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ABSTRACT

An Evaluation of Communicative Activities in First-Year High School Spanish Textbooks

Marcella C. Martinez

Department of Spanish and Portuguese

Master of Arts

The study analyzed activities of Spanish Level 1 textbooks used in high school to determine the extent to which they incorporate some of the most respected theories of communicative language learning, in particular the theories of Krashen, Swain, Long and Nunan. Five well known Spanish books were chosen: Realidades, Exprésate, Así se dice, Avancemos, and Aventura. For each book, Chapter 2 and Chapter 5 were chosen to be evaluated by two raters. The activities in these chapters were analyzed according to four criteria derived from the abovementioned theories. Results suggest that textbooks may not be in alignment with major theories of how language is acquired. The majority of the activities may fall under the category of meaningless drills, which it is claimed do not contribute to acquisition of a second language.

Keywords: textbook activities, theories of language, drills, communicative activities
I would like to acknowledge and extend my heartfelt appreciation to the following persons who have made the completions of this thesis possible: Dr. Blair E. Bateman for his vital encouragement, support, time and guidance. Dr. Cherice Montgomery and Dr. Nieves Pérez Knapp for their support. Tyler Castle for his tremendous help in rating the activities. All faculty members, staff and students that I may have come across at Brigham Young University for their encouragement and assistance. Most especially thanks to my family and particularly my son Antonio, for being such a good trooper.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION ..............................................................1
  Background of the Study ..............................................................1
  Statement of the Problem ............................................................2
  The Present Study .................................................................5
  Significance of the Study .........................................................7
  Delimitations of the Study ........................................................8
  Definitions of Terms ...............................................................8
  Organization of the Thesis .......................................................9

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE .........................11
  Theories of Language Learning ..............................................11
  Language Learning in the Classroom Context .........................14
  Typologies of Textbook Activities ...........................................15
  Research of Textbook Activities .............................................17
  Summary .................................................................................18

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY .........................................................19
  Selection of Textbooks and Chapters to be Evaluated ...............19
  Defining the Rating Criteria ....................................................20
  Applying the Criteria to Evaluate the Textbooks .......................22
  Data Analysis ........................................................................27

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS .................................................................28
  Research Question 1 ...............................................................28
  Research Question 1(a) ..........................................................35
  Research Question 1(b) ..........................................................37
Summary .........................................................................................................38

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .............................40
  Implication for Textbook Publishers and Teachers........................................41
  Limitations of the Study ..............................................................................42
  Recommendations for Further Research .....................................................43

References ....................................................................................................44

Appendices ........................................................................................................48

APPENDIX A
  Rating Scales Used With All Textbook Activities .........................................48

APPENDIX B
  Rating Scales Used With Activities Labeled as “Communicative” ...............49

APPENDIX C
  Actividad 7 (Realidades) ............................................................................50

APPENDIX D
  Actividad 18 (Realidades) ...........................................................................51

APPENDIX E
  Hablar 4 (Así se dice) ................................................................................52

APPENDIX F
  Actividad 18 (Exprésate) ...........................................................................53

APPENDIX G
  Actividad 11 (Exprésate) ............................................................................54

APPENDIX H
  Actividad 5 and 7 (Así se Dice) ................................................................55
APPENDIX I

Vocabulary list………………………………………………………………56
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1

Pearson Correlations between Raters 1 and 2 for Each Variable ...............26

Table 2

Percentage of Activities in Each Chapter Labeled as “Communicative” .......29

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Each Variable (Mean of Raters 1 and 2) .............30

Table 4

Comparison of Chapters 2 and 5 on “Understanding” Variable .................35

Table 5

Comparison of Chapters 2 and 5 on “Purpose” Variable ..........................36

Table 6

Comparison of Chapters 2 and 5 on “Opportunities” Variable .................36

Table 7

Comparison of Chapters 2 and 5 on “Spontaneity” Variable ....................36

Table 8

Comparison of Activities Labeled “Communicative” With Activities Not Labeled as Such: “Understanding” Variable .................................................................38
Table 9

Comparison of Activities Labeled “Communicative” With Activities Not Labeled as Such:

“Purpose” Variable ........................................................................................................38
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1

Score Frequencies for “Understanding” Variable (Mean of Raters 1 and 2) ..31

Figure 2

Score Frequencies for “Purpose” Variable (Mean of Raters 1 and 2) ...........32

Figure 3

Score Frequencies for “Opportunities” Variable (Mean of Raters 1 and 2) ...33

Figure 4

Score Frequencies for “Spontaneity” Variable (Mean of Raters 1 and 2) ......34
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Many foreign language teachers rely exclusively on the textbook as a way to teach their students. Stein, Stuen, Carnine, and Long (2001) estimate that 75% to 90% of classroom instruction is based on textbooks. It is not uncommon for teachers to rely on textbooks as a guide for their lesson plans and to select what they teach in the classroom (Biemer, 1992; Dow, 1992; Eisener, 1987; Woodward & Elliott, 1990).

Like many teachers, I have relied on the text as a source for classroom activities. I have viewed the text as an opportunity for the student to experience variation in how the information is presented. The textbook covers activities such as dictation, role-playing, group work, drills, reading followed by comprehension questions, and more. However, I noticed that my students were complaining about the textbook. Their general consensus seemed to be that they didn’t believe they learned from the book itself, but rather they expressed their opinion that they learn when they are more actively engaged. I was interested in learning more about student’s perspectives on this issue. Consequently, at the end of Spring 2009, I gave an informal evaluation to the students. The survey was given to the students as a tool for teacher evaluation. The purpose was to obtain information that would help me to improve in any area that I needed to improve to be a better teacher. I received comments such as: “stay away from the book,” “don’t do activities out of the book,” ”doing activities out of the book is boring,”and “bookwork does not promote interest in a subject,” “the book is really boring,” “bookwork does not evoke understanding and useful conversation.” Students’ responses to the survey indicated that they had a very negative view with regard to the use of the textbook. The students did not seem to
think that the textbook was helpful as far as learning a language. The students for the most part
did not seem to feel that the book offers much variation or that it enhanced their learning.

In contrast, students rated classroom activities that were not taken from the text in a more
positive way. This led me to consider how my classroom activities (which included such things
as stories from books, TPRS activities, general conversations, Spanish usage in the classroom,
games, and cultural teachings) might differ from the activities in our textbook. It also made me
wonder why the text is not viewed in a more positive way by students. Even though there is
variety in the book, perhaps something is missing to engage students more. Perhaps some of the
exercises in the textbook are not as effective as I thought in helping students acquire a second
language. This insight from my students gave me a realization that there was a disconnection in
what I was perceiving as a learning opportunity and what the students were recognizing as
learning.

Statement of the Problem

Theorists in recent years have described the types of classroom activities that are thought
to promote language learning. In general, these activities involve using the language for real
communication. Lightbown and Spada (1993) describe a communicative classroom as one in
which the main method of teaching places emphasis on conversation, interaction and practice of
the actual language. In this type of class, the emphasis is on meaning rather than grammar, and
the amount of error correction may be limited. Input is simplified and made comprehensible by
the use of contextual cues, props, and gestures, rather than through structural grading (the
presentation of one grammatical item at a time, in a sequence of simple to complex). Shrum and
Glisan (2004) offer a similar view of what constitutes truly communicative activities. These are
activities in which both parties, the teacher and student as well as student to student, seek
clarification in order to interact, check comprehension, and request confirmation that they have understood or are being understood by the other.

Krashen (1981), Swain (1995), Long (1996), and Ellis (1991) have further described what are thought to be the ideal components of communicatively-oriented classrooms. Krashen’s comprehensible input theory (1981) basically says that learners acquire language when they are exposed to linguistic input that is slightly above their current level but to the student is still comprehensible. The implication is that foreign language classroom activities should provide lots of comprehensible input to aid the student in acquiring the second language. Swain’s output hypothesis (1995) counters that input may be the first step needed to have the foundations of language, but without the opportunity for oral expression, the acquisition of language will not take place effectively. Students should have lots of opportunities to produce output. In addition to input and output, Long (1996) and Ellis (1991) emphasize the role of interaction and “negotiation of meaning.” Ellis advances two major claims about the role of interaction in second language acquisition: comprehensible input is necessary for acquiring a second language (L2), and mediations to the interactional structure of conversations which take place in the process of negotiating a communication problem help to make input comprehensible to a L2 learner. Thus, students need opportunities to interact and negotiate meaning with others in the language.

Although much attention has been given to describing what a communicative classroom should look like, research on the activities in foreign language textbooks reveals that many of these activities emphasize the practice of grammatical structures rather than real communication. Lee and VanPatten (2003) affirm that textbook activities can generally be classified as either mechanical drills, meaningful drills or communicative practice drills. Mechanical drills are drills
where the student does not need to understand in order to answer correctly. In contrast, meaningful drills require the learner to attend to the meaning of both the stimulus and their own answer in order to complete the meaningful drill successfully. In this type of activity there is still just one right answer but the learner must understand the question first in order to respond correctly. Communicative practice drills go beyond mechanical and meaningful drills in that they require attention to meaning, and the information contained in the learners’ answers is new and unknown to the person asking the questions. Nunan (1999) makes a similar distinction between what he calls “exercises” and “tasks.” An exercise has a linguistic outcome (such as the correct production of particular language structure), whereas a task offers an opportunity to accomplish nonlinguistic outcome where the focus is on using the language to accomplish a particular purpose or goal. These authors are predominant figures in the communicative approach methodology.

In 2005, Aski briefly reviewed six studies (Ellis, 2002; Frantzen, 1998; Lally, 1998; Tucker, Mitchell, & Redmond, 1993; Shelly, 1995; Takenoya, 1995) assessing the communicative nature of foreign language and ESL textbooks, and concluded that in the early stages of controlled language practice, most activities presented in foreign language textbooks continue to reflect behaviorist teaching methods, namely pattern practice and mechanical drills. Textbooks lacked opportunities for students to use the language for real communication.

Approximately a decade has passed since the studies reviewed by Aski were conducted. During that decade, the Standards for Foreign Language Learning (1996) have begun to be widely cited in foreign language textbooks. The Communication goal area of the Standards emphasizes that students should have opportunities to use language in interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational modes, and virtually all major textbooks now claim to incorporate these types
of activities. At the present time, however, it is uncertain to what extent textbooks are actually incorporating such activities. Furthermore, it is unclear to what extent the activities in textbooks provide the type of communicative practice advocated by Krashen, Swain, Long, Nunan and others. More research is needed in order to determine whether current textbooks provide the type of communicative practice that students need in order to become proficient in the language. Given the prevalence with these theories, and that’s all they are, we cannot conclude that a particular theory is in fact how people acquire a second language.

**The Present Study**

The purpose of this study is to conduct an analysis of Spanish Level 1 textbooks used in high school to see if they correspond to some of the most respected theories of learning, in particular the theories of Krashen, Swain, Long, and Nunan. These theories seem to imply that textbooks should offer at least some activities in which the focus is on meaningful communication rather than form. In order for a textbook activity to be meaningful, it needs to have a goal or purpose other than the production of linguistic forms (Nunan, 1999). In order to accomplish this purpose, students need to understand the language used in the activity; the language must be “comprehensible” (Krashen, 1981). Furthermore, the activity must provide opportunities for students to produce “output” using language creatively in a non-scripted way (Swain, 1995), and to interact in such a way that each student has unique information, and the students must negotiate meaning in order to complete the activity (Long, 1996). I used these criteria in evaluating five commonly-used high school Spanish textbooks, as outlined in the following research questions.
Research Questions

The main research question for the study was as follows: (1) To what extent do the activities in high school Spanish textbooks incorporate current theories and research on language learning, and specifically, in relation to the criteria of (a) understanding, (b) purpose, (c) opportunities for the student to share information and (d) spontaneity? A secondary focus of the study was to answer two related subquestions: (1a) As textbooks progress from the earlier chapters to the later chapters, do the activities become more communicative in nature? (1b) Are activities that textbooks explicitly label as “communicative” actually more communicative than other activities in the book?

Sampling of Textbooks

The study looked at five commonly-used Spanish high school textbooks. The following texts were used: Realidades, Exprésate, Así se dice, Avancemos, and Aventura. These books were chosen on the basis of what was available at the university library as well as Spanish textbooks by major publishing companies. The current text I use in my classes is Realidades.

The study evaluated the types of practice activities in Chapter 2 and Chapter 5 of every textbook. These chapters were chosen with the understanding that most teachers teach Chapter 2 during the first semester and Chapter 5 during the second semester; thus, choosing these chapters allowed me to analyze one chapter per semester. I suspected that the type of exercises from across the various books might not align with some of the learning theories previously mentioned.

Instrumentation

Rubrics were created (see Appendix A and Appendix B) to rate practice activities from the textbooks on four criteria: (a) understanding, (b) purpose, (c), opportunities for the student to
share information and (d) spontaneity. These criteria were chosen based on the language learning theories and research that were discussed above. Each criterion was rated on a scale from 1 to 5. Activities were all rated using the rubrics in Appendix A, and activities that were depicted as communicative, partner or group activities were also evaluated using the rubrics in Appendix B as well as those in Appendix A. These rubrics were validated by expert opinion provided by Spanish Pedagogy faculty at BYU.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

The rating of the textbook activities was done by another teacher and me. At the beginning of the school year I trained this teacher to use the evaluation rubric by practicing on activities from other textbook chapters that were not part of this study. We rated each activity independently and then compared and discussed our ratings in order to come to an agreement on how to apply each criterion. Then, during the first semester, the other teacher and I independently rated the practice activities from Chapter 2 of each of the five textbooks. During the second semester, we rated the practice activities for Chapter 5 of each book. I then calculated inter-rater reliability by computing Pearson correlations for our two sets of ratings.

**Significance of the Study**

This study builds upon previous research by proposing specific criteria for assessing the communicative value of textbook activities, as well as actually evaluating the activities in five current Spanish textbooks. I hope that my research will not only help me to be a more efficient teacher but that it will help other teachers to be more effective with their students. I hope that it can lead to change in the format of the published books so that optimal opportunities are provided to the student through the use of a textbook. I believe that looking closely at the activities in the textbook to see how they rate as far as understanding, purpose, opportunities to
share information and spontaneity will help the student increase their usage of the target language. It will give textbook publishers the opportunity to take the book to a higher level by considering the learning theories of well-known researchers. Previous studies have classified exercises in one particular mode. I propose that any given exercise is not easily categorize into one type. In looking at the activities it is often not easy to determine where a specific example would fit best. The criteria that I am proposing gives a broader spectrum of how to define the particular drills.

**Delimitations of the Study**

This study is limited to Level 1 textbooks that are used for high school Spanish classes with the most current edition available. It was expected that the higher the level of the textbook, the more communicatively-oriented the activities would be. The study is limited to the activities within the textbook and not how the teacher applies activities or how the activities may be modified by the teacher. The study did not look at other books that may be used in the classroom, such as readers, short novels, short stories, authentic material, workbooks, magazines, or any other written material that may be used in class.

**Definition of Terms**

*Comprehensible input (CI)*: Input that is just a bit more difficult than students’ current level but is still understandable (Krashen, 1981). This does not mean, however, that teachers must use only words students understand. In fact, instruction can be incomprehensible even when students know all of the words. Students learn a new language best when they receive input that is just a bit more difficult than they can easily understand.

*Mechanical drill*: A drill in which each prompt has only one correct response, and students can complete the exercise without attending to meaning (NCLRC, 2009).
Meaningful drill: A drill in which each prompt has only one correct response, and students must attend to meaning to complete the exercise (NCLRC, 2009).

“Purpose” variable: The extent to which an activity presents a real life situation in which language is used, as opposed to an artificial activity designed only for linguistic practice.

Communicative practice: A drill that requires attention to meaning, and the information contained in the learner’s answers is new and unknown to the person asking the questions (Aski, 2003).

“Opportunities for the student to Share Information” variable: The extent to which students need to share information in order to successfully complete the activity. This implies that each student has access to information that the other student does not have, and it is essential that they share that information with each other in order to complete the activity.

“Understanding” variable: The extent to which students need to understand what is being said in order to be able to complete the activity, as opposed to being able to do the activity without understanding what is being said.

“Spontaneity” variable: The degree to which an activity allows students to create Spontaneity with language.

Organization of the Thesis

This chapter has introduced the research problem and the present study. Chapter 2 will review the literature related to prominent theories of language learning with emphasis on classroom activities, several typologies that have been proposed for categorizing textbook activities, activities found in foreign language textbooks and their classification according to theories. Chapter 3 will detail the methodology used in the study and Chapter 4 will report the
findings. Chapter 5 will discuss the implications of the study for teachers and textbook authors and publishers, as well as the limitations of the study and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

This chapter will review theoretical and research literature relevant to the present study. First, several prominent theories of language learning will be examined, with emphasis on their application in classroom activities. Next, the writings of authors who have specifically discussed language learning in a classroom setting will be reviewed, with attention to their recommendations as to what constitutes a “communicative” classroom. The chapter will then turn to a discussion of several typologies that have been proposed for categorizing textbook activities. Finally, actual research studies on the activities in foreign language textbooks will be reviewed, with emphasis on the degree to which these activities conform to current theories of language learning.

Theories of Language Learning

Comprehensible Input Hypothesis

Krashen’s (1981) theory of language learning has been highly influential in the past three decades. His theory is broken down into several components, which include the acquisition-learning distinction, the monitor theory and the role of comprehensible input. Acquisition is when a person attains language the same way that a child learns their first language. The child achieves their native language through natural communication, which requires meaningful interaction with the language. Learning, in contrast, occurs through conscious study of the language and, is thought to be helped a great deal by error correction and the presentation of explicit rules. The claim of monitor theory is that the conscious learning is available to the informer only as a monitor. Fluency is obtained basically through active communication. The comprehensible input theory states that learners acquire language when they are exposed to
linguistic input that is slightly above their current level but it is still comprehensible. The implication for this study is that foreign language classroom activities should provide lots of comprehensible input to aid the student in acquiring the second language. If teachers are relying solely on their textbook, is there opportunity for Krashen’s theory to play a role in learning a language by using the textbook?

**Output Hypothesis**

Swain (2005) asserts that although input may be the first step needed to have the foundations of language, without the opportunity for oral expression, the acquisition of language will not take place effectively. Swain’s (2005) output hypothesis claims that the act of producing language (speaking or writing) constitutes, under certain circumstances, part of the process of L2 learning. The process involved in producing language can be quite different than those involved in comprehending language. Swain (1995) outlines three functions of output in second language learning: 1) the noticing/triggering function, 2) the hypothesis-testing function and 3) the metalinguistic (reflective function). In the noticing triggering function, learners may notice that they do not know how to say or write precisely the meaning they wish to convey. This awareness triggers cognitive processes that have been implicated in second language learning. The hypothesis testing function claims that output may sometimes be, from the learners’ perspective, a “trial run” reflecting their hypothesis of how to say or write their intent. In the metalinguistic (reflective) function, the claim is that using language to reflect on language produced by others or the selfmediates second language learning. The implication for foreign language classrooms is that the students should have lots of opportunities to produce output.
**Interaction and Negotiation of Meaning**

Ellis (1991) summarizes what has become known as the interaction hypothesis or negotiation of meaning (NoM). This hypothesis advances two major claims about the role of interaction in second language acquisition: comprehensible input is necessary for acquiring a second language (L2), and mediations to the interactional structure of conversations which take place in the process of negotiating a communication problem help to make input comprehensible to a L2 learner. In this theory the learner is constantly inferring meaning. It is a give and take, much like negotiation in a business. The implication for second language classrooms is that the students need opportunities to interact and negotiate meaning with others in the language.

Doughty and Pica (1986) suggest that classroom tasks require an exchange of information which is crucial in generating conversation in order to acquire a second language, claiming that conversational modification occurring during interaction is instrumental in second language acquisition.

**The Role of Formal Grammar Instruction**

Most of the research up to this point has basically criticized the extensive usage of grammar, claiming that the learner does not acquire language through grammar. However, Ellis (1995) and Fuller (1987) have a different view of the role of grammar. In a 1995 study, Ellis addresses the question of whether grammar is necessary to acquire language, and concludes that learners who receive formal instruction outperformed those who do not. In his study, students who received formal grammar instruction tended to learn faster than students who did not. Fuller (1987) also addresses the question of grammar instruction, asserting that grammar plays a major role in second language learning. How the first language is learned is all natural; however, for the second language learner it is not practical to learn in the same way as a child because it
would require a long time to acquire the language. The grown-up can take advantage of logic and is able to learn the grammar in a more organized way.

**Language Learning in a Classroom Context**

Not surprisingly, the abovementioned theories are reflected in the literature on language learning in a classroom setting. Lightbown and Spada (1993) discuss the gaining of second language skills in three different contexts: natural acquisition, traditional instruction, and communicative language teaching classrooms. In the natural acquisition of a second language students are learning in an environment outside the classroom – perhaps on the streets, at work, or in a foreign country where they have access to the language for many hours during the day. In this environment students are rarely corrected. If the people are able to understand what the speaker is trying to say, they would probably not correct the speaker for fear of being rude. In this context language is not structured on a sequence.

Learners in traditional instruction are students in a foreign language class who are learning vocabulary words or grammatical concepts, often in isolation from meaning. The goal of the teacher is that students learn the vocabulary and grammatical structure of the foreign language. Traditional instruction differs from natural learning in that students are often corrected in the classroom; accuracy tends to prevail over meaningful interaction; and input tends to be simplified or sequenced. Grammar is practiced in isolation, not in the context of creating meaning. Students tend to feel pressure to communicate orally or in written in a correct manner. This type of environment may have very limited time for learning.

Communicative language teaching involves the students learning the language by using it for meaningful communication. The main method of teaching places emphasis on conversation, interaction, and practice of the actual language. In this type of class the emphasis is on meaning,
and the amount of correction may be limited. Input is simplified and made comprehensible by the use of contextual cues, props, and gestures, rather than through structural grading (the presentation of one grammatical item at a time, in a sequence of a simple to complex). The teacher in these settings attempts to communicate with students using language that they are able to understand, and the students may also communicate with each other using basic language.

Shrum and Glisan (2004) describe what, in their opinion, constitute truly communicative activities. These are activities in which both parties (whether the teacher and a student or a student and another student) seek clarification in order to interact. They check comprehension and request confirmation that they have understood or are being understood by the other.

**Typologies of Textbook Activities**

Lee and VanPatten (2003) observe that foreign language textbooks for the most part seem to present grammar in a similar sequence and use the same types of practice activities. The activities can generally be classified as either mechanical drills, meaningful drills, or communicative practice drills. Mechanical drills are drills where the student does not need to understand in order to answer correctly. These types of drills only have one option as an answer. Krashen (1991) believes that mechanical drills for the most part tend to be meaningless. One of the issues with mechanical drills is that these types of drills are not natural nor do they intend to be. Thus, mechanical drills are, at best, only partially suitable for acquisition. Aski (2003) agrees that mechanical drills are not necessary, nor do they benefit the learning process in any way. Aski claims that drills cannot anchor declarative knowledge in the learners’ consciousness, which is the goal of cognitive approaches because they favor repetition of pattern practice, and thus do not encourage learners to notice and understand the context in which rules applies. Van Patten (2002) and Wong and VanPatten (2003) have found that mechanical drills are among the
least successful in language-practice activities because they do not influence or give strength to the learner to form meaning.

In contrast, meaningful drills require the learner to attend to the meaning of both the stimulus and their own answer in order to complete the meaningful drill successfully. Lee & VanPatten (1995), the learner must understand the question first in order to respond correctly. Meaningful drills require the learner to communicate something which was not in the text. According to Paulston (1971), the problem is that real communication is not taking place with these kinds of drills. Drills are given to students solely for the sake of practice in order to create an automatic response from the student.

In contrast to mechanical and meaningful drills, communicative practice drills require attention to meaning, and the information contained in the learners’ answers is new and unknown to the person asking the questions and to the teacher; they cannot be predicted. In mechanical and meaningful drills the teacher can always anticipate what the student will say; in communicative practice the answer is not known (Lee & VanPatten, 1995). Paulston (1971) claims that communicative drills require the most time and can be the most difficult to arrange, but she believes that if we want fluency from our students then we have to give them the opportunity for expression. She affirms that exercises such as role-playing, problem solving, ordering meals, and acting out a scene can enhance the opportunity for the individual to learn and practice the language in a way that is more meaningful to learners.

Nunan (1999) makes a similar distinction between drills and communicative activities, calling the former “exercises” and the latter “tasks.” According to Nunan, an exercise has a linguistic outcome such as the correct production of a grammar structure, whereas a task offers an
opportunity for a non-linguistic outcome where language is used in order to accomplish some purpose or goal.

Wong and VanPatten (2003) take a strong position that there is enough evidence to reject mechanical instructional practice. Their evidence comes from both theory and empirical research. According to Wong and Van Patten, “drills are simply unnecessary and at best a waste of time for the development of communicative language ability” (p 417).

Research on Textbook Activities

However, relatively few studies have examined the communicative nature of foreign language textbook activities. Ellis (2002), Shelly (1995) and Takenoya (1995) examined textbooks activities in terms of how grammar is practiced, and Frantzen (1998) examined the extent to which grammar practice activities incorporated culture, he concluded that teaching grammar with a communicative component leads to higher levels of language ability.

Only two known studies have looked at how communicative foreign language textbooks are. Lally (1998) examined six beginning French college textbooks published between 1995 and 1998. She categorized the activities as mechanical drills, forced-choice practice activities (activities in which the context forces the students to choose among alternative responses), and communicative activities. She found that the six books varied greatly in the types of activities they contained. Among the six books, the percentage of activities that were mechanical drills ranged from 18% to 41%; forced-choice practice activities ranged from 10% to 42%; and communicative activities ranged from 15% to 49%. It is not completely clear, however, what criteria Lally used to sort the textbook activities into these categories.

In a similar study, Aski (2003) examined seven elementary Italian textbooks in terms of the practice activities for two grammar principles: the verb piacere and the passato prossimo.
She categorized these activities as mechanical drills, meaningful drills, communicative drills, and communicative language practice activities. She found that for *piacere*, only 14% of the activities were communicative activities, and for the *passato prossimo*, only 3% of the activities were communicative. It is important to note that Aski was examining only those activities designed to practice these grammatical concepts; she presumably did not look at other activities in the chapters.

**Summary**

Both Lally (1998) and Aski (2003) attempted to sort textbook activities into clear cut categories such as drills or communicative activities. However, this is not an easy task, as often the activities may overlap. This may very well be a limitation for both their studies. Activities may fall under more than one category. The present study takes a different approach. Rather than attempting to classify activities into different categories, the study defines four variables (Understanding, Purpose, Opportunity to share, and Spontaneity) that are thought to make an activity communicative, and then rates textbook activities according to those variables. In the next chapter I describe the present study, which looks at five high school Spanish textbooks for Spanish 1 in the United States to determine the type of exercises that the books offer.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Selection of Textbooks and Chapters to Be Evaluated

Five Spanish books were chosen on the basis of what was available at the university library as well as popular Spanish textbooks by major publishing companies. The texts were all books used for Spanish 1 at the high school level. The books that were evaluated were: *Realidades*, *Exprésate*, *Así se dice*, *Avancemos* and *Aventura*. For each book, Chapter 2 and Chapter 5 were chosen to be assessed by two raters. This is a very limited study as only two raters were included in the analysis of the activities of the books. No supplemental material was appraised, such as workbooks, Total Physical Response activities or stories, readers, or videos. The only item evaluated was the textbook. It was not feasible to have more raters as only two foreign language educators teach at Coal City High School.

The rationale in choosing Chapters 2 and 5 was that one chapter represented material covered during the first semester and the other chapter covered during the second half of the year. In my own personal teaching and in speaking to other Spanish teachers, I have not come across anyone who is able to finish a book during a school year. It is definitely possible, however, to get to Chapter 2 by the first semester and Chapter 5 by the second semester. Most teachers can get through Chapter 5 and maybe the beginning of Chapter 6. I wanted to make sure that the chapters represented each semester. I also wanted to see if there would be a difference in activities from one semester to another. By the second semester students have acquired more language, so one would expect the exercises to shift to reflect the acquired language.
Defining the Rating Criteria

In the study, four properties of textbook activities were evaluated: Understanding, Purpose, Opportunities to Share Information, and Spontaneity. All activities were rated on understanding and purpose. Activities that the books specifically labeled as “communicative activities” also were rated on opportunities for the student to share information and spontaneity. Each category had a ranking from 1 to 5.

The Understanding scale assessed the extent to which an activity required students to understand the meaning of the language used in order to complete the activity. The points of the scale were defined as follows:

1. The activity can be completed by the student without understanding the meaning of any of the words.
2. The activity can be completed by the student without understanding the meaning but may require a little effort to obtain meaning (such as looking at cognates).
3. The activity requires understanding of some of the language in order for the activity to be completed.
4. The question requires mostly to be understood in order for the student to complete the activity.
5. The activity can be completed only with full understanding of meaning.

The Purpose scale measured the extent to which an activity presented a real-life purpose for using language, as opposed to merely providing practice with linguistic forms. The points of the scale were defined as follows:
1. Activity is designed to focus exclusively on linguistic forms, with no attention to meaning, nor does it reflect applicability to situations outside of the classroom.

2. The activity can be answered by making minimum substitutions to the activity given; it is an activity unlikely to be used outside of the classroom.

3. Activity focuses mainly on linguistic forms, with some attention to meaning. Activity may be applicable outside the classroom under certain circumstances.

4. Activity requires attention to form in order to be able to answer correctly, and may very well be used outside the classroom.

5. The activity is designed to expand beyond grammar concepts allowing the students to create own concepts, and helps students apply information. Activity can be use outside the classroom.

The Opportunities to Share Information Scale measured the extent to which an activity allowed for the sharing of information that was known by one student or the other but not both, and required interaction in order to for each student to obtain information from the other. The points of the scale were defined as follows:

1. All students have access to the same information; no negotiation of meaning is required.

2. The students have access to the same information but are able to substitute information in order to make the activity more personal.

3. Activity requires interaction but the information is not shared equally. One student may have access to the information while the other student may need to come up with the answers in order to complete the activity.

4. Students have access to information equally and some negotiation of meaning is required to complete the activity.
5. Each student has unique information, and the students must negotiate meaning in order to complete the task.

The Spontaneity Scale measured the degree to which an activity allowed students to create Spontaneity with language. The points of the scale were defined as follows:

1. Activity requires the student to follow a formatted script.

2. The activity has some formatted script but the student is able to make some substitutions.

3. The activity may require one student to have a formatted script while another student has the opportunity to answer although the answer is expected or known.

4. This activity allows both students to share information equally, in this activity the answer is not known or expected.

5. Activity allows students to be able to create open-ended questions or dialogue.

The scales used in the book activities were discussed extensively with my thesis committee as well as other professors in the Spanish Pedagogy section of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Brigham Young University to determine the accuracy of wording of the rating scales.

Applying the Criteria to Evaluate the Textbooks

The two raters first discussed the criteria of scales to clarify what each scale meant. The two raters came from the same school, and we both teach the same curriculum. We collaborate in our teaching. No compensation was provided to the raters for taking the time to complete the task. We discussed some activities and rated them together. If one person rated one way and the other person rated differently, we discussed our differences in order to understand the rationale behind
the rating. Often, when we spoke to one another we were able to understand why the person would rate in that way or the other. The purpose of doing this prior to the rating was to clear up any misconceptions as to what the wording in the scale could mean. Some activities were not easily rated as the instruction often gave two or more options as far as how the activity could be used. If such was the case, we opted to go for the spoken activity over the written one. Inter-rater reliability for the ratings of the two raters on each variable was calculated using a Pearson Product-moment correlation. The results are shown in Table 1. As can be seen in the table, inter-rater reliability for the Understanding variable was \( r (278) = .87 \); for the Purpose variable, \( r (278) = .85 \); for the Opportunities variable, \( r (77) = .90 \); for the Spontaneity variable, \( r (77) = .86 \). These results were judged to be acceptably high. Conversely, the correlations among different variables (e.g., Understanding with Purpose, Opportunities with Spontaneity, etc.) were much lower than those for Rater 1 with Rater 2 on the same variable, suggesting that the different variables were in fact measuring different attributes.

In order to give the reader an idea as to how the rating criteria were applied in evaluating specific textbook activities, several of these activities are included in Appendix C-I, along with an explanation of how they were rated on the different variables

Appendix C

**Actividad 7 (Realidades)**

This activity did not have the communication component. For the “Understanding” Variable it would score about a 2 or lower. For the “Purpose” Variable this activity would be rated as a 3 or lower.
Appendix D

Actividad 18 (Realidades)

This task has the option of either writing or speaking the activity, with such activity the option was to go for the speaking part. This activity would have 4 variables. For the “Understanding” Variable this activity would not receive a rating higher than 2. For the “Purpose” Variable this activity would rate at a 3 or lower. For the Opportunities for the student to share information this exercise would rank at a 2 or lower. For the “Spontaneity” Variable the score would not be higher than a 2.

Appendix E

Hablar 4 (Así se dice)

This practice is labeled as a communicative, therefore 4 rankings would be assigned. For the “Understanding” Variable the score would be a 4 or lower. The “Purpose” Variable the rate would be at a 4 or lower. For the “Opportunity” Variable the score would not be higher than a 3. For the “Spontaneity” Variable the mark would be at a maximum of a 3.

Appendix F

Actividad 18 (Exprésate)

This exercise only had 2 component scale. For the “Understanding” Variable the rate would be at a 4 or lower. The “Purpose” Variable the highest rating would be a 4.

Appendix G

Actividad 11 (Exprésate)

This activity had 2 variables. The “Understanding” variable ranked at a 3 or lower. The “Purpose” Variable would not receive a score higher than a 2.
Appendix H

Actividad 5 and 7 (Así se Dice)

Práctica 5 has the option of doing the activity by either listening, talking or writing. For the “Understanding” Variable, the score would not be higher than a 3. The “Purpose” Variable would not be higher than a 1. For the “Opportunity” Variable the highest rating was a 1. For the “Spontaneity” Variable the rate would be a 2 the highest.

Práctica 7 is labeled as a communication activity. The “Understanding” Variable is a 1. The “Purpose” Variable scored 2 for the highest. The Opportunity ranked at a 3. The “Spontaneity” Variable the highest score was a 3.

APPENDIX I

Vocabulary list

I included a list of a typical vocabulary list at the end of the chapter. My purpose in including this page was to show that it may not do the student any good to memorized vocabulary words if they are not applying these words to situations where it can be applicable to outside the classroom.
The raters then worked independently in rating Chapter 2 and Chapter 5 of each book. A scoring sheet was provided listing the activities in the book in numerical order.

Inter-rater reliability for the ratings of the two raters on each variable was calculated using a Pearson Product-moment correlation. The results are shown in Table 1. As can be seen in the table, inter-rater reliability for the Understanding variable was $r(278) = .87$; for the Purpose variable, $r(278) = .85$; for the Opportunities variable, $r(77) = .90$; for the Spontaneity variable, $r(77) = .86$. These results were judged to be acceptably high. Conversely, the correlations among different variables (e.g., Understanding with Purpose, Opportunities with Spontaneity, etc.) were

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Understand Rater 1</th>
<th>Purpose Rater 1</th>
<th>Opportunity Rater 1</th>
<th>Spontaneity Rater 1</th>
<th>Understand Rater 2</th>
<th>Purpose Rater 2</th>
<th>Opportunity Rater 2</th>
<th>Spontaneity Rater 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.557**</td>
<td>.598**</td>
<td>.549**</td>
<td>.872**</td>
<td>.460**</td>
<td>.553**</td>
<td>.434**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
much lower than those for Rater 1 with Rater 2 on the same variable, suggesting that the different variables were in fact measuring different attributes.

Some activities were not as easily identifiable as communicative activities as in some cases the instructions did not seem to point out clearly that a particular activity was a partner activity requiring communication. After the rating was complete, Rater 1 compared questions to make sure that Rater 2 did not miss any questions. Some textbooks were not as easily labeled with the activity number. In that case we went through the chapter together to make sure we covered the same activities and in some it would have been very easy to skip an activity not realizing that it was an activity, particularly in textbooks where the activities are not numbered or they may be numbered but may also use lettering.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using PASW Statistics 18 software. Descriptive statistics (averages, standard deviations, and frequencies) were calculated for each variable. Comparisons between the mean ratings of Chapter 2 and Chapter 5 activities, as well as between the mean ratings of activities labeled as “communicative” and those not labeled as such, were made using independent *t* tests.

Chapter 4 will discuss the findings of the data.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter will examine the results of the data analysis for the main research question, (1) To what extent do the activities in high school Spanish textbooks incorporate current theories and research on language learning, and specifically, in relation to the criteria of (a) understanding, (b) purpose, (c) opportunities for the student to share information and (d) spontaneity? The chapter will also examine results for the two subquestions, (1a) As textbooks progress from the earlier chapters to the later chapters do the activities become more communicative in nature? (1b) Are activities that textbooks explicitly label as “communicative” actually more communicative than other activities in the book?

Research Question 1: To what extent do the activities in high school Spanish textbooks incorporate current theories and research on language learning, and specifically, in relation to the criteria of (a) understanding, (b) purpose, (c) opportunities for the student to share information and (d) spontaneity?

The analysis of this question was approached in two ways. First, for each chapter of each book, I calculated what percentages of the activities were explicitly labeled by the book as “communicative.” Results are shown in Table 2.
Table 2

Percentage of Activities in Each Chapter Labeled as “Communicative”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chapter 2 &amp; Chapter 5 questions labeled as communicative/total questions</th>
<th>% of activities labeled as communicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aventura</td>
<td>20/69</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avancemos</td>
<td>10/41</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Así se dice</td>
<td>13/61</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exprésate</td>
<td>19/69</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realidades</td>
<td>12/40</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL BOOKS</td>
<td>74/280</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, 74 out of the total 280 were classified as activities that require communication. This represents 26% of all the activities among all five books, suggesting that the other 74% of the activities did not have communication as their main focus.

The second approach to evaluating the communicative nature of the textbook activities involved calculating descriptive statistics for the raters’ scores on each of the four variables. These are shown in Table 3. Differences between Chapter 2 and Chapter 5 were not significant.
Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Each Variable (Mean of Raters 1 and 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Understanding</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Purpose</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Opportunities</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Spontaneity</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures 1 through 4 below show histograms for each variable showing the frequency of each rating. As can be seen, the ratings for the Understanding variable were the highest of the four. Ratings for the Purpose variable were the lowest, with the most common rating being 1. This suggest that publishing companies are aware of the importance of having the language be comprehensible but lack applicability in how this information can apply to communication outside of the classroom.
As can be seen from the “Understanding” Variable the most common trend was a score of 3 which means that the activity requires understanding of some of the language in order for the activity to be completed.
Figure 2

Score Frequencies for “Purpose” Variable (Mean of Raters 1 and 2)

As can be seen from the “Purpose” Variable the most common trend was a score of 1 which means that the activity is designed to focus exclusively on linguistic forms, with no attention to meaning, nor does it reflect applicability outside of classroom.
As can be seen from the “Opportunities” Variable the most common trend was a score of 2 which means that the students have access to the same information but are able to substitute in order to make the activity more personal.
As can be seen from the “Spontaneity” Variable the most common trend was a score of 2 which means that the activity has some formatted script but the student is able to make some substitutions.
Research Question 1(a): As textbooks progress from the earlier chapters to the later chapters, do the activities become more communicative in nature?

As explained in Chapter 3, it was hypothesized that the activities in Chapter 5 of each book would be more communicative than those in Chapter 2 because students’ communicative ability presumably increases as the course progresses. Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7 below show the mean rating for each variable for Chapter 2 and Chapter 5, as well as the results of $t$ tests comparing the ratings for the two chapters. An alpha level of .05 was used to determine statistical significance.

Table 4

Comparison of Chapters 2 and 5 on “Understanding” Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2.346</td>
<td>.8894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2.532</td>
<td>.9021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t$ test for Equality of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.735</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.1857</td>
<td>.1071</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Comparison of Chapters 2 and 5 on “Purpose” Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.796</td>
<td>.8416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>.8445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.425</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>-.0429</td>
<td>.1008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

Comparison of Chapters 2 and 5 on “Opportunities” Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.113</td>
<td>1.0469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.590</td>
<td>1.0442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2.028</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.4772</td>
<td>.2353</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

Comparison of Chapters 2 and 5 on “Spontaneity” Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.038</td>
<td>.9634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.538</td>
<td>.9623</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2.312</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.5010</td>
<td>.2167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As is evident from the tables, the mean ratings for two of the variables, Opportunities and Spontaneity, were significantly higher for Chapter 5 than for Chapter 2, suggesting that the activities did in fact become more communicative as the books progressed. The mean ratings for the other two variables, Understanding and Purpose, did not change significantly from Chapter 2 to Chapter 5, although the difference for the Understanding variable did approach significance ($p = .08$).

**Research Question 1(b): Are activities that textbooks explicitly label as “communicative” actually more communicative than other activities in the book?**

As previously explained, some of the activities in each chapter of all textbooks were explicitly labeled as “communicative.” This research question examined the extent to which these exercises were in fact more communicative than tasks that were not specifically labeled as communicative. Because the latter group of activities was not rated on the Opportunities and Spontaneity variables, the analysis for this subquestion compared the two groups of activities only on the Understanding and Purpose variables. Tables 8 and 9 below show the mean rating for each variable for the two groups of exercises, as well as the results of $t$ tests comparing the means of the two groups.
Table 8

Comparison of Activities Labeled “Communicative” With Activities Not Labeled as Such:

“Understanding” Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Communicative”</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.264</td>
<td>.9139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.886</td>
<td>.6838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t \] test for Equality of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-5.478</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.6224</td>
<td>.1136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9

Comparison of Activities Labeled “Communicative” With Activities Not Labeled as Such:

“Purpose” Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Communicative”</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.590</td>
<td>.7530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.399</td>
<td>.7778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t \] test for Equality of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-8.018</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.8092</td>
<td>.1009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

In general, the textbook activities did not rate highly on any of the four communicative variables; they did not come anywhere near the highest rating of the rubric that was used to rate the activities. As can be seen, the activities labeled as “communicative” scored significantly
higher than activities not labeled as such. However, the authors do seem to be making a conscious effort to make activities more communicative as the book progresses, and the activities that are specifically designed as “communicative” do seem to provide more communicative practice than other activities.

This chapter has reported the results of the data analyses for the main research question and two subquestions. Chapter 5 will discuss conclusions drawn from the findings, implications for textbook publishers and teachers, limitations of the study, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The goal of the study was to evaluate the activities in textbooks to determine if the exercises in the books represented tasks deemed as “communicative.” The study suggests that all textbooks evaluated across the board have room for improvement as far as making their activities more communicative. Only 26 percent of the activities were even labeled as such, with the remaining activities not even claiming to have communication as their main focus. This information implies that textbooks may not be in alignment with major theories of how language is acquired. The majority of the activities may fall under the category of meaningless drills.

Swain (1985), suggests that in order to develop communicative capability, learners must have prolonged opportunities to use the second language effectively. Clearly the textbooks fall behind in achieving this goal as less than half of the activities attempt to be communicative.

Of the four variables rated in the study, the category of Understanding scored the highest, suggesting that the textbook authors are making an effort to provide information which could be valuable to the students, as the students must understand the language in order to complete the given assignment. Yet the mean of this category was under 2.4 for Chapter 2 and Chapter 5 combined. The effort is there, but publishers have a way to go to truly bring activities that would be more beneficial to the student of a foreign language.

The category labeled as Purpose scored the lowest. The mean for this category was 1.81. What this implies is that many of the activities in the textbook do not carry a purpose that can be applied outside of the classroom. This is an area that textbooks could improve tremendously; if the students see some connection to outside the classroom, they may be able to do much better in their language acquisition.
According to Krashen (1984), “second language acquisition occurs when the learner receives comprehensible input, not when the learner is memorizing vocabulary or completing grammar exercises” (p. 304). The low ratings in the Purpose category show that textbook activities are not really reflecting activities that would be applicable to the student outside of the classroom. The exercises do not provide comprehensible input for the most part, as many of the purpose activities are just requirements to memorize vocabulary words or practice grammar, with no apparent applicability to the students’ “real life” communicative needs.

The mean ratings for two of the variables, Opportunities and Spontaneity, were significantly higher for Chapter 5 than for Chapter 2. This suggests that the activities did in fact become more communicative as the books progressed. However, the other two variables, Understanding and Purpose, did not change significantly from Chapter 2 to Chapter 5. It would be ideal if activities scored higher in all categories and if there were a significant improvement across all questions since the language of the student should have improved from Chapter 2 to Chapter 5.

The activities labeled as “communicative” scored significantly higher. The authors do attempt to make a conscious effort to make activities more challenging as they progressed through the book, yet they still fall behind as they did not come anywhere near the highest rating of the rubric that was used to rate the activities.

**Implications for Textbook Publishers and Teachers**

It is my recommendation that publishing companies look at this study to improve the structure of the textbook so that they contain activities which are more meaningful and applicable to outside the classroom. It would be ideal if future textbooks took into account how language is acquired. Perhaps the area of drills can be minimized and the area of communication
can be maximized. Instead of having only 26% of the activities be communicative, it would be more beneficial for the student to have 74% of the activities be more communicative and with meaningful purpose.

I would highly encourage teachers to perhaps use the textbook as a guide, but to try to incorporate other material that perhaps the book publisher does not offer. This may require more work on the teacher’s part, as it may necessitate more planning to be able to deliver a lesson that offers more opportunities for the students to communicate. Going outside the textbook may allow students to do activities that rank higher in understanding, purpose, opportunities for sharing and spontaneity.

I don’t want to imply that learning grammar is not an important part of language acquisition or that the textbooks do not provide any valuable learning. I strongly believe that as learners progress in their language acquisition, they need to have the grammar rules to be able to communicate effectively. Perhaps initially if the goal is communication only, if learners communicate with mistakes and get their point across, then they have achieved communication. At some point, however, one would hope that learners would want to be able to communicate correctly, and for that purpose they need grammar rules. Having said that, I would like to see publishers enhance communication by decreasing their emphasis on grammar. The goal should not be grammar for its own sake but rather as a tool for communication. Students should be able to explore the learning of a language where they can actually use what they achieve to be able to communicate in situations outside of the classroom.

Limitations of the Study

This is a small study with only two raters, and I was one of them. The two raters were from a small rural community and were chosen completely by convenience. It would be
interesting to see assessments from other teachers as well as teachers from other states or even more metropolitan cities.

A second limitation of the study was that it only included activities in the textbook and not any exercises that may be supplemented by the publishing company. In addition, teachers may do many activities in the classroom to enhance communication with students in the classroom, and those actions were not taken into consideration for this study.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

In future studies of this type, it would be interesting to have more raters to see what kind of results are generated. Another area for future research would be to compare learning outcomes in classes that rely heavily on the textbook with those that do not. If the textbook is not utilized by some teachers, it would be interesting to see if people increase their language skills by using the textbook compared to students who do not use the textbook. If that is the case, then researchers could examine what activities teachers are using in the classroom to increase their student’s language skills. A third line of research for future studies could be to attempt to align different types of learning activities with theories of acquisition of language and to see which activities are most effective for students.
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**APPENDIX A**

**Rating Scales Used With All Textbook Activities**

**Understanding** (extent to which students need to understand the language used in order to complete the activity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The activity can be completed by the student without understanding the meaning of any of the words</th>
<th>The activity can be completed by the student without understanding the meaning but may require a little effort to obtain meaning (looking at cognates)</th>
<th>The activity requires understanding of some of the language in order for the activity to be completed</th>
<th>The question requires most of the language to be understood in order for the student to complete the activity</th>
<th>The activity can be completed only with full understanding of meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Purpose** (extent to which activity focused on communicating meaning, and extent to which activity can be transferred to a real life situation outside the classroom, as opposed to merely practicing linguistic forms)

| Activity is designed to focus exclusively on linguistic forms, with no attention to meaning, nor does it reflect applicability to situations outside of classroom | The activity can be answered by making minimum substitutions to the activity given, it is an activity unlikely to be use outside of the classroom | Activity focuses mainly on linguistic forms, with some attention to meaning, this activity may be applicable outside the classroom under certain circumstances | Activity requires attention to form in order to be able to answer correctly, activity may very well be used outside the classroom | The activity is designed to expand beyond grammar concepts allowing the students to create own concepts, this activity helps students apply information and it can be use outside the classroom |
APPENDIX B

Rating Scales Used With Activities Labeled as “Communicative”

**Opportunities for the student to share information** (Activities that are depicted as communicative or have a sharing icon will have this extra rating scale)

| All students have access to the same information, no negotiation of meaning is required | The students have access to the same information but are able to substitute in order to make the activity more personal | Activity requires interaction but the information is not shared equally. One student may have access to the information while the other student may need to come up with the answers in order to complete the activity | Students have access to information equally and some negotiation of meaning is required to complete the activity | Each student has unique information, the student must negotiate meaning in order to complete the task |

**Spontaneity** (lack of prompting and naturalness)

| Activity requires the student to follow a formatted script | The activity has some formatted script but the student is able to make some substitutions | The activity may require one student to have a formatted script while another student has the opportunity to answer although the answer is expected or known | This activity allows both students to share information equally, in this activity the answer is not known or expected | Activity allows students to create open-ended questions or dialogue |
**APPENDIX C**

**Hablar**

**Mucha tarea**
With a partner, ask and tell if you have a lot of homework in each class.

**Modelo**

A. —¿Tienes mucha tarea en la clase de matemáticas?
B. —Sí, tengo mucha tarea.
C. —No, no tengo mucha tarea.
D. —No estudio matemáticas.

**Escribir**

**Me gusta más...**
Write sentences stating which of the two classes you like better and why. Use the list of adjectives to help with your response. Save your paper for Actividad 8.

**Modelo**

_Álgebra / español_

Me gusta más la clase de español. Es divertida.

C. Me gusta más la clase de español. No es aburrida.
D. No me gusta ni la clase de español ni la clase de inglés.
Escribir/Hablar

Actividades y más actividades

1. Work with a partner. Copy the Venn diagram on a sheet of paper. Label the oval on the left Yo. Label the oval on the right with the name of your partner. Label the overlapping area Nosotros or Nosotras.

2. From the list below, choose five activities you do a lot. Write your activities in the oval labeled Yo. Be sure to conjugate the verb in the yo form.

   - montar en bicicleta
   - pasar tiempo con amigos
   - hablar por teléfono
   - practicar deportes
   - escuchar música
   - hablar español
   - dibujar
   - nadar
   - estudiar
   - usar la computadora

   - trabajar
   - cantar
   - bailar

3. Interview your partner. Ask questions to find out the five activities your partner wrote in his or her diagram. When you find out an activity, write it in the right oval of your diagram. Be sure to conjugate the verb in the él/ella form. Save your diagram for Actividad 19.

   - ¿Recuerdas?
   When you answer in the negative, you often use no twice. The first no answers the question. The second no goes before the verb and means "not."

   - A — ¿Dibujas mucho?
   - B — A ver . . . No, no dibujo mucho.
   - A — Pues, ¿trabalas mucho?
   - B — Sí, trabajo mucho.

   - Modelo

   A — ¿Dibujas mucho?
   B — A ver . . . No, no dibujo mucho.
   A — Pues, ¿trabalas mucho?
   B — Sí, trabajo mucho.

Nosotros(as) . . .

Compare the two sides of your diagram. Write the activities you and your partner both do in the center. Be sure to use the nosotras(as) form. Then use your completed diagram from Actividad 18 to write about what you and/or your partner do. Write at least five complete sentences.

   - Modelo

   Diego y yo trabajamos.
   Yo dibujo.
APPENDIX E

MAÑAR
Ask your partner these questions. Develop brief conversations by giving your own opinions as well. When you agree with your partner's opinion, you can add **Estoy de acuerdo**.

1. ¿Qué piensas del fútbol?
2. ¿Qué piensas del equipo de fútbol de tu escuela?
3. ¿Qué piensas de tu clase de español?
4. ¿Qué piensas de tus amigos?
5. ¿Qué piensas de tus profesores?

**Lectura - Hablar**

**Lee y completa.** Cuando los equipos juegan en la Copa Mundial, todos los jugadores del equipo son de la misma nacionalidad. Cada equipo tiene la bandera de su país. Da los colores de las banderas de los siguientes países.

 México  
 ![Bandera de México](image1)

 Argentina  
 ![Bandera de Argentina](image2)

 Chile  
 ![Bandera de Chile](image3)

 Perú  
 ![Bandera de Perú](image4)

**Comparaciones**

Con un(a) amigo(a), compara y contrasta el fútbol americano y el fútbol que juegan en Europa y Latinoamérica.
APPENDIX F

17 ¿Dónde?

Léanmos/Hablemos Complete each sentence with a logical place.

1. El carro y las bicicletas están en □□□□□.
   a. el garaje
   b. la sala

2. Almorzamos en □□□□□.
   a. el baño
   b. el comedor

3. Hay muchas plantas en las ventanas □□□□□.
   a. de la sala
   b. del baño

4. Descanso y veo películas en □□□□□.
   a. la sala
   b. el garaje

5. Preparamos la comida en □□□□□.
   a. la cocina
   b. la habitación

   a. la sala
   b. la casa

7. Hay un escritorio y una cama en □□□□□.
   a. el jardín
   b. la habitación

13 Donde vivo

Escribamos Complete the paragraph so that it's true for you.

MODELO Vivo en las afueras. Mi dirección es calle Mercado, número 3232.


¡Expresate!

To ask about responsibilities

¿Qué te parece tener que ayudar en casa?
What do you think about having to help out at home?

¿Qué te toca hacer a ti?
What do you have to do?

¿Y a Juan?
And Juan?

To respond

A veces tengo que cuidar a mis hermanos, pero me parece bien. No es gran cosa.
Sometimes I have to take care of my brothers and sisters, but it's all right with me. It's no big deal.

A mí siempre me toca pasar la aspiradora en la sala.
¡Qué lata!
I always have to vacuum the living room. What a pain!

A menudo tengo que arreglar mi cuarto.
I often have to pick up my room.

A Juan nunca le toca lavar los platos. Me parece injusto.
Juan never has to do the dishes. It seems unfair to me.
APPENDIX G

Stem-changing verbs: o — ue

1. Verbs with vowel variations in their stems are called stem-changing verbs. You have already learned jugar where the u changes to ue. In the verb dormir (to sleep), the o of the stem changes to ue in all forms except nosotros(as) and vosotros(as).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yo duermo</th>
<th>nosotros(as) duermos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tú duermes</td>
<td>vosotros(as) duermes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ud., él, ella duerme</td>
<td>Uds., ellos, ellas duermen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

El perro duerme mucho. The dog sleeps a lot.

2. Other verbs that follow this pattern are almorrar (to have lunch), volver (to go back or come back), and llover (to rain).

Cuando llueve, vuelvo a casa en el autobús. When it rains, I come home on the bus.

3. Use dormir hasta to say you sleep until a certain time.

Los domingos dormimos hasta las once.

Su rutina diaria

Léanmos Lee el mensaje que Bernardo le escribe a su abuela. Completa el párrafo con los verbos lógicos. Usa cada verbo sólo una vez.

duermo almuerzo vuelvo almorrarnos
duerme almuerza vuelve volvemos

Nosotros casi siempre ___1___ en la cafetería. Mi hermano ___2___ a las once y media y yo ___3___ a la una. Siempre tengo mucha hambre. Mi hermano ___4___ a casa en su bicicleta a las dos y media y yo ___5___ a las tres. A veces nosotros ___6___ a videojuegos después de volver y a veces yo ___7___ un poco en el sofá. A las cuatro y media vamos al parque por una hora. Nosotros ___8___ del parque a las cinco y media. Después de cenar hacemos nuestra tarea. Los sábados nosotros ___9___ hasta tarde. El perro siempre ___10___ conmigo.

Capítulo 5  •  En casa con la familia
APPENDIX H

**Rompecabezas**

Choose the word in each group that does not belong. Then switch the wrong words to make each group correct.

1. campo | guardar | raqueta | portero
2. receptor | platillo | guante | portera
3. pelota | canasta | red | golpear
4. bate | cesto | balón | driblar

**Confirma.** Correct the false statements.

1. Los béisbolistas juegan con un balón.
2. Los béisbolistas juegan en una cancha.
3. Los futbolistas llevan un guante.
4. Juegan básquetbol con una pelota.
5. El jugador de básquetbol mete el balón en un guante para marcar un tanto.
6. En el tenis la pelota tiene que tocar (rebosar) la red.

**Completa.** Complete with the correct color.

1. Las zapatillas del jugador de béisbol son __________.
2. El guante de béisbol es de color __________.
3. La camiseta del jugador de básquetbol es __________.
4. El pantalón corto del jugador de básquetbol es __________.
5. Los calcetines del jugador de tenis son __________.
6. La camiseta del jugador de tenis es __________.

**Comunicación**

Work with a partner. Give some information about a sport. Your partner will tell what sport you're talking about. Take turns.
# Repaso de Vocabulario 1

Describing people and family relationships... See p. 159.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>men</td>
<td>hombre (m)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woman</td>
<td>mujer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child</td>
<td>niño(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baby</td>
<td>bebé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father</td>
<td>padre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother</td>
<td>madre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daughter</td>
<td>hija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son</td>
<td>hijo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grandmother</td>
<td>abuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grandfather</td>
<td>abuelo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sister</td>
<td>hermana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brother</td>
<td>hermano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative</td>
<td>pariente</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Repaso de Vocabulario 2

Talking about where you and others live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>street</td>
<td>calle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house</td>
<td>casa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>room</td>
<td>cuarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apartment</td>
<td>departamento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>building</td>
<td>edificio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>door</td>
<td>puerta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address</td>
<td>dirección</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Talking about your responsibilities... See p. 172.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to cook</td>
<td>cocinar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to cut the grass</td>
<td>cortar el césped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to make the bed</td>
<td>hacer la cama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to do the chores</td>
<td>hacer los quehaceres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to clean</td>
<td>limpiar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to take out the trash</td>
<td>sacar la basura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chile

56