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Abstract

There is much dissention among theorists about whether foreign or second language education influences students' attitudes toward the target culture and language. Although many foreign language advocates assume that language learning naturally fosters positive cultural attitudes, research findings suggest a wide sample of explanations about the relationship between language learning and cultural attitudes. The examination of prior research into whether foreign language education fosters positive attitudes in students is startlingly contradictory and inconclusive. Conclusions of such research range from assertions that foreign language education enhances appreciation of culture to the assertion that foreign language education actually decreases appreciation of the target culture. A number of relevant variables are hypothesized to influence the relationship between foreign or second language learning and attitudes toward the target culture, the most significant of these being the deliberate addition of cultural instruction into the foreign language curriculum. The author presents research findings that indicate changes in some measures of attitude.
The Inspiration for the Thesis

As a Spanish Education major, I am preparing for a career in language teaching. Of utmost concern to me is that my teaching be effective on two levels: that students learn to speak, read, and write Spanish and that students learn to appreciate Hispanic culture as a window toward appreciating cultural diversity. In a perfect world, I would like to see my classroom emerge as a symbol of cultural diversity—a place where students can learn to set aside ethnocentric bias and learn to respect other cultures as much as their own.

With this goal in mind, I chose a thesis topic of practical significance to my career. My intent was to determine whether language education enhances cultural understanding. If it does, I wish to know how it accomplishes this goal as a guide to my own teaching. If it does not, I wish to discover why not in hopes of overcoming any ethnocentric barriers in my own teaching.

Therefore, my thesis has a practical purpose—to examine the relationship between language and cultural attitudes—as well as a theoretical purpose—to prepare a new teacher to teach language more effectively. With this in mind, I have divided my thesis into three parts. First, I review the current research on language education and cultural awareness. Second, I describe a research project I devised in order to add my own conclusions to this body of research. Finally, I reflect on what I have learned and draw preliminary conclusions about a direction for my own teaching—a direction designed to teach language in such a way as to enhance the appreciation of cultural diversity.
I'VE GOT A NEW ATTITUDE: THE INFLUENCE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION ON CULTURAL ATTITUDES

The Current Status of Foreign Language Education

One concern facing foreign language education advocates is the lack of availability of foreign language classes to students. Language study has declined since the 1960s, and now keeping foreign language classes in the curriculum, even as an elective, has proven difficult for its supporters (Omaggio, 1986). In Al-Rubaiy's (1984) analysis of five educational plans for school futures, he found that the reports generally neglected to provide for foreign language and multi/intercultural education. Opportunities for foreign language education are particularly scarce within the elementary school arena where only one in five students have the option of participating in a foreign language experience (Met & Rhodes, 1990). The lack of foreign language programs in the status quo has not only come to the attention of foreign language teachers, but has raised concern with many curriculum analysts. National organizations including the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies have noted the lack of foreign language skills among United States students, especially compared to students of more multilingual nations (Padilla, 1991).

This commentary raises another concern about foreign language education in addition to its lack of availability to students; foreign language within the curriculum
is not traditionally valued as a core subject. This can be seen when considering the predominantly elective status of foreign language in the United States. Omaggio (1986) explained the grave lack of importance placed on foreign language education in a society that wholly accepts monolingualism:

We should not be unduly surprised at our students' ignorance when fewer than four percent of all students graduating from high school today have had more than two years of a foreign language, and when the United States is the only nation in the world where an individual can graduate from college without ever having had even one year of a foreign language during any of the twelve years of schooling (p. 360).

Omaggio stressed the point that no other nation is as casual as the United States about requiring foreign language education on all educational levels. Borjian (1997) confirmed Omaggio's statement, explaining: "Foreign language education has been seen by some educators as 'extra,' with no part in the heart of the curriculum" (p. 3).

Although one perception of foreign language education is that it is supplementary to a curriculum, the importance of foreign language education in the curriculum is consistent with the goals and realities of a globally interacting society. A changing world requires that language differences cease to be barriers and that language learning takes its place to open lines of communication between cultures. Padilla (1990) asserted the necessity of a "language-competent society" which "encourages linguistic diversity and gives all individuals the opportunity to acquire and use more than a single language. A society that demands linguistic homogeneity
is neither free nor wise... In these days of increasing global dependence, it is essential that everyone be able to speak at least one language other than English” (p. 38).

Padilla recognized the need to integrate foreign language into all students’ lives in order to insure their success in a global society. Borjian (1997) also stressed the importance of multilingualism for participating in a globally interacting world. Borjian quoted Senator Paul Simon: “We are linguistically malnourished. Yet never in history has there been one nation with such a variety of ethnic and language backgrounds” (p. 3). Simon’s commentary called attention to the seemingly contradictory state of a monolingual United States with such linguistic and cultural diversity within its borders.

Not only does the United States’ reluctance to fully integrate foreign language into its traditional curricula hinder the development of a language-competent population, it also poses risks of fostering hostile or ethnocentric attitudes toward other cultures. Omaggio (1986) attempted to compare the United States’ resistance to bilingualism to Adolf Hitler’s attitude toward foreign language, expressed in Mien Kampf. She stated, “Seen in the chilling light of Hitler’s perspective, can there be any doubt that extreme ethnocentric attitudes represent a serious threat to world peace and security?” (p. 358). In addition to possibly breeding ethnocentrism, tolerating monolingualism can result in individual or societal dependence on language-competent individuals for cross-lingual communication (Robinson-Stuart & Nocon, 1996). Another risk of monolingualism is an increased chance of miscommunication occurring because of language differences, which can pose large-scale problems in addition to individual ones (Robinson-Stuart & Nocon, 1996).
The invasive ethnocentric attitude described can become integrated into students’ thinking when it is portrayed through societal values. Al-Rubaiy (1984) noted the prevalence of negative cultural attitudes in his investigation of educational goals: “I am claiming that I see too much ethnocentrism among our students... reforms were advocated in the name of achieving dominance over others. In other words 'being number one' was the goal versus what is being learned” (p. 13). The curriculum goals examined by Al-Rubaiy reflected an institutional priority of global superiority, which he feared could be easily adopted by the students.
The Integration of Language and Culture

The question arises as to the connection between language learning and cultural attitude. In many cases, the assumption is made that language learning naturally results in understanding or acceptance of the target culture. Brown (1986) posited the interconnection between language and thought when he stated, “Second language learning is often second culture learning” (Valdes, p. 33). Brown implied that cultural awareness can be contained within the language. Bentahila and Davies (1989) also asserted the inherent cultural content of language. They believe that language, because it is used by culturally-charged people, is also culturally-charged. “We can say that in practice a language could be culture-free only if it remained unused” (p. 110).

The belief that language and culture are naturally integrated was shared by Bex (1994) who identified as “positively misleading” the popular idea that English can be considered a culturally neutral international language. He supported Bentahila and Davies’ argument as can be seen in his statement: “Language quite simply cannot be ‘emptied of its cultural content.’ Teachers may focus more, or less, on the cultural messages conveyed by the language they offer to their pupils, but the language will inevitably be situated to carry some cultural meaning” (p. 64).

Blair (1995), in a discussion of the importance of multicultural awareness in the classroom, also asserted that to learn language, one could not help but to learn
culture. “One cannot master the grammar and vocabulary of a language without engaging in the mentality of people who live in that language,” stated Blair.

Padilla (1991) also held the assumption that culture comes innately with foreign language learning. He believed foreign language immersion programs in themselves hold the potential to open lines of understanding, fostering an environment for a language-competent society.

Clearly, many foreign language advocates believed language learning in itself will bring societal benefits of reducing ethnocentrism because students will simultaneously be learning to accept another culture with the language. One must ask the questions of whether this viewpoint is accurate, whether foreign language education reaps the attitudinal benefits that are claimed, and whether other factors are involved in the attitudinal influence of language students.
Language Learning and Cultural Attitudes: A Closer Look

The position that foreign language learning positively affects learners’ attitudes toward the target language and its speakers has been refuted on multiple levels, as can be observed in the following examination of research. Refutations have been comprised of claims that no relationship exists between language learning and cultural attitudes, that language learning does not affect attitude, rather attitude affects language learning achievement, and that language learning negatively affects cultural attitudes.

No Language-Attitude Relationship

Robinson-Stuart and Nocon (1996) criticized what they credited Robinson (1978) as coining “the magic-carpet-ride-to-another-culture syndrome.” As its name suggests, this encompasses the erroneous idea that language exposure automatically results in positive cultural awareness. They drew data from the 1973 St. Lambert experiment performed in Canada, which concluded that “children can become functionally bilingual without their linguistic experience influencing their attitudes toward speakers of the language” (p. 433). Robinson-Stuart and Nocon (1996) maintained the notion that exposure to foreign language does not necessarily affect the language learner’s attitude toward the target language and culture. This conclusion was reinforced in an examination of a study of six-year-old Canadians learning French completed by Genesee and Hamayan (1980). In this study, as in the St. Lambert experiment, no relationship was found between attitudes and learning the
second language (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). Gardner (1985) examined attitudinal research done on students learning language on a long-term basis through immersion. He was surprised to find that the programs in general "offer little reason to conclude that they have permanent effects on the evaluative component of attitudes toward the other language community" (p. 105).

Positive Cultural Attitudes Affect Language Learning

Contrary to the belief that no relationship exists between language and cultural attitude is the idea that a relationship does indeed exist in which a positive attitude toward the target language and culture results in more proficient language learning. Hakuta (1986) considered the nature of the relationship between language learning and attitude: "How do we know that positive attitudes result in more second-language learning, rather than that more second-language learning results in more positive attitudes?... The argument has so far been indirect, based on the fact that the families of the subjects share their attitudes" (p. 159). Hakuta (1986) concluded that the attitude is held intact, as attitude remains consistent within family members, regardless of the individual's experience with second-language learning. Gardner and Lambert conducted research on Canadians studying French, which resulted in similar findings. The students who, from the beginning, showed positive attitudes toward the French and their culture also showed higher performance levels in French (Hakuta, 1986). Gardner and Lambert negated the prospect of a causal relationship between achievement and attitude on the same basis that Hakuta certified. "Attitudes are more stable personality characteristics which influence and determine one's progress in
mastering a foreign language” (Omaggio, 1986, p. 253). Like Hakuta (1986), Gardner and Lambert’s assertion that attitude affects achievement rather than vice versa was based on the more inherent, permanent nature of attitude as a personality trait. Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) noted the same relationship upon examination of Canadian studies conducted by Van Els et al. As in Gardner and Lambert’s results (Hakuta, 1986), students more positively disposed to French yielded more proficiency in acquiring the language. A study conducted by Scherer and Wertheimer yielded similar conclusions, when it indicated that U.S. college students who had positive attitudes toward Germans performed better in German (Larsen-Freeman and Long, 1991).

**Language Learning Influences Attitudes Negatively**

Some research refuted the assumption that language learning breeds positive attitudes by showing incidents of language learning resulting in negative attitudes toward the target culture. The 1991 Nocon experiment at San Diego State University explored effects of a foreign language class requirement on students’ attitudes. The data indicated that “the foreign language requirement does not positively influence student attitudes toward speakers of the language or toward the language itself, but rather correlates with negative attitudes” (Robinson-Stuart & Nocon, 1996, p. 433). Gardner (1985) cited several studies that have concluded similarly: “Both Smith (1971) and Turner (1974) suggest that there is a good possibility that negative rather than positive attitude change may be the more common, and such speculations are supported by research findings. Investigations of English school students by both
Pritchard (1935) and Jordan (1941) reported a deterioration of attitudes toward the second language as a result of continued study" (p. 89). Gardner (1985) mentioned a study conducted by Hennick and Kennedy (1968) that yielded similar results; researchers suspected that forced language learning commonly causes feelings of failure for students. These negative feelings were transferred to the language. In these cases, the structure of the language program itself may have some bearing on students' reactions.
Hermann's (1978) studies bring support to the position that language learning does positively influence attitudes of learners toward the target language and culture. Hermann (1978) opposed Gardner and Lambert's conclusions that positive or negative attitudes enhance or hinder language achievement, calling Gardner and Lambert's position "a little one-sided" (p. 247). She held that language by nature contains culture that affects the learner's attitudes. The process of learning the foreign language also works to reach the students affectively, which influences their cultural attitudes so that "the mere satisfaction he derives from his achievement of the learning task may influence his attitude to the ethnolinguistic group in question and even result in change of such attitudes" (p. 249). Hermann's (1978) research supported her notions about the attitudinal influence of language learning. She studied 750 students in Germany who had been studying English for between one and five years. Hermann (1978) found that positive attitudes increased with the length of time students had been studying the language. She also noted that students who performed poorly in language classes began to develop negative attitudes toward the language class, which they then transferred to English speakers. These conclusions indicated the opposite of Gardner and Lambert's causal relationship. Hermann (1978) asserted that foreign language learning influences students' attitudes toward the target language, culture and speakers. She did mention such factors as teacher influence and proficiency as possible variables, but she did not discount the possibility of language learning alone as an attitudinal influence.
DiPietro (1980) explained the occurrence of language learning influencing cultural attitudes in his evaluation of an elementary school language project performed in a multi-lingual community in Arlington, Virginia. He found that at the end of the 14-week program, “mainstream children enrolled in the language courses had begun to use their newly acquired second language competence with minority children on the playground. Teachers reported fewer intergroup altercations during the same period” (p. 123). DiPietro’s (1980) observation implied a manifestation of attitude changes occurring toward the minority children as a result of language learning.
Other Variables to Consider

Extracurricular Factors

When examining a possible relationship between language learning and attitude, it is important to consider that other strong influences on the student may play a part in attitude formation or change. These include family, peers, the learning environment, teachers, and social groups (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). Students also participate in many activities outside the language classroom, and their attitudes are influenced by all their experiences, collectively (Gardner, 1985). These points cause one to question the possibility of deriving accurate results when attempting to isolate and evaluate one attitude-influencing variable among many.

Program Intensity and Time

The intensity of the language learning program may be another factor that helps determine whether, or the degree to which language learning influences attitudes. Stemfeld (1988), in a discussion of Canadian Immersion programs, identified program intensity as an important factor in attitude change. Students in immersion programs showed more positive attitudes toward learning French and toward further studying the language than did students in traditional courses.

As mentioned before, Hermann's (1978) research showed a marked distinction in positive attitude development over time, indicating that time may be an important factor to consider when examining attitudinal changes. Similar results were yielded in a study conducted by Savignon at the University of Illinois. After one semester of
studying French, students showed no relationship between attitude and proficiency, but as time passed, the correlation did develop (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991).

**Achievement**

The fact that the Savignon study looked at a correlation between proficiency and attitude brings up the importance of examining the level of success in the foreign language as a separate, significant variable. Hermann’s (1978) findings suggested that positive attitudes are at least enhanced by achievement level, although she did not assert that proficiency is an attitudinal determining factor. Other studies did attribute attitude changes to success or failure in the language. The Scherer and Wertheimer study showed a correlation between positive attitudes toward the German language and speakers and proficiency in German. This suggested that mere exposure or instruction in the language does not alone promote positive attitudes; student success is an important part of the equation (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991).

Gardner, Ginsberg and Smythe incorporated the question of whether success promotes positive attitudes in a study in which they compared college students in a traditional program with those in a “self-instruction” program that allowed them to monitor their own learning and pace. Gardner (1985) concluded that, “It is still clear that permitting students to pace themselves produces a more relative positive attitude change than that typically obtained in a traditional programme” (p. 192). He speculated that it may be attributed to a more pronounced sense of achievement among students in the self-instruction group. These findings supported the idea that achievement level may be an important variable in attitude.
Age

Age is another factor that may affect the effectiveness of foreign language programs on attitudinal influence. Gardner (1985) recounted results of both a study conducted by Halperne et al. and one conducted by Stennet and Earl. Halperne et al. measured no attitudinal changes occurring with foreign language instruction for first and second grade students, but did measure some effect in fifth, sixth, and seventh grade students. Gardner (1985) commented: "It seems clear... that at least for older students some very real attitude changes do result" (p. 191). The Stennet and Earl research found that older students showed more positive attitude changes than younger students. All these indications pointed to age as an important factor in the amount of attitude influence that can occur through language learning.

Program Novelty

Another variable that has been given some credibility is the innovativeness or novelty of the language learning program. Gardner (1985) discussed a "Francobus program" in which actor-teachers visited elementary schools a few times during the year to engage in French singing, dancing, and putting on plays with the students. This program proved to promote positive attitudes in students, possibly because it was meant to be enjoyable. Gardner (1985) speculated on the source of the attitudinal change: "Where relatively brief innovations are introduced they might influence attitudes... but here again it would be seen to be the novelty and the experience which mediates the change, not the process of learning the second language" (p. 107). He
remained resolute in his position that language learning alone does not alter attitudes, and in this case, the attitudinal change can be attributed to students' enthusiastic involvement in a novel experience.
Of all the variables examined that may influence the extent to which language learning can improve cultural attitudes—program length, achievement level, age of students, and novelty—perhaps the most significant attitude-influencing factor is the conscious addition of culture study into the curriculum. The need for culture learning in current foreign language curricula in addition to language learning is widely recognized. Brooks (Valdes, 1986) cited the conclusion of Robert Politzer in the Georgetown University Report of the Fifth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Teaching:

If we teach language without teaching at the same time the culture in which it operates, we are teaching meaningless symbols or symbols to which the student attaches the wrong meaning; for unless he is warned, unless he receives cultural instruction, he will associate American concepts or objects with the foreign symbols (p. 123).

Brooks strongly believed students must be given a cultural context in which to view language because they lack pertinent background to which they can successfully apply linguistic meaning. A similar conclusion was reached at the Associate at the Center for Applied Linguistics National Priorities Conference. The final position, focusing on foreign language instruction in the elementary school, was that cultural education should not be considered an optional supplement to language learning. If students are to fully become cultural aware, they must have some knowledge about
the speakers of the language they are studying (Met & Rhodes, 1990). Byram (1989) is another supporter of integrating culture into the curriculum. He deemed necessary explicit objectives concerning culture learning and tolerance included on the syllabus to insure that they are striven for with the same amount of direction and intent as traditional instructional objectives. Byram (1989) believed that culture learning and language learning combine to create a whole program of study: “They all have to be pursued with time and energy, which at the moment tend to be wholly devoted to refining narrowly linguistic skills for passing messages. Some of that time and energy has to be redirected to the broader issue” (p. 17). In his commentary, he implied that too much focus is given to teaching the language itself which, in his view, results in an incomplete learning program.

Success of Cultural Integration

Much testimony exists as to the attitudinal improvements that resulted from integrating culture studies with language classes. DiPietro (1980) reported a significant improvement in students’ attitudes that occurred particularly in reaction to instituting a Friday period designed solely for culture learning. Barrera-Vidal’s (1997) observations stood in agreement with those of DiPietro (1980). He applauded the movement for including culture within language study because it broadens the scope of the language class making it more holistic.

Gardner (1985), in an attempt to answer the question of what factors may cause language learning to influence attitudes, examined attitudinal changes in three contexts. The programs compared were of varying intensity. They included intensive
language programs which offered linguistic immersion, bicultural excursion programs which involved interspersions of interaction with native speakers of the second language with the objective of fostering positive attitudes in learners, and regular language classes. Gardner (1985) found that higher direct contact with individuals of the target culture yielded more positive attitude change. For this reason, students who participated in the bicultural excursion programs manifested greater positive attitude changes than the other students, whose programs did not include contact with the target group. In light of this research, Gardner (1985) stated, “The bulk of the research which has focused on the effect of interethnic contact in the context of language training demonstrates that where actual contact is considered the experience does promote attitudinal/motivational change” (pp. 85-86). Although Gardner (1985) denied that attitude is causally related to language learning, he lent credibility to the idea that if cultural contact is included in language learning, attitude change can result. Gardner (1985) found this result in spite of the fact that the contact was neither extensive nor long-term.

Gardner’s (1985) argument that contact with members of the target culture is the deciding variable that causes attitudinal influence is supported by a study conducted at the National Language Resource Center at San Diego State University. Robinson-Stuart and Nocon (1986) examined the research project which utilized a technique called “ethnographic interviews,” designed to facilitate contact between language learners and native speakers of the target language. The interviews were specifically designed to improve attitudes toward the target cultural group, in this case Mexican people in San Diego. Students were encouraged to seek common interests
between themselves and the interviewees. Instead of interviewing their partners with a prepared list of questions, students were mandated to engage in "active listening," and could ask questions only based on what their interviewee had said. Robinson-Stuart and Nocon (1986) in their analysis of the study, were convinced that language learning alone does not improve attitudes; they alluded to the previously noted St. Lambert Experiment which showed a negative attitude change with language learning. The ethnographic interviewing process, however, showed a positive attitude change toward the Mexican people and toward the Spanish language. Robinson-Stuart and Nocon's (1986) attribution of the change to contact with members of the target group was consistent with Gardner's (1985) conclusions. They stated, "We argue that culture is not only located in cultural products and forms, but in the active lives of those who share forms" (p. 432). They stressed the need to be involved in the lives of second-language speakers if positive cultural attitudinal effects are desired because although culture manifests itself in its artifacts, it is more importantly found within the people that live within the culture.

Fromm (1964) addressed the need for personal interaction with those unlike oneself in order to overcome any superior or hostile feelings toward them, which stem from ethnic, religious, racial, or political narcissism. Within the bounds of narcissism, one perceives the other negatively simply because of his or her difference: "The stranger is precisely the person who is not part of my clan, my family, my nation; he is not part of the group to which I am narcissistically attached" (p. 89).

Fromm (1964) held that an individual or a society can overcome the barrier of narcissism only by entering into a personal relationship with the other. He described
a transforming process of involvement with the other which results in "replacement of narcissism by relatedness to the world" (89).

Methodological Hazards

Much research indicated the importance and benefit of involving cultural awareness in the foreign language curriculum. However, some sources warned against attempting this task too casually. Because no language is represented by only one culture, "monocultural" representations of the foreign language-speaking culture can be misleading. This problem was addressed by Bex (1994), who stated, "Because language learners are taught a 'core' variety of the target language, they are often unaware of the cultural differences, tending instead to see the 'core' language as a representation of a unified, monolithic culture" (p. 57). Bex (1994) expressed a fear that students may come to categorize all target language-speakers by the one culture's content they are taught.

Another potential for misrepresentation was expressed by Byram (1989). He noted the surface-level, unrealistic depictions of culture that are found in language textbooks, despite the fact that students express keen interest in learning about genuine family relations within the culture. "We need to find a way of life which avoids the pitfalls of family idyll and of superficial tourism," pleaded Byram (p. 17).

Rebecca Valette (Valdes, 1986) also expressed concern with casually introducing culture to the foreign language curriculum. Although she encouraged language teachers to "free these young people from the straight jacket of monoculturalism" by offering cultural study, she acknowledged many specialists'
Concerns with doing so, and she quoted Margaret Mead who wrote, "When the students saturate themselves deeply and meaningfully in one other culture and language... they tend to become locked into a kind of we-they position, in which one language and culture tends to become better, higher, than the other" (Valdes pp. 179-187). This statement addressed a danger of comparatively viewing two cultures so that one emerges as superior in the student's mind.

Methodological Suggestions

Clearly, integrating cultural studies into a foreign language curriculum must be done delicately. Many suggestions were given for methods which may facilitate culture teaching. Byram (1989) described culture learning as a process that must be attended to carefully. He noted that students enter the language classroom with cultural predispositions which "include a sense of the exclusive nature of the rightness and naturalness of their culture, which may lead to intolerance of others" (p. 18). The teacher must serve as a guide to help the students deal with feelings about their own culture. Byram (1989) advocated encouraging students to detach themselves from their own cultural identity: "Tolerance of other cultures will grow more readily if pupils experience, however briefly and fragmentarily, their own culture as 'strange' and 'other,' as not necessarily 'the norm'" (p. 20). He stressed that the teacher must consciously guide the students through this process of cultural examination.

Bex (1994) offered methodological suggestions that were consistent with those of Byram (1989). He, too, encouraged teachers to begin students' process of cultural
awareness by critically examining their own culture and then looking at cultural and linguistic differences between the native and target cultures (161).

In his discussion of individual and societal narcissism, Fromm (1964) recognized the importance of seeking cultural similarities in order to fully accept and embrace a different culture or individual. He stated, “To love the stranger and the enemy is possible only if narcissism has been overcome, if ‘I am thou’” (p. 89). Fromm’s commentary demonstrated that, in order to fully understand and love the other, not only must one overcome any feelings of superiority that exist toward the other, but one must enter into a deeply personal relationship in which the self is recognized within the other.

A study done by Hall and Ramirez confirmed the research positions of Byram (1989) and Bex (1994). The research revealed that “language learners who are not actively guided to seek similarities between themselves and speakers of the target language... come to objectify both target language speakers and English speakers as different and distant from themselves” (Barrera-Vidal, 1997, p. 433). Barrera-Vidal (1997), in his analysis of the study, advocated a more comprehensive approach than simply studying the target culture. He encouraged students to reflect on their own culture as well so they might find common ground with the people whose language they are learning. This would reduce the tendency for objectification of other cultures or their own.

Omaggio (1986) offered a methodological suggestion in response to the traditional tendency to separate language content and cultural content within the language curriculum. She commented: “A ‘language-first, culture-later’ approach...
reflects the view... that students should learn to 'appreciate' formal culture from
'outside' the language rather than function within the culture through the language”
(p. 361). Omaggio (1986) encouraged methods that fully integrate culture with
language so the students are not taught to perceive them as inherently separate.
Research Methods

Introduction

In order to practically examine the question of whether language learning positively influences cultural attitudes, the following research project was completed. Students' attitudes were assessed in the following areas: (1) attitude toward Spanish speakers, (2) attitude toward learning Spanish, (3) desire to learn Spanish, (4) interest in foreign languages, and (5) interest in other cultures.

Participants

Two groups of fifth-grade students were examined in the study. One fifth-grade class, the control group, consisted of 19 students who did not receive any Spanish instruction throughout the year. The other fifth-grade class, the experimental group, consisted of 21 students who did receive Spanish instruction, as will be described in the following section. According to the Halperne et al. research examined by Gardner (1985), the students were old enough (fifth grade) to exhibit attitudinal changes that may occur. The two classes attended the same school, and, besides the Spanish class, their curricula were nearly identical.

Design

Spanish classes were taught for six months (September 1998 to February 1999) to a 21-student fifth-grade class in Helena, Montana. Classes took place twice
each week for 45-minute periods. Most class periods consisted of a review of vocabulary words previously learned, an introduction to a new concept or set of vocabulary, and a class activity. During the six-month period, students learned vocabulary including numbers, colors, days of the week, months of the year, animals, clothing, food, emotions, family, people, and words related to specific holidays. The class activity was usually a game, art project, or a story read aloud in Spanish. The class sang several Spanish songs throughout the instruction period and participated in one party with a piñata and Mexican food.

Assessment

Before beginning the Spanish classes, two measuring devices were administered to the students in the class. Identical surveys were administered to students in the control group.

Matched guise description. The first survey measured attitude toward Spanish speakers. Students were surveyed using a "matched guise" method developed by Gardner and Lambert designed to measure subjects' attitudes toward Speakers of the target language (Hakuta, 1986). Students listened to two speakers each reading a short passage. The first speaker spoke English and the second spoke Spanish. Students were asked to rate each speaker on a battery of personality traits (Appendix B). Hakuta described the procedure: "Unbeknownest to the subject, the voices come from fluent bilinguals...thus avoiding the possibility that the subjects are rating the speakers on the basis of voice quality" (p. 158). As Hakuta described, the speaker on the tape was a native bilingual speaker of both Spanish and English. Students listened
twice to the passage in English and rated the English speaker, and then they listened
twice to the Spanish speaker and rated her. The questionnaire consisted of ten
continuums, each containing a positive trait at one end (e.g., well-dressed) and a
negative trait at the opposite end (e.g., poorly-dressed). Students were asked to place
a mark on the continuum wherever they thought the speaker belonged.

Matched guise scoring method. Students' attitudes toward Spanish
speakers were evaluated on the basis of their responses to the matched guise
procedure previously described. A rating on the positive end of the continuum was
given a numerical value of eight; a rating on the negative end was given a value of
zero, and marks in between were given numerical values (zero through eight) of the
whole number most closely corresponding to the position of the students' mark on the
continuum. (Appendix C) In order to compare the pre-test and post-test scores and
the two groups, each student's ten responses were averaged to derive one composite
score for each student. The possible range was zero to eight, and higher scores
represented more positive attitudes.

Questionnaire Description. The second questionnaire consisted of 40 questions
(Appendix A). Ten questions—five positively worded and five negatively worded—
addressed each of four areas of interest: (1) attitude toward learning Spanish, (2)
desire to learn Spanish, (3) interest in foreign languages, and (4) interest in other
cultures (Appendix D). Questions in the first three areas were taken from an
attitudinal research project conducted by Gardner, Tremblay, and Masgoret (1997).
Questions that addressed interest in other cultures were derived by the researcher.
Students were read each item aloud, and items were further explained if necessary.
Questionnaire scoring method. The questionnaire was designed to give the four measurements using a Likert scale. Students were given a statement that reflected (either positively or negatively) attitudes in one of these four areas. For each statement, students had the option of selecting “Agree Strongly,” “Agree,” “Disagree,” “Disagree Strongly,” or “Undecided.” Results were derived by converting each response into a numerical value. For positively-worded statements, “Agree Strongly” was given a value of four, “Agree” was given a value of three, “Disagree” was given a value of two, “Disagree Strongly” was given a value of one, and “Undecided” was disregarded. For negatively-worded statements, “Agree Strongly” was given a value of one, “Agree” was given a value of two, “Disagree” was given a value of three, “Disagree Strongly” was given a value of four, and “Undecided” was disregarded. Each group of ten statements were then averaged (excluding “Undecided” selections) to derive a composite score (zero to four) reflecting the student’s attitude in each of the four areas. (Appendix E) The possible range was one to four, and higher scores represented more positive attitudes.
Results

The data collected from the survey were analyzed by using a box plot graphing method to compare the post-test scores of the control and the experimental group, and by using paired t-tests to assess the significance of changes from pre-test to post-test in each respective group. A significance level of .05 was chosen because the sample size was relatively small and non-random and because the intent of the study was to identify trends in attitude change rather than to intricately assess the changes that were occurring. Because the sample of students was not selected randomly, a quantitative statistical analysis of the results would yield a certain degree of misinformation. For this reason, it was beneficial to utilize graphing devices to clarify the results as accurately as possible.

Attitude Toward Spanish Speakers

Attitude toward Spanish speakers was assessed using the matched guise survey administered to students. Possible scores range from one to eight.

Comparison of pre-test and post-test scores. The mean pre-test score for the control group decreased slightly, from 5.40 on the pre-test to 5.31 on the post-test. This change when evaluated within a paired samples correlations t-test, emerged with a significance level of .054, so would nearly be considered significant at the .05 level.

The mean pre-test score of the experimental group increased from 4.87 to a post-test mean score of 5.10. This change, was deemed significant when place in a paired samples correlations t-test, with the significance level of .001. This indicated
an extremely significant adjustment at the .05 level. Analysis of this data would lead to a conclusion that an increase in positive attitude toward Spanish speakers did occur within the experimental group.

Comparison of post-test scores of the control and experimental groups. In viewing the box plot in Figure A, it could be observed that the experimental group’s post-test scores had a slightly lower mean than those of the control group. The mean was indicated by the horizontal lines within the box. The range of the experimental group’s responses extends both higher and lower than that of the control group. The middle 50 percent of scores, represented by the boxes, are more concentrated in the control group than they are in the experimental group, suggesting more homogeneous scores within the control group.

Figure A:
Attitudes Toward Spanish Speakers

![Box plot showing attitudes toward Spanish speakers](image)
Attitude Toward Learning Spanish

Attitude toward learning Spanish was assessed using 10 questions from the questionnaire administered to students. Possible scores range from one to four.

Comparison of pre-test and post-test scores. The mean pre-test score reflecting attitude toward learning Spanish was 3.61, and the mean post-test score was 3.24, marking a decrease of .37. However, after completing a paired samples correlations t-test, the significance value of this change, .210, suggested that the change is not statistically significant within the .05 significance level. In this case, there was not sufficient evidence to conclude that attitude toward learning Spanish decreased significantly in the control group.

The mean pre-test score reflecting attitude toward learning Spanish increased from 3.60 to 3.74 in the experimental group. A paired samples correlations t-test derived a significance level of .009 for this change. This suggested statistical significance at the .05 level. Therefore, the increase in the experimental group’s attitude toward learning Spanish warrants credibility.

Comparison of post-test scores of the control and experimental groups. The box plot in Figure B showed the post-test scores of the control group and of the experimental group. The horizontal lines located in the boxes indicate the means for each group. The mean of the experimental group’s responses (3.74) was substantially higher than that of the control group (3.24). The middle fifty percent of students are indicated by the boxes, which shows that the experimental group’s responses were not only higher but more homogeneous than those of the control group. The range of the
control group’s responses was a great deal wider and reached lower than the experiment group’s. From the chart, one can infer that the class that had Spanish emerged from the study with more positive attitudes toward learning Spanish than the class with no Spanish instruction.

**Figure B:**

**Attitudes Toward Learning Spanish**

Desire to Learn Spanish

Desire to learn Spanish was assessed using ten questions from the questionnaire administered to students. Possible scores range from one to four.

**Comparison of pre-test and post-test scores.** The mean score of the control group decreased from 3.52 on the pre-test to 3.07 on the post-test on the measurement of desire to learn Spanish. The change was deemed statistically significant (.037) as determined by a paired samples correlations t-test. There was sufficient evidence to conclude that the control group’s desire to learn Spanish decreased from pre-test to post-test.
The mean score assessing desire to learn Spanish increased from 3.21 on the pre-test to 3.49 on the post-test in the experimental group. This increase, however, had a significance of .154 when viewed in a paired samples correlations t-test. This did not constitute statistical significance at a .05 level. The increase assessed in this category did not merit sufficient credibility.

**Comparison of post-test scores of the control and experimental groups:** The box plot in Figure C showed that the experimental group emerged with a mean post-test score of 3.50 while the control group’s mean was 3.07. Much like in the measurement of attitude toward learning Spanish, the middle fifty percent of the experimental group was concentrated within a smaller range than that of the control group, indicating a more homogeneous set of responses. The range of the control group’s responses was wider and extended lower than that of the experimental group.

![Figure C: Desire to Learn Spanish](image)
Interest in Foreign Languages

Interest in foreign languages was assessed using ten questions from the questionnaire administered to students. Possible scores range from one to four.

Comparison of pre-test and post-test scores. The mean score measuring interest in foreign languages decreased in the control group from 3.69 to 3.43. The paired samples correlations t-test indicated a significant level of .037, which warranted a statistically significant decrease within the .05 level.

The mean pre-test score assessing interest in foreign languages was 3.35 in the experimental group, and this value rose to 3.44 in the post-test. This increase merited a significance value of .346, which did not constitute statistical significance at the .05 level.

Comparison of post-test scores of control and experimental groups. The control group’s mean post-test score in the category of interest in foreign language was 3.43, while the mean post-test score of the experimental group was 3.44; the means were nearly identical. The box plot in Figure D showed that the experimental group was more homogeneous, and the lower end of responses was slightly higher than that of the control group. The analysis, however, did not indicate any substantial differences between the scores of the control group and the experimental group.
Interest in Other Cultures

Interest in other cultures was assessed using ten questions from the questionnaire administered to students. Possible scores range from one to four.

Comparison of pre-test and post-test scores. The mean pre-test score measuring interest in other cultures in the control group was 3.73, and this decreased to a 3.67 mean post-test score. This measure, however, when examined within a paired samples correlations t-test had a significance level of .817, suggesting that the change measured was highly insignificant.

The mean score of the experimental group increased slightly from a 3.57 mean pre-test score to a 3.59 post-test score. In spite of the slight change, the values are determined in the paired samples correlations t-test to have a significance level of .010, which constitutes statistical significance at the .05 level. This analysis curiously
suggests a significant lack of change in interest in other cultures occurring within the experimental group.

**Comparison of post-test ratings of control and experimental groups.** As can be seen in Figure E, the mean scores of the control and experiment groups were close; the control group’s mean score was 3.67 while the experiment group’s mean was 3.59. In this case, the mean score of the experimental group was lower than that of the control group. The control group also was more homogeneous in their responses, and the range of their scores was smaller and did not extend as low as the range of the experimental group’s responses.

**Figure E:**

**Interest in Other Cultures**
Discussion

In an examination of the results, several of the conclusions warranted further discussion. In the analysis of the data measuring attitude toward Spanish speakers, it is interesting to note that the control group emerged with a higher post-test mean than the experimental group, yet the experimental group’s mean increased from the pre-test score while the control group’s mean decreased from the pre-test score. Although the experimental group’s increase was significant, the conclusion could not be made that the foreign language instruction influenced the experimental group’s attitude toward Spanish speakers because they essentially emerged with less positive attitudes than the control group.

One glaring enigma was the statistically significant decreases that occurred in both the desire to learn Spanish and interest in foreign languages within the control group. One would not expect these attitudes to decrease, and it was impossible to assert the cause for the change. However, one speculation could be that the control group was aware that the other fifth grade class in the school was receiving Spanish instruction. Students in the two classes had much interaction with each other. Students in the experimental group may have portrayed either excessive enthusiasm or an elitist attitude about learning Spanish while the others were not. Either perception may have caused the control group to express negative feelings about learning Spanish and other foreign languages. The decrease in attitude may have been the manifestation of “sour grapes” or jealousy on the part of the control group.
The box plots illustrating post-test scores on attitude toward learning Spanish and desire to learn Spanish, (Figures B and C), presented interesting images. These two representations were considerably more extreme in their distinctions between the control group and the experiment group than were the other three arenas of attitude assessment. The experimental group’s means and concentrations of the middle fifty percent were considerably higher than those in the control group. This may have been related to the specifically Spanish nature of these two attitude assessments. It seemed reasonable that the group that had Spanish would respond more positively to questions about Spanish than the control group, which had no experience with the language. This may have been an explanation for the more homogeneous nature of the experimental group’s responses in these two assessments. The experimental group underwent their experience with the Spanish language together, so they may have shared many common feelings about this common experience. The control group, on the other hand, had no common experience with language, and this could be reflected in their relatively heterogeneous responses.

The large, statistically significant increase in the experimental group’s attitude toward learning Spanish also merited speculation. This piece of data could confirm the hypothesis that language learning does improve students’ attitudes toward learning the language. This positive change could, however, be attributed to some of the variables previously discussed. Gardner (1985) addressed the possibility of program novelty as a variable that could influence students’ attitudes in a process that has little to do with the language itself. The experimental group’s marked change in attitude toward learning Spanish could reflect an enthusiasm for their Spanish classes.
because the class presented them with a diversion from their core curriculum. Although the extensively discussed variable of a cultural addition to the curriculum was not added to the experimental group’s Spanish classes, they still showed positive attitude change; the variable of novelty may have played a part in this change.

A final research indication worthy of noting is the curious conclusions derived from students’ responses to the assessment about interest in other cultures. The statistically significant, nearly static nature of the experimental group’s mean scores suggests that interest in other cultures may be a factor that remained rather unaffected by the language classes.
Summary and Conclusions

The diversity of research conclusions on the relationship between language learning and cultural attitudes makes it difficult to derive a clear understanding of if the two are connected, and if they are, how they are connected. However, there is strong evidence that emphasizing culture in the foreign or second language curriculum greatly increases the possibility of students developing positive attitudes toward the target culture and language (Valdes, 1986; Byram, 1989, Met & Rhodes, 1990; DiPietro, 1980; Barerra-Vidal, 1997; Gardner 1985; Robinson, Stuart & Nocon, 1996; Fromm, 1964).

The study described in detail suggests no general positive change in attitude toward Spanish speakers, interest in foreign languages, or interest in other cultures. Positive changes were observed and asserted in the experimental group’s attitude toward learning Spanish and desire to learn Spanish. These changes occurred in a curriculum in which cultural study was not emphasized.

Suggestions for Future Research

The studies and influencing factors discussed lead to a natural examination of possible next steps for research into the relationship between language and cultural attitudes. It would be beneficial to isolate and explore the roles of the variables previously mentioned, such as extracurricular factors, achievement levels, age, and program novelty. After reviewing the evidence suggesting the significance of cultural
curricular content, it is evident that this variable merits exploration. Such exploration could further our understanding of why the addition of cultural content could influence students’ cultural attitudes, and how best to utilize this knowledge in the classroom. In order to more accurately investigate the effects of foreign language education on cultural attitudes, the size and composition of the groups examined must be considered. A large sample would derive more accurate results, and the control group should not be in contact with the experimental group in order to avoid the “sour grapes” effect that may have resulted in the research discussed.

Questions of Quantity and Quality

Generally, the two most comprehensive elements to consider are the quantity and the quality of the language instruction. A viable interpretation of the information assessed is that mere exposure to language does not guarantee attitudinal change. The quantity of language instruction, length of time and intensity, has been alleged to play an important part in attitudinal changes (Sternfeld, 1988; Hermann, 1978; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). The quality of the language program was also an important factor in determining whether attitudinal benefits were claimed. Factors such as awareness of one’s own culture and personal involvement with members of the target culture facilitated the development of positive attitudes toward the target culture (Valdes, 1986; Byram, 1989, Met & Rhodes, 1990; DiPietro, 1980; Barerra-Vidal, 1997; Gardner 1985; Robinson, Stuart & Nocon, 1996; Fromm, 1964). These two general variables, the quality and the quantity of language instruction, merit
examination in any realm of investigation of the relationship between language instruction and cultural attitudes.
Looking Ahead: Implications for Language Teachers

Existing research can help foreign language teachers and advocates more discerningly strive to guide students toward more broad-minded views of the world. Language education can aid students in becoming culturally-competent individuals, however this change can occur only with deliberate effort on the part of the teacher and the students.

A Mission Statement

The first section in this thesis discussed the ethnocentric attitude that seems to prevail in the United States among not only individuals but also among institutions. Acceptance of and personal involvement in other cultures is generally not highly valued in American society (Padilla, 1991; Omaggio, 1986, Al-Rubaiy, 1984). However, there is a great deal of merit in learning to interact with and embrace other cultures. Individuals who are unable to do so close themselves off to the possible growth and understanding of others and of themselves that can result from intercultural interaction. Language educators have the unique opportunity to encourage and nurture students' openness to intercultural appreciation. If this objective is desired, it should not be subtle or simply supplemental to the language curriculum; an objective of cultural awareness should be stated explicitly and striven for with the same time and energy as learning vocabulary or grammar (Byram, 1989;
Bex, 1994; Barrera-Vidal, 1997). Students can only benefit from the perspective and personal growth gained by opening themselves to intercultural interaction.

**Specific Guidelines**

The research examined in this thesis offers some suggestions for methodologies that can help obtain the objective of cultural awareness. The language teacher should consider the successes and failures of the different approaches discussed in designing a curriculum that will help foster positive attitudes toward the target language and culture.

**Personal contact with members of the target culture.** Perhaps the single most significant element that may foster students’ positive attitudes toward the target language and culture is direct involvement with the people of that culture. This important element was seen in ethnographic interviews, in which students actively conversed with members of a culture different from their own (Robinson-Stuart & Nocon, 1986). Through the interviewing process, students had no choice but to break down any barriers they had constructed that might impede the ability to communicate with culturally different individuals. These interviews gave students the opportunity to enter a distinct, personal relationship with people of a different culture. The insight that students gain from a process like the one described can be profoundly transforming, and it cannot be found in a textbook.

For foreign language teachers, finding members of the target culture who are willing to share their culture with students can be difficult. However, now that technology has provided the potential for instantaneous, global communication, the
possibility of students developing relationships with members of other cultures is plausible in most foreign language classrooms.

**An objective look at one’s own culture.** Another important element in fostering positive attitudes toward other cultures is the ability to see one’s own culture objectively (Byram, 1989; Bex 1994). Students should be encouraged to examine their own cultural identities, the strengths and weaknesses that come with them, and their feelings about their own cultures. This examination gives students an opportunity to take a step back from the beliefs and attitudes that have contributed to defining them and view them separately from themselves.

**Common ground.** After examining one’s own culture, students should be encouraged to seek common ground between themselves and those cultures perceived as “other” (Fromm, 1964; Byram, 1989; Bex, 1994). Only when students realize that they share similarities with members of other cultures can they begin to develop an awareness of their integration with all human beings. Once individuals stop focusing on the differences they see when they look at members of other cultures, they can move forward on the journey of discovering their relatedness to the world.

**The educator’s role.** The teacher’s role in the process of cultural awareness is as a model and active guide for the student (Barrera-Vidal, 1997). The teacher is, by no means exempt from the journey, since cultural awareness is not an end in itself but a manner of living. The educator would benefit by refraining from the assumption that only the students are in the process of developing awareness, and by viewing him or herself as a work-in-progress as well.
Final thoughts of an aspiring language teacher. The anticipation of applying the preceding compilation of opinions, theories, and research to my teaching has left me overwhelmed, slightly bewildered, but above all enthusiastic at the prospect of utilizing some of the pedagogical strategies I have learned to help further the cultural awareness of my students. I am confident that the language classroom can serve as an environment for students to develop a better understanding of themselves and of those they perceive as different from themselves. Goals for the classroom need not be stifling nor simply cognitive. Graman (1991) has described some non-traditional yet meritorious objectives for the language classroom: “For many teachers and students the primary goals for language education are to acquire language and gain access to ways of developing independent and rational thinking and of becoming critical agents for creative change in themselves and society” (p. 15). The language classroom can be an environment that contributes more to the lives of its students than simply providing them with decontextualized information. It can be an environment that invites students to better understand themselves and others in a transforming process of discovery.
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Name_____________________________ Male/Female (please circle)

1. Have you ever had a foreign language class before? Yes/No
   If yes, in what grade(s)? ______

Please use the scale to circle the number that best fits how you feel.

1=Agree Strongly
2=Agree
3=Disagree
4=Disagree Strongly
U= Undecided

1. I would like to learn many foreign languages. 1 2 3 4 U
2. I wish I had begun studying Spanish even earlier. 1 2 3 4 U
3. I do not like Spanish. 1 2 3 4 U
4. Knowing Spanish isn’t really an important goal in my life. 1 2 3 4 U
5. I would rather spend my time on subjects other than Spanish. 1 2 3 4 U
6. I often wish I could read books in other languages. 1 2 3 4 U
7. I really have no interest in foreign languages. 1 2 3 4 U
8. I love learning Spanish. 1 2 3 4 U
9. I do not have any desire to know Spanish. 1 2 3 4 U
10. I think learning Spanish is enjoyable. 1 2 3 4 U
11. I wish I could speak Spanish perfectly. 1 2 3 4 U
12. Spanish is really great. 1 2 3 4 U
13. I would like to learn as much Spanish as possible. 1 2 3 4 U
Please keep using this scale to select the answer that fits how you feel.

| 1 = Agree Strongly | 2 = Agree | 3 = Disagree | 4 = Disagree Strongly | U = Undecided |

14. Studying a foreign language is not a pleasant experience.  
1  2  3  4  U

15. I would rather see a foreign movie dubbed in English than see it in its original language with English sub-titles.  
1  2  3  4  U

16. If it were up to me, I would spend all my time learning Spanish.  
1  2  3  4  U

17. I find the study of Spanish very boring.  
1  2  3  4  U

18. I would like to visit another country.  
1  2  3  4  U

19. I wish I could speak another language perfectly.  
1  2  3  4  U

20. I am not much interested in knowing people from other countries.  
1  2  3  4  U

21. Learning Spanish is a waste of time.  
1  2  3  4  U

22. I am losing any desire I ever had to learn Spanish.  
1  2  3  4  U

23. I would rather not learn about other cultures in school.  
1  2  3  4  U

24. Since the United States is far away from countries that speak other languages, it is not important for Americans to learn foreign languages.  
1  2  3  4  U

25. I don’t think I would like to study another culture.  
1  2  3  4  U

26. I am not interested in taking Spanish classes.  
1  2  3  4  U

27. Most foreign languages sound weird and harsh.  
1  2  3  4  U

28. I would like to have a friend from another country.  
1  2  3  4  U

29. I want to learn Spanish so well that will become second-nature to me.  
1  2  3  4  U
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. I think all schools should teach Spanish.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. It would be neat to study other cultures.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. If I planned to stay in another country, I would make a great effort to learn the language even though I could get by on English.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I am not interested in visiting another country.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I plan to learn as much Spanish as possible.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I am not much interested in knowing people from other countries.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I don’t really want to learn any more than just the basics of Spanish.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I would not really like to learn about other cultures in school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I am interested in getting to know people from other countries.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I enjoy meeting and listening to people who speak other languages.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Knowing Spanish isn’t really an important goal in my life.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name________________________________________

**Speaker #1**

Rude ——— Polite ——— Nice ——— Mean

Responsible ——— Irresponsible ——— Poorly-Dressed ——— Well-Dressed

Dumb ——— Smart ——— Athletic ——— Un-Athletic

Fun ——— Boring ——— Poor ——— Rich

Ugly ——— Good Looking ——— Well-Groomed ——— Not Well-Groomed

**Speaker #2**

Rude ——— Polite ——— Nice ——— Mean

Responsible ——— Irresponsible ——— Poorly-Dressed ——— Well-Dressed

Dumb ——— Smart ——— Athletic ——— Un-Athletic

Fun ——— Boring ——— Poor ——— Rich

Ugly ——— Good Looking ——— Well-Groomed ——— Not Well-Groomed
### Attitude Toward Spanish Speakers: Experimental Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Rude/Polite</th>
<th>Resp/Irrs</th>
<th>Dumb/Smart</th>
<th>Fun/Boring</th>
<th>Ugly/Good L</th>
<th>Nice/Mean</th>
<th>W/Prly Dsd</th>
<th>Athlc/Un</th>
<th>Poor/Rich</th>
<th>W/Prly Gmd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>post</td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>post</td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>post</td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>post</td>
<td>pre</td>
<td>post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVG</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C

### Attitude Toward Spanish Speakers: Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Rude/Polite pre</th>
<th>Resp/Irres. post</th>
<th>Dumb/Smart pre</th>
<th>Fun/Boring post</th>
<th>Ugly/Good L. pre</th>
<th>Nice/Mean post</th>
<th>Wi/Pri Drsd. pre</th>
<th>Athletic/Un. post</th>
<th>Poor/Rich pre</th>
<th>Wi/Pri Gmd. post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVG** 6.26 5.53 5.53 5.53 6.32 6.32 5.47 5.74 5.89 4.84 5.95 5.95 4.95 4.00 4.63 3.89 4.42 4.84 5.16
Appendix D

Attitude Toward Learning Spanish

Positively Keyed:
- Spanish is really great.
- I think learning Spanish is enjoyable.
- I love learning Spanish.
- I plan to learn as much Spanish as possible.
- I think all schools should teach Spanish.

Negatively Keyed:
- I do not like Spanish.
- I would rather spend my time on subjects other than Spanish.
- I find the study of Spanish very boring.
- Learning Spanish is a waste of time.
- I am not interested in taking Spanish classes.

Desire to Learn Spanish

Positively Keyed:
- I wish I had begun studying Spanish even earlier.
- If it were up to me, I would spend all my time learning Spanish.
- I want to learn Spanish so well that it will become second-nature to me.
- I would like to learn as much Spanish as possible.
- I wish I could speak Spanish perfectly.

Negatively Keyed:
- Knowing Spanish isn’t really an important goal in my life.
- I sometimes wish I did not have to take Spanish.
- I do not have any desire to know Spanish.
- I am losing any desire I ever had to know Spanish.
- I don’t really want to learn any more than the basics of Spanish.

Interest in Foreign Languages

Positively Keyed:
- I would like to learn many foreign languages.
- I wish I could speak another language perfectly.
- I often wish I could read books in other languages.
- If I planned to stay in another country, I would make a great effort to learn the language even though I could get by on English.
- I enjoy meeting and listening to people who speak other languages.

Negatively Keyed:
- Studying a foreign language is not a pleasant experience.
- I really have no interest in foreign languages.
- Seeing that the United States is far from countries that speak other languages, it is not important for Americans to learn foreign languages.
- Most foreign languages sound weird and harsh.
- I would rather see a foreign film dubbed in English than see the film in its original language with English sub-titles.

Interest in Other Cultures

Positively Keyed:
- I would like to visit another country.
- It would be neat to study other cultures.
- I’m interested in getting to know people from other countries.
- I would like to have a friend from another country.

Negatively Keyed:
- I’m not interested in visiting another country.
- I don’t think I would like to study other cultures.
- I am not much interested in knowing someone from another country.
- I wouldn’t like knowing people from another country.
- I would rather not learn about other cultures in school.
### Experimental Group Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E13</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E14</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E15</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E17</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E18</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E19</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E21</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGs.</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Control Group Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVGs.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>