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	0	51	4.32	51	4.32
52	2.04	52	2.04	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	4.08	52	4.08	52	4.08	52	4.08
53	1.71	53	3.42	53	1.71	53	3.42	53	0	53	3.42	53	3.42	53	0
54	1.90	54	3.80	54	1.90	54	3.80	54	3.80	54	3.80	54	3.80	54	3.80
57	4.47	57	4.47	57	2.24	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47
58	4.26	58	4.26	58	2.13	58	2.13	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26
59	1.96	59	0	59	1.96	59	3.92	59	3.92	59	3.92	59	3.92	59	3.92
60	0	60	0	60	0	60	1.90	60	3.79	60	3.79	60	1.90	60	0

TABLE XI (Continued)

Dept. 9		Dept. 10		Dept. 11		Dept. 12		Dept. 13		Dept. 14		Dept. 15		Dept. 16	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
36	4.12	36	2.06	36	0	36	2.06	36	0	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12
37	3.88	37	3.88	37	3.88	37	1.94	37	0	37	1.94	37	1.94	37	0
38	4.26	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	0	38	2.13	38	2.13	38	4.26
39	3.75	39	0	39	0	39	0	39	3.75	39	0	39	3.75	39	0
40	3.78	40	0	40	3.78	40	0	40	3.78	40	0	40	3.78	40	0
41	3.13	41	0	41	0	41	0	41	3.13	41	0	41	0	41	1.57
42	3.92	42	0	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	0	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92
43	3.23	43	0	43	0	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	1.62	43	1.62	43	3.23
44	3.69	44	1.85	44	0	44	3.69	44	0	44	1.85	44	3.69	44	1.85
45	3.43	45	0	45	0	45	3.43	45	0	45	1.72	45	3.43	45	1.72
46	4.10	46	2.05	46	2.05	46	4.10	46	0	46	2.05	46	4.10	46	2.05
47	3.65	47	1.83	47	1.83	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	1.83	47	3.65	47	3.65
48	3.66	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	1.83	48	3.66	48	1.83
49	3.91	49	3.91	49	1.96	49	1.96	49	0	49	1.96	49	1.96	49	1.96
50	4.27	50	2.14	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	0	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27
51	2.16	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	0	51	2.16	51	4.32	51	4.32
52	4.08	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	4.08	52	0	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	2.04
53	3.42	53	1.71	53	0	53	1.71	53	3.42	53	0	53	1.71	53	1.71
54	3.80	54	1.90	54	0	54	3.80	54	0	54	1.90	54	3.80	54	3.80
57	4.47	57	2.24	57	0	57	4.47	57	0	57	2.24	57	4.47	57	2.24
58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	0	58	2.13	58	4.26	58	4.26
59	3.92	59	1.96	59	1.96	59	1.96	59	1.96	59	1.96	59	3.92	59	0
60	3.79	60	0	60	1.90	60	1.90	60	1.90	60	0	60	3.79	60	0

TABLE XI (Continued)

Dept. 17		Dept. 18		Dept. 19		Dept. 20		Dept. 21		Dept. 22		Dept. 23		Dept. 24	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	2.06	36	0	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12
37	3.88	37	3.88	37	3.88	37	1.94	37	0	37	3.88	37	3.88	37	3.88
38	4.26	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	2.13	38	0	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	4.26
39	0	39	3.75	39	3.75	39	1.88	39	0	39	1.88	39	3.75	39	3.75
40	3.78	40	1.89	40	3.78	40	1.89	40	0	40	1.89	40	3.78	40	3.78
41	3.13	41	0	41	3.13	41	0	41	0	41	3.13	41	3.13	41	0
42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	1.96	42	0	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92
43	3.23	43	3.23	43	1.62	43	0	43	1.62	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	3.23
44	3.69	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	1.85	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	3.69
45	3.43	45	0	45	3.43	45	1.72	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43
46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	2.05	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10
47	3.65	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	0	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	1.83
48	3.66	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	1.83	48	0	48	3.66	48	0	48	1.83
49	3.91	49	3.91	49	1.96	49	1.96	49	3.91	49	3.91	49	0	49	1.96
50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27
51	4.32	51	2.16	51	2.16	51	2.16	51	2.16	51	2.16	51	4.32	51	2.16
52	4.08	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	4.08	52	4.08	52	4.08
53	3.42	53	3.42	53	3.42	53	1.71	53	0	53	3.42	53	3.42	53	1.71
54	3.80	54	1.90	54	3.80	54	0	54	3.80	54	3.80	54	0	54	1.90
57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	2.24	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	2.24
58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	0	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26
59	1.96	59	1.96	59	0	59	1.96	59	0	59	0	59	3.92	59	1.96
60	0	60	1.90	60	3.79	60	0	60	0	60	1.90	60	0	60	1.90

TABLE XI (Continued)

Dept. 25		Dept. 26		Dept. 27		Dept. 28		Dept. 29		Dept. 30		Dept. 31		Dept. 32	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12
37	0	37	0	37	3.88	37	3.88	37	0	37	3.88	37	3.88	37	1.94
38	4.26	38	2.13	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	2.13	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	2.13
39	0	39	0	39	1.88	39	1.88	39	1.88	39	3.75	39	3.75	39	0
40	0	40	0	40	1.89	40	1.89	40	3.78	40	3.78	40	3.78	40	0
41	3.13	41	0	41	3.13	41	1.57	41	3.13	41	1.57	41	3.13	41	0
42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92
43	3.23	43	1.62	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	1.62
44	3.69	44	1.85	44	3.69	44	1.85	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	3.69
45	3.43	45	1.72	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	1.72
46	4.10	46	2.05	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10
47	3.65	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	0	47	1.83	47	3.65	47	3.65
48	3.66	48	3.66	48	1.83	48	3.66	48	0	48	1.83	48	3.66	48	1.83
49	3.91	49	3.91	49	3.91	49	1.96	49	3.91	49	1.96	49	3.91	49	3.91
50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	2.14	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27
51	4.32	51	2.16	51	4.32	51	2.16	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	2.16
52	4.08	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	0
53	3.42	53	1.71	53	3.42	53	1.71	53	3.42	53	1.71	53	3.42	53	1.71
54	1.90	54	1.90	54	3.80	54	1.90	54	3.80	54	1.90	54	3.80	54	3.80
57	4.47	57	2.24	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47
58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	0	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26
59	0	59	1.96	59	0	59	0	59	0	59	3.92	59	0	59	1.96
60	0	60	1.90	60	0	60	0	60	0	60	1.90	60	0	60	0

TABLE XI (Continued)

Dept. 33		Dept. 34		Dept. 35		Dept. 36		Dept. 37		Dept. 38		Dept. 39		Dept. 40	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12
37	1.94	37	3.88	37	3.88	37	0	37	3.88	37	1.94	37	0	37	3.88
38	2.13	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	2.13	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	0	38	4.26
39	3.75	39	3.75	39	3.75	39	0	39	1.88	39	1.88	39	3.75	39	1.88
40	0	40	3.78	40	3.78	40	0	40	3.78	40	1.89	40	3.78	40	1.89
41	3.13	41	0	41	3.13	41	3.13	41	3.13	41	0	41	3.13	41	3.13
42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92
43	3.23	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	0	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	3.23
44	3.69	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	1.85	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	1.85	44	3.69
45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	1.72	45	3.43
46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	2.05	46	4.10
47	3.65	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	3.65
48	3.66	48	3.66	48	1.83	48	1.83	48	3.66	48	1.83	48	1.83	48	3.66
49	3.91	49	3.91	49	1.96	49	3.91	49	3.91	49	1.96	49	1.96	49	3.91
50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	0	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27
51	4.32	51	0	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	2.16	51	4.32
52	4.08	52	4.08	52	4.08	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	2.04	52	2.04	52	4.08
53	3.42	53	0	53	3.42	53	3.42	53	3.42	53	1.71	53	1.71	53	3.42
54	3.80	54	3.80	54	3.80	54	1.90	54	3.80	54	3.80	54	3.80	54	3.80
57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	2.24	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	2.24	57	4.47
58	4.26	58	4.26	58	2.13	58	2.13	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26
59	1.96	59	1.96	59	3.92	59	1.96	59	1.96	59	3.92	59	1.96	59	3.92
60	3.79	60	1.90	60	3.79	60	1.90	60	0	60	1.90	60	1.90	60	3.79

TABLE XI (Continued)

Dept. 41		Dept. 42		Dept. 43		Dept. 44		Dept. 45		Dept. 46		Dept. 47		Dept. 48	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
36	2.06	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	2.06	36	0	36	0	36	0	36	2.06
37	1.94	37	3.88	37	1.94	37	1.94	37	3.88	37	0	37	3.88	37	1.94
38	2.13	38	4.26	38	2.13	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	0	38	4.26	38	4.26
39	1.88	39	1.88	39	1.88	39	0	39	1.88	39	1.88	39	3.75	39	1.88
40	1.89	40	1.89	40	1.89	40	0	40	1.89	40	0	40	3.78	40	1.89
41	1.57	41	3.13	41	0	41	0	41	1.57	41	0	41	0	41	0
42	1.96	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	0	42	1.96	42	1.96	42	3.92	42	3.92
43	1.62	43	3.23	43	0	43	0	43	1.62	43	1.62	43	3.23	43	1.62
44	1.85	44	3.69	44	1.85	44	1.85	44	1.85	44	0	44	0	44	0
45	1.72	45	3.43	45	0	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	0	45	0	45	3.43
46	4.10	46	4.10	46	2.05	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	2.05	46	4.10	46	4.10
47	3.65	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	1.83	47	3.65	47	1.83	47	3.65	47	3.65
48	0	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	1.83	48	1.83	48	3.66
49	0	49	3.91	49	1.96	49	0	49	3.91	49	0	49	0	49	3.91
50	0	50	2.14	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	2.14	50	4.27	50	4.27
51	4.32	51	2.16	51	2.16	51	2.16	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	2.16
52	2.04	52	2.04	52	2.04	52	0	52	4.08	52	0	52	4.08	52	2.04
53	1.71	53	1.71	53	1.71	53	0	53	1.71	53	0	53	0	53	0
54	1.90	54	1.90	54	3.80	54	0	54	1.90	54	0	54	3.80	54	0
57	4.47	57	2.24	57	2.24	57	2.24	57	4.47	57	0	57	4.47	57	0
58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	2.13	58	4.26	58	4.26
59	3.92	59	0	59	0	59	1.96	59	1.96	59	1.96	59	0	59	3.92
60	3.79	60	1.90	60	0	60	1.90	60	0	60	0	60	0	60	3.79

TABLE XI (Continued)

Dept. 49		Dept. 50		Dept. 51		Dept. 52		Dept. 53		Dept. 54		Dept. 55		Dept. 56	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	2.06	36	2.06	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12
37	1.94	37	1.94	37	3.88	37	1.94	37	3.88	37	3.88	37	3.88	37	3.88
38	2.13	38	2.13	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	4.26
39	0	39	1.88	39	1.88	39	1.88	39	0	39	3.75	39	1.88	39	3.75
40	1.89	40	1.89	40	1.89	40	1.89	40	0	40	1.89	40	1.89	40	3.78
41	0	41	1.57	41	3.13	41	1.57	41	0	41	3.13	41	3.13	41	3.13
42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	1.96	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92
43	3.23	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	1.62	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	3.23
44	1.85	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	1.85	44	1.85	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	3.69
45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	1.72	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43
46	2.05	46	2.05	46	4.10	46	0	46	2.05	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10
47	0	47	3.65	47	1.83	47	1.83	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	3.65
48	0	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	1.83	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	3.66
49	0	49	1.96	49	3.91	49	0	49	1.96	49	3.91	49	3.91	49	3.91
50	2.14	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	2.14	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27
51	4.32	51	2.16	51	4.32	51	2.16	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	2.16	51	4.32
52	2.04	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	2.04	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	4.08	52	4.08
53	3.42	53	3.42	53	1.71	53	1.71	53	0	53	1.71	53	3.42	53	3.42
54	3.80	54	3.80	54	1.90	54	1.90	54	3.80	54	1.90	54	3.80	54	3.80
57	4.47	57	2.24	57	4.47	57	2.24	57	4.47	57	2.24	57	4.47	57	4.47
58	2.13	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	2.13	58	2.13	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26
59	0	59	1.96	59	3.92	59	3.92	59	3.92	59	1.96	59	1.96	59	3.92
60	0	60	1.90	60	3.79	60	3.79	60	3.79	60	0	60	1.90	60	3.79

TABLE XI (Continued)

Dept. 57		Dept. 58		Dept. 59		Dept. 60		Dept. 61		Dept. 62		Dept. 63		Dept. 64	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12
37	3.88	37	1.94	37	3.88	37	3.88	37	1.94	37	1.94	37	3.88	37	1.94
38	4.26	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	2.13	38	2.13	38	0	38	4.26	38	2.13
39	0	39	1.88	39	1.88	39	1.88	39	1.88	39	0	39	1.88	39	1.88
40	3.78	40	1.89	40	1.89	40	3.78	40	1.89	40	0	40	1.89	40	1.89
41	3.13	41	3.13	41	1.57	41	0	41	0	41	0	41	1.57	41	1.57
42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	1.96	42	1.96	42	3.92	42	3.92
43	3.23	43	3.23	43	1.62	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	0	43	3.23	43	1.62
44	3.69	44	3.69	44	1.85	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	1.85
45	0	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	1.72	45	0	45	3.43	45	3.43
46	4.10	46	2.05	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	2.05	46	2.05	46	4.10	46	4.10
47	3.65	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	1.83	47	3.65	47	3.65
48	3.66	48	3.66	48	1.83	48	3.66	48	0	48	0	48	3.66	48	1.83
49	3.91	49	3.91	49	3.91	49	3.91	49	0	49	1.96	49	3.91	49	1.96
50	4.27	50	4.27	50	2.14	50	4.27	50	2.14	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27
51	4.32	51	2.16	51	2.16	51	4.32	51	2.16	51	2.16	51	4.32	51	4.32
52	4.08	52	2.04	52	2.04	52	0	52	2.04	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	2.04
53	0	53	3.42	53	1.71	53	1.71	53	1.71	53	1.71	53	3.42	53	1.71
54	3.80	54	3.80	54	1.90	54	3.80	54	1.90	54	1.90	54	3.80	54	1.90
57	4.47	57	2.24	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	2.24	57	2.24	57	4.47	57	2.24
58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26
59	0	59	3.92	59	3.92	59	0	59	1.96	59	1.96	59	3.92	59	1.96
60	0	60	3.79	60	1.90	60	1.90	60	1.90	60	0	60	3.79	60	1.90

TABLE XI (Continued)

Dept. 65		Dept. 66		Dept. 67		Dept. 68		Dept. 69		Dept. 70		Dept. 71		Dept. 72	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
36	2.06	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	2.06	36	0
37	0	37	1.94	37	3.88	37	0	37	1.94	37	3.88	37	1.94	37	3.88
38	0	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	0	38	0	38	4.26	38	2.13	38	4.26
39	0	39	3.75	39	3.75	39	0	39	0	39	3.75	39	0	39	1.88
40	0	40	3.78	40	3.78	40	0	40	0	40	3.78	40	0	40	0
41	0	41	3.13	41	1.57	41	1.57	41	1.57	41	1.57	41	1.57	41	3.13
42	1.96	42	0	42	3.92	42	1.96	42	1.96	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92
43	1.62	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	0	43	1.62	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	3.23
44	1.85	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	1.85	44	3.69	44	1.85	44	3.69
45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	1.72	45	1.72	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43
46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	2.05	46	2.05
47	1.83	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	1.83	47	1.83	47	3.65	47	1.83	47	3.65
48	3.66	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	1.83	48	3.66	48	3.66
49	3.91	49	3.91	49	3.91	49	3.91	49	3.91	49	3.91	49	1.96	49	3.91
50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	0	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	2.14	50	4.27
51	4.32	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	2.16	51	4.32	51	2.16	51	4.32	51	4.32
52	4.08	52	4.08	52	4.08	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	2.04
53	1.71	53	3.42	53	0	53	0	53	1.71	53	1.71	53	1.71	53	1.71
54	3.80	54	3.80	54	3.80	54	1.90	54	1.90	54	3.80	54	0	54	3.80
57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	2.24	57	4.47
58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	0	58	4.26
59	1.96	59	0	59	3.92	59	1.96	59	3.92	59	1.96	59	1.96	59	1.96
60	3.79	60	0	60	3.79	60	0	60	3.79	60	0	60	1.90	60	1.90

TABLE XI (Continued)

Dept. 73		Dept. 74		Dept. 75		Dept. 76		Dept. 77		Dept. 78		Dept. 79		Dept. 80	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
36	4.12	36	2.06	36	4.12	36	2.06	36	4.12	36	2.06	36	4.12	36	2.06
37	3.88	37	0	37	3.88	37	3.88	37	1.94	37	1.94	37	3.88	37	0
38	4.26	38	0	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	4.26	38	2.13	38	4.26	38	0
39	1.88	39	0	39	1.88	39	1.88	39	1.88	39	3.75	39	0	39	0
40	1.89	40	0	40	3.78	40	1.89	40	1.89	40	3.78	40	3.78	40	0
41	3.13	41	1.57	41	0	41	1.57	41	3.13	41	0	41	3.13	41	0
42	1.96	42	1.96	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	1.96	42	3.92	42	3.92
43	3.23	43	1.62	43	1.62	43	3.23	43	3.23	43	1.62	43	3.23	43	3.23
44	3.69	44	1.85	44	1.85	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	1.85	44	3.69	44	3.69
45	3.43	45	1.72	45	0	45	3.43	45	1.72	45	0	45	1.72	45	1.72
46	4.10	46	2.05	46	0	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	2.05	46	4.10	46	4.10
47	3.65	47	3.65	47	1.83	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	1.83	47	3.65	47	1.83
48	3.66	48	3.66	48	1.83	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	3.66	48	1.83	48	3.66
49	3.91	49	3.91	49	0	49	1.96	49	3.91	49	0	49	3.91	49	1.96
50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	2.14	50	4.27	50	2.14	50	4.27	50	4.27
51	4.32	51	2.16	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	2.16
52	2.04	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	4.08	52	2.04	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	2.04
53	3.42	53	1.71	53	1.71	53	1.71	53	3.42	53	0	53	1.71	53	1.71
54	1.90	54	0	54	3.80	54	3.80	54	3.80	54	0	54	1.90	54	0
57	2.24	57	2.24	57	2.24	57	2.24	57	4.47	57	0	57	4.47	57	2.24
58	4.26	58	2.13	58	2.13	58	2.13	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26
59	3.92	59	1.96	59	0	59	3.92	59	1.96	59	0	59	0	59	0
60	1.90	60	1.90	60	0	60	1.90	60	3.79	60	0	60	0	60	0

TABLE XI (Continued)

Dept. 81		Dept. 82		Dept. 83		Dept. 84		Dept. 85		Dept. 86		Dept. 87		Dept. 88	
Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score	Item	Score
36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12	36	4.12
37	3.88	37	3.88	37	1.94	37	3.88	37	1.94	37	3.88	37	0	37	3.88
38	4.26	38	4.26	38	2.13	38	4.26	38	2.13	38	2.13	38	2.13	38	4.26
39	0	39	1.88	39	1.88	39	1.88	39	1.88	39	1.88	39	0	39	3.75
40	0	40	1.89	40	1.89	40	1.89	40	1.89	40	1.89	40	0	40	3.78
41	0	41	1.57	41	1.57	41	3.13	41	3.13	41	0	41	0	41	3.13
42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	3.92	42	0
43	3.23	43	1.62	43	3.23	43	1.62	43	1.62	43	1.62	43	3.23	43	3.23
44	3.69	44	3.69	44	3.69	44	1.85	44	3.69	44	1.85	44	0	44	3.69
45	3.43	45	3.43	45	3.43	45	1.72	45	1.72	45	1.72	45	1.72	45	3.43
46	2.05	46	4.10	46	2.05	46	2.05	46	4.10	46	4.10	46	0	46	4.10
47	3.65	47	1.83	47	3.65	47	3.65	47	1.83	47	3.65	47	0	47	3.65
48	3.66	48	3.66	48	1.83	48	3.66	48	1.83	48	3.66	48	0	48	3.66
49	3.91	49	3.91	49	3.91	49	1.96	49	1.96	49	1.96	49	0	49	3.91
50	4.27	50	4.27	50	4.27	50	2.14	50	2.14	50	2.14	50	2.14	50	4.27
51	4.32	51	4.32	51	2.16	51	4.32	51	4.32	51	2.16	51	4.32	51	0
52	2.04	52	4.08	52	4.08	52	4.08	52	2.04	52	4.08	52	0	52	4.08
53	1.71	53	3.42	53	1.71	53	3.42	53	0	53	1.71	53	0	53	3.42
54	3.80	54	3.80	54	1.90	54	1.90	54	1.90	54	1.90	54	1.90	54	3.80
57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	4.47	57	2.24	57	2.24	57	4.47
58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	2.13	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	4.26	58	2.13
59	3.92	59	3.92	59	0	59	3.92	59	1.96	59	1.96	59	1.96	59	1.96
60	0	60	3.79	60	0	60	3.79	60	0	60	1.90	60	1.90	60	1.90

TABLE XI (Continued)

OSU	
Item	Score
36	4.12
37	1.94
38	4.26
39	1.88
40	1.89
41	1.57
42	1.96
43	3.23
44	1.85
45	3.43
46	4.10
47	3.65
48	1.83
49	1.96
50	4.27
51	2.16
52	2.04
53	1.71
54	3.80
57	4.47
58	4.26
59	0
60	0

VITA

Theodore B. Kalivoda

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: THE DEVELOPMENT AND APPLICATION OF A SET OF CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Major Field: Higher Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Erie, Pennsylvania, July 10, 1930, the son of Nickolaus and Marie Kalivoda

Education: Attended grade school in Erie, Pennsylvania; graduated from Erie East High School in 1948; received the Bachelor of Arts degree from Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois, with a major in Spanish language and literature, in August, 1953; received the Master of Arts degree from the Louisiana State University, with a major in Spanish language and literature, in May, 1956; attended the National University of Mexico, Mexico City, from June to August, 1964; completed requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in May, 1967.

Professional Experience: Employed as Instructor in English at Colegio La Libertad, Trujillo, Peru, from February, 1954 to December, 1954; served as graduate teaching assistant in the Foreign Language Department, Louisiana State University, from January, 1955 to June, 1956; employed as Administrator and Instructor in Spanish at the Louisiana State University Armed Forces Program, Panama Canal Zone, from June, 1956 to August, 1957; employed as Director of the Division of Latin America Relations at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, from September, 1957 to August, 1962; employed as International Student Adviser and Assistant Professor of Spanish at Oklahoma State University, from September, 1962 to February, 1967; employed as Assistant Professor of Spanish at Oklahoma State University, February, 1967.

Professional Organizations: American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese, American Association of Language Laboratory Directors, Modern Language Association, National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Phi Delta Kappa.