Second Language Research & Practice
ISSN 2694-6610

October 2023, Volume 4, Issue 1
pp. 99–118

REPORT

Reincarnating textbook programs for the 21st century

Amy Rossomondo, University of Kansas

Gillian Lord, University of Florida

Abstract

This report argues against the death of language textbook programs. It highlights the need for them to serve as the agents of change needed for language programs to remain viable in higher education today. Although commercially published language teaching materials are often cast as obstacles to progressive change, we argue that available materials can serve as transformative models for language teaching. Drawing on our own experiences as educators, researchers, and textbook authors, we discuss why we need these materials and how the textbook program itself can and should serve as an agent of change.

Keywords*: textbooks, transforming, digital learning materials, commercial*

APA Citation: Rossomondo, A., & Lord, G. (2023). Reincarnating textbook programs for the 21st century. *Second Language Research & Practice*, *4*(1), 99–118. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/69881

Introduction

Is the language textbook dead? If by *textbook* we mean the big, out-of-date, and overpriced books that largely consist of form-focused, content-poor, mechanical exercises, then we hope so. We do not believe, however, that the concept of the textbook program itself should wither away, but rather that we must change how we define and create these programs. These programs are our opportunity to apply current second language research into effective, engaging materials for our students and thus to provide our students with the greatest chances of success.

Unfortunately, however, most textbooks today do not embrace these opportunities. Many of the highest-profile textbooks were initially developed decades ago, with subsequent editions driven by profit rather than by changes in the field. The theoretical groundings of these textbooks can often be traced to highly traditional approaches of the previous century, such as grammar-translation or audiolingual methodologies. Such outdated materials contribute directly to institutional inertia and resistance to change in our units because, for the most part, we do tend to rely on textbooks to determine our lower-division curricula and how courses are designed. There will always be hard-working, brilliant instructors who create unique materials for their courses, but most instructors lack the time, expertise, or resources needed to go this route. It is challenging to develop such materials at scale for large programs staffed by graduate students or part-time instructors teaching multiple sections. Given these realities, the truth is that many programs allow textbooks to control how we teach, even though we know what and how we want to teach and even if we know what the latest research tells us. We remain tied to textbooks that are not designed to facilitate innovative teaching and learning, making it nearly impossible to make our classrooms work as we want them to.

It should come as no surprise, then, that lower-division students trying to satisfy an institutional language requirement often find these classes unengaging; a means to an end rather than an opportunity to learn valuable skills and concepts relevant to their studies and lives. This perspective is only reinforced by materials lacking meaningful contexts and realistic, usable language. As a result, we miss a valuable opportunity to convey the importance of language and culture and the utility of our language classes to

foster critical analysis skills and intercultural engagement. This climate of disengaged learning, of course, is no recipe for reversing the downward trajectory of student enrollment in language classes.

For these reasons, we argue that our pedagogical materials—textbooks included—play a key role in stimulating change. Rather than urging the death of the textbook, we argue for a transformed approach to teaching and learning which in turn must be reflected in our teaching materials. These materials can be the agents of change needed to usher in the new approaches to teaching and learning called for in the 2007 Modern Language Association (MLA) report (MLA, 2007) and by various scholars (e.g., Allen & Paesani, 2010; Blyth & Davis, 2007; Bragger & Rice, 2000; Lord & Isabelli, 2014; Lord & Rossomondo, 2018; Meyers, 2009; Rossomondo, 2012). They will also be the key to reversing the downward trend in language enrollments reported by the MLA (Looney & Lusin, 2019; MLA, 2007), and thus the key to saving and reinvigorating language programs.

This transformed approach is outlined below, focusing on four key (and admittedly intertwined) premises:

1. Teaching materials need to truly reflect what we know from decades of second language acquisition (SLA) research;
2. Teaching materials should engage students so that the language of study becomes integrated into their own world, as opposed to remaining an artificial add-on disconnected from personal experience;
3. Teaching materials can help instructors to be more effective and impactful teachers, and to better and more efficiently manage their classes and their work outside of class; and
4. Teaching materials must be accessible, affordable, and adaptable.

Research-Informed

Although the idea that materials should reflect SLA research may seem obvious, many of the enduring best-sellers and the most widely adopted textbooks appear to be based on mid-20th century theory and scholarship: fill-in-the-blank grammar drills, decontextualized sentences thrown together in random activities, and other features that are disconnected from critical inquiry in this century. Our understanding of current research on teaching and learning and our own scholarship in SLA informed the materials we designed. For one, the very development and structure of our program are based on the process of backward design (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005). As this design model prescribes, each unit is developed around concrete learning outcomes, as opposed to the more traditional unit design built around an aspect of grammar. By articulating what students will be able to do upon completing the unit from the outset, it is possible to assess student success in meeting those goals. This in turn guides the creation and development of the unit's content—not according to what grammar is covered, but rather by developing the linguistic and cultural information needed for students to accomplish that goal. For each unit of our program a culminating, project-based assessment defines the content provided as a process of empowering students to complete it successfully. A model of this product is the featured text at the beginning of the unit, followed by materials that provide the grammatical, lexical, and cultural support needed to emulate it at the end.

Secondly, the program uses the flipped classroom model, following research from the field of education. This approach, which overlaps with what language teachers have called the communicative approach for decades, emphasizes active learning in the classroom through interaction and collaboration and reserves individual learning—reading, watching prerecorded lectures, etc.—for at-home work. In our program, for example, students watch instructional videos with inline comprehension checkpoints that ground new vocabulary and morphosyntactic structures in the context of the text that drives the unit and meaningful language use. They then complete carefully designed instructional sequences that move from input to output, informed by processing instruction research (see Leeser et al., 2021), and provide immediate, contextualized feedback.

This contextualized practice primes students for in-class participation, where they engage in paired and

small-group activities related to their at-home work. Conversation activities designed specifically for class time are used to structure opportunities for them to explore critical cultural content in meaningful and communicative ways. Key to this entire sequence of at-home preparation and practice followed by in-class conversation and collaborative writing is that all activities are directly related to the content and context of the unit and draw specific connections between strategies, skills, and content learning that are applied to the unit's creative, summative project. By making this scaffolding explicit and transparent, students are less likely to perceive their work with these materials as "busy work." Instead, their focused work along the way builds to a tangible product at the end of the unit, rendering it productive, purposeful, and meaningful.

A third research-based element of the program is the text-centered model that informs its design. Text-centered, or multiliteracies-based, approaches recognize that language is multimodal and that learners should be exposed to the full variety of modes of its real-world usage (Allen & Paesani, 2010; Elsner & Viebrock, 2013; Menke & Paesani, 2019; Paesani, 2016; Warner & Dupuy, 2018). This approach embraces the premise that language needs to be examined in context through texts, with a broad understanding of the word *text* to include any authentic and concrete language use. In practical terms, students work with a broader range of texts than more traditional materials offer, including text messages, advertisements, recipes, and social media posts. These texts can be approached analytically by prompting students to deconstruct their discursive or genre-based components and then reconstruct them using their linguistic and cultural skills.

An example of how we interpret text in the program is found in the introductory texts at the beginning of each unit that anchor the student's experience of the materials to follow and serve as models for their end-of-unit projects. For example, one unit begins with a student filming a selfie-tour of her campus for her friends back home; students eventually create their own tours of their own campuses or for students taking classes online, of their favorite places to study. Another unit is anchored by a *micro-cuento* (micro-story) by Agusto Monterroso titled *El eclipse* (1959). We present the written text of Monterroso's story, along with narration and visual illustrations to facilitate comprehension. At the end of the unit students create their own micro-story. As scholars in multiliteracies research have prescribed, the vast array of textual genres represented all share the common feature of using language in context.

Research also guides our inclusion of concrete strategies shown to be effective for language learning. We include different strategies for reading and listening to help students understand the texts that start each unit. We include strategies for speaking, writing and research, pronunciation, and spelling to facilitate their work on the unit project. Research strategies are structured by prompting students to search the Internet for relevant cultural information, with specific search strategies presented to them. These strategies include critical analysis of their findings because even though most of our students belong to a "digital native" (e.g., Prensky, 2001) generation, their ability to find and evaluate online information is often less sophisticated than expected. All the strategies we teach are valuable to their language learning, but many are also useful well beyond language class, such as reading for the gist, outlining, or how to do Boolean searches.

A final research-informed feature of the program is our use of authentic assessment that tests student learning in meaningful and authentic ways. This approach operates on the premise that the kind of learning that is privileged in coursework should also be the focus of how student learning is evaluated (Aksu Atac, 2012; Archibald, 1991; Geeslin, 2003; Wiggins, 1990). Our goal is not to catch students in what they have failed to learn, but rather to allow them to showcase what they have learned.

The end-of-unit projects described above were designed to replace traditional grammar-based testing with the opportunity for students to demonstrate how they have accomplished the unit's learning objectives. These projects vary widely in their formats, from videos to letters, blog posts to infographics, and everything in between, thus reflecting the variety of materials used throughout the program. What they share is the principle that they are authentic and germane to the unit in which they appear. Rather than measuring student learning through controlled fill-in-the-blank activities that drive students to rely on rote memorization and away from connecting form and meaning, they are all based on open-ended learner

production and are evaluated based on the unit goals and on realistic expectations of what learners at this level can do. For example, the second project requires them to use what they have learned about greetings and exchanging basic personal information to interview a Spanish speaker, native or learner, in Spanish. To successfully complete the unit, students must apply their developing Spanish abilities to carry out the interview—which, often to their surprise, they can do.

Student Engagement

Recognizing that many first- and second-year language students are enrolled to fulfill a requirement, we emphasize student engagement to highlight that language learning is exciting and that they can gain valuable knowledge, experiences, and skills, even from a required class. This engagement begins with real-world, meaningful topics and contexts that are engaging to students. With these content-driven materials, students' developing language abilities become the medium through which they can explore and discuss those topics and even reflect on context-bound language use. Topics selected for development do not necessarily differ radically from what one might expect a beginning or intermediate text to cover, but they should be approached in ways that are authentic and interesting to students through frames of reference tied to their own lives and experiences. For example, the program includes units dedicated to the use of art to promote social justice, food insecurity, communication and technology, physical and mental well-being, as well as units on immigration and social media influencers. Students confront these ideas in their everyday lives, making them relatable and familiar. As experts on their own experiences and impressions, students become more invested and engaged in their work.

Our treatment of culture is also reimagined to engage students. Each unit theme is inherently rooted in culture, not by treating it as a monolithic and static set of facts appearing in a textbox in the corner of a page, but by presenting it through the voices and perspectives of our cultural collaborators who are real people from throughout the Spanish-speaking world and who share their thoughts on the unit's central themes in writing and in video interviews. Fresh and authentic voices help us update traditional topics to make them more current and relevant to our contemporary students. In a unit dedicated to the topic of family, for example, the cultural collaborators speak about the status of marriage equality in their countries. In another unit dedicated to health and wellness, the focus is placed on mental health, anxiety, and depression, which we know are concerns for many students.

We also recognize that it would be impossible to cover the vast array of cultural practices and traditions of the Hispanic world, which vary not only by country but also by region within the same country, and even from person to person within a given society. Rather than attempt to cover such breadth, we leverage this diversity to provide opportunities for students to engage in structured, independent research. Their findings for a particular country or region can then be combined with those of their classmates to provide a more comprehensive picture of how real-world issues manifest uniquely across Hispanic cultures and of the variability that exists even within specific communities of speakers. This approach provides the additional benefit of making students responsible for their own learning, which has been shown to enhance student engagement and motivation in higher education (e.g., Athanasiou, 2007). Furthermore, it encourages them to become participant-users of the target language beginning in their first semester of study.

We also develop more engaging materials by featuring social learning, which has been shown in studies from various fields of education to make learning more engaging, and therefore more meaningful and enduring (e.g., Bass & Elmendorf, n.d.; Thorne & Hellermann, 2022; Vygotsky, 1962). Learning that has an end goal beyond the class, such as communicating with someone other than the teacher, is built into our system of unit projects and student portfolios. These portfolios house all students' projects in a class, effectively making them collaborators and information providers within their own social network. In each unit, students are asked to update their profile according to the topics and information learned during that unit. This in turn contributes to the construction of a classroom community of learners in which students get to know one another to a degree that is not typical of many college classes. More importantly, for each

project, students are required to review and comment on each other's projects, and then to reflect on the class projects and comments, both given and received. In this way, students interact with each other consistently outside of class, fostering their comfort with one another during active-learning classroom sessions. This collaborative work is structured to require substantive interaction, rather than simply exchanging compliments on their work. As their work progresses, students see evidence of their own learning and that of their classmates, all of which serve to make their experience more rewarding, more motivating, and thus more engaging.

Benefits for Instructors

Transformed, state-of-the-art instructional materials must also take into account the new challenges faced by today's language instructors, who are often overworked, and frequently face precarious employment (e.g., contingent labor). Likewise, materials should accommodate the needs of graduate student instructors who are balancing the responsibilities of their teaching with the demands of their own program of study.

The most overt way we do this is by providing support and lesson planning that reduces instructor workload. This is facilitated by our flipped approach to classwork: because the instructional component primarily takes place outside of class (and is thus already developed through text and video instruction and practice), planning in-person or synchronous class sessions is as simple as deciding which conversation activities to do. Those in-class activities are coded to indicate which sections of their at-home work students need to have done first and according to what skills and content they practice. By using this coding to align out-of-class work with in-class activities, instructors are given multiple pathways to help their students meet the unit's goals.

To further support instructors, out-of-class work is graded automatically within the platform, with built-in feedback. Without the busy work associated with traditional grading, instructors have more time to thoughtfully evaluate the substance of their students' creative and subjective work in the unit projects and, we should note, to connect more deeply with their students. Instructors learn about their students' lives, experiences, hopes, role models, and more through these unit projects. We also facilitate the instructors' grading process by providing an easily accessible grading rubric pane customizable to each assignment, that further guide instructors' expectations for learner production at earlier stages of development.

Affordability, Accessibility, and Adaptability

Finally, the fourth characteristic of transformed materials is their affordability, accessibility, and adaptability to meet the needs of all stakeholders. Higher education's emphasis on diversity, equity and inclusion prompts the need for transformed language learning materials. The cost of learning materials has grown exponentially alongside tuition in U.S. higher education over the last three decades, with most students spending well above $1,000 per year on learning materials (Hanson, 2022), even as they work part-time or take on debt to afford skyrocketing tuition rates. Spanish-language textbook programs regularly cost more than $200, and the release of new editions of printed textbooks every four years requires students to purchase new rather than used copies, keeping those prices high.

Our program is digital only, designed from the ground up for a multimedia web-based setting. The pedagogical benefits are enormous (including the ability to update and diversify content, e.g., more Afro-Hispanic and Latinx representation) and advantages our students with respect to price and the flexibility to complete their assignments on any device. The program's publisher is also committed to affordability while providing wrap-around support for instructors and students, the lack of which is a recognized impediment to adopting Open Educational Resources.

Commercially created learning materials must remain up to date with ADA accessibility guidelines, as well as adopters' institutional strategies for promoting accessibility and equity in general, such as inclusive access from the first day of classes and a flexible timeline for purchasing materials. To meet the learning

goals of specific foundational language programs, transformed learning materials should be adaptable with options for seamlessly adding components that address programmatic goals. For example, integrating language coaching services (c.f., LinguaMeeting, TalkAbroad, Conversifi, etc.), with structured assignments to guide these interactions to achieve unique learning outcomes, eliminates the need for yet another platform for stakeholders to master. Finally, transformed learning materials must adapt seamlessly to the different course modalities (in-person, hybrid, fully online) that today's COVID-era students require.

Outcomes

The research-informed nature of the program is iterative: We are informed by research, but we also assess the program through our own research. We designed a small study to assess outcomes from students using our program to measure and provide evidence of its effectiveness. Our pilot study compared two groups of beginning Spanish at the same institution, one using our transformed program (n = 24) and the other using the best-selling traditional text used at that level for several years (n = 47). A general Spanish knowledge test was administered at the beginning and end of the semester to gauge general skills. The test consisted of fill-in-the-blank and multiple-choice questions, chosen to gather a sense of students' general competency independent of the specific topics in the textbook groups (see Appendix A). We also administered an instrument that had a series of can-do statements modeled after ACTFL's can-dos, so that the students could self-assess at the beginning and end of the semester (ACTFL, n.d.) (Appendix B). Finally, we used a pre- and post-test survey of student attitudes to measure non-linguistic outcomes, such as whether they enjoy Spanish class and their levels of comfort during their classes (Appendix C). Both the can-do and the attitudinal data were measured on a Likert scale. To determine if there were differences between the groups, a series of mixed-effects analyses were run, based on ordinal regressions with specified probit link function (using the ordinal package in R).

The results of the language skills test are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Language Skills Test Scores (out of 100%)*

Group	Pre-test score	Post-test score	Change
Traditional	59.41%	64.38%	+4.97%
Transformed	48.00%	57.89%	+9.89%

The traditional group started and ended with higher scores than the transformed group (likely a random effect of class enrollment) and both groups evidenced gains in the scores at the post-test. The mixed-effects model showed that the difference between the groups was significant at the beginning ($p < 0.01$), but by the end, the two groups were statistically indistinguishable ($p = 0.396$). Further, a Group*Time interaction indicates that those using the transformed approach are significantly more likely to make gains than the others. Thus, in spite of the non-traditional focus on content and texts, the students using the transformed program have learned as much or more than those using the traditional program.

Regarding the can-do statements, the sum of scores on that Likert test for both groups and test times is represented in Table 2.

Table 2. *Sum of Can-do Scores (out of 140)*

Group	Pre-test score	Post-test score	Change
Traditional	83.38	112.26	+28.88
Transformed	77.76	115.90	+38.14

Both groups reported an increase in their perceptions of their Spanish abilities. The ordinal mixed effects

model revealed significantly higher post-test scores for both groups ($p < 0.001$ for both), which tells us that both groups of students felt they increased their language abilities during the course. However, a significant Group*Time interaction ($p < 0.001$) suggests more extensive changes in rating likelihood, i.e., toward higher can-do ratings, for the transformed group than the traditional.

It is especially interesting to see which individual items the experimental group rated higher than the control group, such as: "I can express my own preferences or feelings and react to those of others;" "I can compare cultural products and practices from my culture and those of Spanish speaking cultures;" "I can converse with Spanish speakers in familiar situations at school, work, or play;" and "I can use culturally appropriate behaviors and avoid major social blunders."

For the attitudinal instrument, Table 3 represents the sum of Likert responses at both points and the change in scores over time. The higher post-test scores in both groups indicate an overall more positive attitude toward learning Spanish and the classroom experience at the end of the semester.

Table 3. *Sum of Attitude Scores (out of 118)*

Group	Pre-test score	Post-test score	Change
Traditional	86.55	88.11	+1.56
Transformed	87.83	91.90	+4.08

The mixed effects model revealed that the two groups started with comparable scores ($p = 0.214$) but that the transformed group's post-test scores are significantly higher than those of the traditional group ($p = 0.045$). There was also a significant Group*Time interaction ($p < 0.001$), suggesting an increased likelihood of higher post-test scores for the experimental group than for the control group. This result suggests that students learn well from the experimental materials, and not only that they recognize their learning, but that they were enjoying their classes more. Some of the items showing higher attitudes in the experimental group included: "I look forward to taking Spanish next semester;" "I always look forward to Spanish classes;" "Studying Spanish can be important for my major/field of interest;" and "I really enjoy learning Spanish."

As with any small-scale pilot study, there are limitations to this study. For example, we could not control for all variables, such as the fact that the instructors of the two sections were different. Moreover, with such small sample sizes, we recognize that these should not be interpreted as definitive replicable data. Our goal was to provide an initial investigation of the potential outcomes of using such transformed instructional materials. Taken together, the results provide promising evidence of the effectiveness of these materials with students learning language and culture and reporting engagement and enjoyment.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we reiterate our belief that new approaches to developing commercial language teaching materials can and will help move our discipline forward. Materials like those described in this report offer concrete benefits to students by affording them the experience of engaging with the full range of language as it is used in the real world. They have meaningful, productive language class experiences; they understand the value of language learning; and their project-based and content-driven work is structured to allow them to recognize their own successes. Added to these outcomes are the additional benefits of affordability, accessibility, and adaptability, which make language study accessible to a more diverse array of students.

Meanwhile, these materials also offer tangible advantages to instructors. By making lesson planning simple and quick, and by limiting the responsibilities of grading to more substantive and engaging content, these transformed materials streamline the instructor's work and maximize limited classroom time to focus on

honest communication. These materials also support instructors in creating a collaborative learning environment in which their students depend upon each other to learn while instructors can better get to know their students as human beings. In short, instructors are given the flexibility to teach how they want to, without fighting against a textbook.

As we have reported from our preliminary inquiry, these materials appear to produce results: Linguistic outcomes are on par with those seen using more traditional materials, but with the intangible affective benefits of student confidence in their language skills and of student enjoyment and appreciation for their language classes. More rigorous data collection related to student learning outcomes and perceptions of their own subjective experiences of learning with transformed materials in various course modalities is underway, which will inform efforts to refine and improve the transformed materials.

The pedagogical materials we use in our foundational language classes are just one of many tools available to us as we strive to innovate our programs; however, they may be the most accessible and the most powerful tool we have. If the future of our departments and our discipline depends at least in part on what and how we teach our foundational language classes, it is imperative that we discontinue the use of outdated materials that fail to engage our students. Yes, those old textbooks can die out. However, we must replace them with research-informed, engaging, and accessible materials that can produce the desired results while allowing instructors to focus on using the target language to create meaningful connections with and among their students. Although it is early to make strong claims about the impact of the transformed materials described with respect to sustained or increased enrollments or persistence beyond the foundational sequence, preliminary results and feedback from instructors and students indicate that we are on the right track.

References

ACTFL. (n.d.). *NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-do Statements*. https://www.actfl.org/educator-resources/ncssfl-actfl-can-do-statements

Aksu Atac, B. (2012). Foreign language teachers' attitude toward authentic assessment in language teaching. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 8*(2), 7–19. https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.162751761975839

Allen, H. W., & Paesani, K. (2010). Exploring the feasibility of a pedagogy of multiliteracies in introductory foreign language courses. *L2 Journal, 2*(1). http://dx.doi.org/10.5070/L2219064

Archbald, D. A. (1991). Authentic assessment: Principles, practices, and issues. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *6*(4), 279–293. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0088821

Athanasiou, A. (2007). Developing learner autonomy through collaborative learning in a higher education context. *Journal of Business & Society*, *20*(1–2), 115–129.

Bass, R., & Elmendorf, H. (n.d.). Designing for difficulty: Social pedagogies as a framework for course design. https://blogs.commons.georgetown.edu/bassr/social-pedagogies/

Bragger, D., & Rice, D. (2000). Foreign language materials: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. In R. Terry (Ed.), *Agents of change in a changing age* (pp. 107–140). National Textbook Company.

Geeslin, K. L. (2003). Student self-assessment in the foreign language classroom: The place of authentic assessment instruments in the Spanish language classroom. *Hispania*, *86*(4), 857–868. https://doi.org/10.2307/20062958

Hanson, M. (2022, July 15) *Average cost of college textbooks*. Education Data Initiative https://educationdata.org/average-cost-of-college-textbooks

Leeser, M., Keating, G., & Wong, W. (2021). *Research on second language processing and processing instruction: Studies in honor of Bill Van Patten.* John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.62

Looney, D., & Lusin, N. (2019). *Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, Summer 2016 and Fall 2016: Final report.* Modern Language Association of America. https://www.mla.org/content/download/110154/file/2016-Enrollments-Final-Report.pdf

Lord, G., & Isabelli, C. (2014). Program articulation and management. In M. Lacorte (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 150–167). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315882727

Menke, M. R., & Paesani, K. (2019). Analysing foreign language instructional materials through the lens of the multiliteracies framework. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 32*(1), 34–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2018.1461898

Meyer, C. (2009). The role of thinking in the college language classroom. *ADFL Bulletin, 41*(1), 86–93. https://doi.org/10.1632/adfl.41.1.86

MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. *Profession*, 234–245. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25595871

Monterroso, A. (1959). *Obras completas (y otros cuentos)*. [*Complete works (and other stories).*] Impresa Universitaria.

Paesani, K. (2016). Investigating connections among reading, writing, and language development: A multiliteracies perspective. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 28*(2), 266–289. http://hdl.handle.net/10125/66902

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants. *On the Horizon*, *9*(5), 1–6.

Rossomondo, A., & Lord, G. (2018). The world is not flat, so why are our textbooks? *Hispania*, *100*(5), 251–257. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/688471

Rossomondo, A. (2012). Integrating foundational language and content study through new approaches to hybrid learning and teaching. In F. Rubio & J. Thoms (Eds.), *Hybrid language teaching and learning: Exploring theoretical, pedagogical, and curricular issues* (pp. 219–238). Heinle. https://hdl.handle.net/10125/71674

Thorne, S. L., & Hellermann, J. (2022). Interfacing formal education and language learning beyond the classroom. In H. Reinders, C. Lai, & P. Sundqvist (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language learning and teaching beyond the classroom* (pp. 36–51). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003048169

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. MIT Press.

Warner, C., & Dupuy, B. (2018). Moving toward multiliteracies in foreign language teaching: Past and present perspectives…and beyond. *Foreign Language Annals, 51*(1), 116–128. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12316

Wiggins, G. (1990). The case for authentic assessment. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation, 2*, 1–3. https://doi.org/10.7275/ffb1-mm19

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design.* Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Appendix A. Spanish Knowledge Test[1]

Please indicate the correct response for as many items as you can in the time allotted.
It's ok if you don't know, feel free to guess or leave blank any items you can't answer! This is only to roughly gauge your overall experience with Spanish.
This assignment is not meant to reflect your grade or performance in class!

1. Me ... José.

- ◯ llama
- ◯ llamo
- ◯ llaman
- ◯ llame

2. El cielo es ...

- ◯ mucho
- ◯ largo
- ◯ dulce
- ◯ azul

3. ¿... qué tal?

- ◯ Por favor
- ◯ Cómo
- ◯ Hola
- ◯ Por

4. Me ... bailar.

- ◯ quiero
- ◯ quieren
- ◯ gusta
- ◯ gustan

5. ¿Habla ... español?

- ◯ tú
- ◯ usted
- ◯ que
- ◯ por

6. ... acuesto tarde.

- ◯ Me
- ◯ Mi
- ◯ Yo
- ◯ A mí

7. Dos y nueve son ...

- ◯ doce
- ◯ quince
- ◯ trece
- ◯ once

8. Le duele ...

- ◯ la cabeza
- ◯ el pelo
- ◯ la cerveza
- ◯ el nieto

9. Duermes ... el día.

- ◯ tanto
- ◯ todo
- ◯ casi
- ◯ bastante

10. ¿Qué hay de ...?

- ◯ parecer
- ◯ nuevo
- ◯ aún
- ◯ siempre

[1] This test was modeled after and, in some cases, adapted from various free online tests, such as https://www.lengalia.com/en/placement-test.html; https://www.cervantes.to/test_inicial.html; https://testyourlanguage.com/spanish-level-test; or https://oxfordhousebcn.com/en/levels/level-tests/spanish/.

11. ... viento.

- ◯ Gusta
- ◯ Puede
- ◯ Hace
- ◯ Está

12. Tengo ... hablar con ella.

- ◯ que
- ◯ a
- ◯ al
- ◯ de

13. Los platos ... en la mesa.

- ◯ es
- ◯ son
- ◯ están
- ◯ está

14. Tú ... muy joven.

- ◯ es
- ◯ estás
- ◯ sois
- ◯ eres

15. Sólo hablo ... de alemán.

- ◯ nada
- ◯ un poco
- ◯ también
- ◯ muy

16. Voy ... baño.

- ◯ a el
- ◯ al
- ◯ a
- ◯ el

17. - ¿Cómo está usted? - ...

- ◯ Un poquito.
- ◯ Muy bien.
- ◯ No es nada.
- ◯ Gracias.

18. Los chicos estudian en la ...

- ◯ sala de espera
- ◯ torre
- ◯ escuela
- ◯ comida

19. ¿... cuestan los billetes?

- ◯ Qué
- ◯ Cómo
- ◯ Cuándo
- ◯ Cuánto

20. Este sillón es muy ...

- ◯ cómodo
- ◯ está
- ◯ cierra
- ◯ hay

21. ¡Buenos ..., señorita!

- ◯ días
- ◯ tardes
- ◯ noches
- ◯ mañanas

22. Hay muchos ... en la biblioteca.

- ◯ platos
- ◯ nombres
- ◯ frutas
- ◯ libros

23. Lo ... mucho.

- ◯ siento
- ◯ tengo
- ◯ es
- ◯ qué

24. Marga tiene ... rubio.

- ◯ coche
- ◯ pelo
- ◯ problema
- ◯ codo

25. Enero y febrero son ...

- ◯ semanas del mes
- ◯ años de la semana
- ◯ meses del año
- ◯ días del mes

26. Carlos no ... diligente.

- ◯ está
- ◯ es
- ◯ esto
- ◯ eres

27. ¿... está el supermercado?

- ◯ Qué
- ◯ Cómo
- ◯ Dónde
- ◯ Por qué

28. Tenemos dos ...: un niño y una niña.

- ◯ hijos
- ◯ padres
- ◯ yernos
- ◯ mujeres

29. ¡... pronto!

- ◯ Tanto
- ◯ Hasta
- ◯ Mucho
- ◯ Un

30. En mi ciudad ... siempre llueve.

- ◯ casi
- ◯ nunca
- ◯ mucho
- ◯ nada

31. ... treinta años.

- ◯ Hago
- ◯ Soy
- ◯ Tengo
- ◯ Estoy

32. Por ... me gusta cocinar.

- ◯ qué
- ◯ ejemplo
- ◯ favor
- ◯ mí

33. ... la radio.

- ◯ Escucho
- ◯ Hablo
- ◯ Estoy
- ◯ Raro

34. ... acuerdo.

- ◯ Desde
- ◯ Y
- ◯ A
- ◯ De

35. ¿... se llama usted?

- ◯ Qué
- ◯ Quién
- ◯ Cómo
- ◯ Cuál

36. Deme una bolsa, por ...

- ◯ favor
- ◯ supuesto
- ◯ qué
- ◯ uno

37. La nieve es ...

- ◯ larga
- ◯ perezosa
- ◯ blanca
- ◯ gorda

38. ... fiebre.

- ◯ Tengo
- ◯ Cuesto
- ◯ Me
- ◯ Por

39. Madrid tiene más ... tres millones de habitantes.

- ◯ que
- ◯ de
- ◯ y
- ◯ los

40. El verano viene ... la primavera.

- ◯ después de
- ◯ para
- ◯ contra
- ◯ entre

41. - ¿Qué hora es? - ...

- ◯ Es el once.
- ◯ Son las una.
- ◯ Son las ocho.
- ◯ Es los cuatro.

42. Hoy es mi ...

- ◯ Navidad
- ◯ cumpleaños
- ◯ Pascua
- ◯ hermano

43. - Soy de Valencia. - ...

- ◯ ¿Y dónde?
- ◯ Según mi opinión.
- ◯ ¿De verdad?
- ◯ Estás bien.

44. Empezamos ... estudiar español.

- ◯ a
- ◯ con
- ◯ en
- ◯ que

45. No ... lo que dices.

- ◯ gusta
- ◯ puedo
- ◯ estás
- ◯ entiendo

46. Los ... ya son viejos y no trabajan.

- ◯ pensionistas
- ◯ mecánicos
- ◯ abogados
- ◯ floristas

47. Tengo ..., necesito comer.

- ◯ suerte
- ◯ hembra
- ◯ hambre
- ◯ seda

48. Por ... que sí.

- ◯ ejemplo
- ◯ qué
- ◯ favor
- ◯ supuesto

49. La madre de mi padre ...

- ◯ nunca come
- ◯ es mi abuela
- ◯ no tiene hijos
- ◯ se vende

50. - Muchas gracias. - ...

- ◯ De nada.
- ◯ Por favor.
- ◯ De verdad.
- ◯ No lo es.

51. Marianne es una chica ...

- ◯ inglesa
- ◯ inglés
- ◯ inglese
- ◯ Inglaterra

52. Una semana consiste en ...

- ◯ seis meses
- ◯ catorce horas
- ◯ un año
- ◯ siete días

53. - ¿Adónde vas? - ... a la cocina.

- ◯ Voy
- ◯ Vamos
- ◯ Yendo
- ◯ Ir

54. Hay cuatro sillas y una mesa ...

- ◯ sí
- ◯ aunque
- ◯ también
- ◯ poco

55. ¿... es este hombre en la televisión?

- ◯ Quién
- ◯ Cuánto
- ◯ Por
- ◯ Adónde

56. Hay un reloj en ... pared.

- ◯ al
- ◯ el
- ◯ la
- ◯ lo

57. ... la playa a la piscina.

- ◯ Prefiero
- ◯ Voy
- ◯ Gusta
- ◯ Son

58. Primero Juan se ducha, ... se afeita.

- ◯ tanto
- ◯ luego
- ◯ pero
- ◯ ya

59. No quiero estar lejos ... ti.

- ◯ a
- ◯ para
- ◯ en
- ◯ de

60. - ¿Quieres acompañarnos? - ... que sí.

- ◯ Claro
- ◯ Nunca
- ◯ Por
- ◯ Ya

61. ... de nacimiento: 04-04-2006

- ◯ Tiempo
- ◯ Calle
- ◯ Fecha
- ◯ Cuenta

62. ¡Qué casa ... grande!

- ◯ cómo
- ◯ tan
- ◯ es
- ◯ y

63. Es el presidente ... Estados Unidos.

- ◯ de la
- ◯ del
- ◯ de el
- ◯ de los

64. El hotel está situado ... la Ópera.

- ◯ junto a
- ◯ con
- ◯ entre
- ◯ para

65. Los árboles pierden sus hojas ...

- ◯ por favor
- ◯ en otoño
- ◯ con acuerdo
- ◯ conmigo

66. Real Madrid es campeón ... vez.

- ◯ tanta
- ◯ un
- ◯ otra
- ◯ para

67. ¿Tienes ... que decir?

- ◯ algo
- ◯ ninguno
- ◯ alguien
- ◯ algún

68. En el quiosco de prensa se venden ...

- ◯ patatas
- ◯ faldas
- ◯ perros
- ◯ periódicos

69. ¿... es el mejor restaurante?

- ◯ Cómo
- ◯ Cuál
- ◯ Cuánto
- ◯ Cuándo

70. Ellos tienen un nombre y dos ...

- ◯ apellidos
- ◯ madres
- ◯ pieles
- ◯ vistas

71. Llevo una ... y una falda.

- ◯ agua
- ◯ moto
- ◯ blusa
- ◯ pájaro

72. Sólo tomo un café con leche para ...

- ◯ yo
- ◯ desayuno
- ◯ saber
- ◯ el mes

73. Estoy ... el restaurante Botín.

- ◯ buscando
- ◯ siempre
- ◯ bueno
- ◯ pensando

74. Uno de los siguientes no es para la cocina.

- ◯ el frigorífico
- ◯ el cuchillo
- ◯ la cama
- ◯ el horno

75. De vez ... cuando vamos al cine.

- ◯ y
- ◯ con
- ◯ en
- ◯ por

76. ..., no es una tarea fácil.

- ◯ Cómo
- ◯ Es decir
- ◯ Según
- ◯ Desde hace

77. Yo ... caso con ella.

- ◯ no
- ◯ mi
- ◯ me
- ◯ quiero

78. Aquí ... español.

- ◯ se habla
- ◯ está
- ◯ hacen
- ◯ entender

79. Te llamo ... teléfono.

- ◯ con
- ◯ por
- ◯ el
- ◯ para

80. Mi colega no tiene más ... veinte años.

- ◯ que
- ◯ de
- ◯ por
- ◯ el

81. Clara trabaja como ... en una tienda.

- ◯ cantante
- ◯ pescador
- ◯ dependiente
- ◯ maestra

82. Manuel toma un vaso de agua porque tiene…

- ◯ hombre
- ◯ sed
- ◯ hambre
- ◯ dudas

83. Su familia vive en Francia ... un año.

- ◯ desde hace
- ◯ ya que
- ◯ con
- ◯ de

84. Tenemos muchos animales: gatos, ... y conejos.

- ◯ zapatos
- ◯ coches
- ◯ nietos
- ◯ perros

85. El concierto comienza a las siete y ...

- ◯ ocho
- ◯ eso
- ◯ media
- ◯ pronto

86. Esta fiesta es en el ... de julio.

- ◯ mes
- ◯ junio
- ◯ día
- ◯ verano

87. Mi madre está ... mis camisas.

- ◯ hablando
- ◯ entiendo
- ◯ planchando
- ◯ cuando

88. ... es que no la conozco.

- ◯ La verdad
- ◯ A ver
- ◯ Aunque
- ◯ Una vez

89. Pienso ... comprar un computador.

- ◯ que
- ◯ en
- ◯ a
- ◯ como

90. Sobre gustos no hay nada ...

- ◯ esto
- ◯ escrito
- ◯ sólo
- ◯ yo

91. Lo ... hacer ahora.

- ◯ tengo
- ◯ es para
- ◯ tratamos de
- ◯ quiero sin

92. Felipe y Antonio juegan ... tenis.

- ◯ el
- ◯ al
- ◯ de
- ◯ -

93. Mi jefe viaja ... frecuencia a Barcelona.

- ◯ de
- ◯ por
- ◯ con
- ◯ entre

94. El perro está ... la mesa.

- ◯ debajo de
- ◯ sin
- ◯ sobre todo
- ◯ contigo

95. El ... hace trajes a medida.

- ◯ panadero
- ◯ chófer
- ◯ fontanero
- ◯ sastre

96. Este hotel es ... alto de la ciudad.

- ◯ el más
- ◯ más
- ◯ lo mayor
- ◯ el mejor

97. A ... me gusta ir a cenar fuera.

- ◯ que
- ◯ yo
- ◯ mí
- ◯ para

98. No queda pan ... el fin de semana.

- ◯ con
- ◯ sin
- ◯ sólo
- ◯ para

99. Vas a descubrir una sorpresa ... esa puerta.

- ◯ por que
- ◯ detrás de
- ◯ por encima
- ◯ junto con

100. Me interesan los deportes, ... el fútbol.

- ◯ pero
- ◯ muy bien
- ◯ contra
- ◯ sobre todo

Appendix B. Self-Assessment of Abilities ("Can-Do" Statements)

Please indicate the degree to which you are able to carry out each task in Spanish, *using this scale.*

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I am incapable of doing this, even with help.		*I might be able to do this with some help, but I'm not confident in my abilities.*				*I feel I could do this with little problem.*

1. _____ I can identify basic facts in written texts.
2. _____ I can understand familiar questions and statements in oral conversations.
3. _____ I can answer simple questions on very familiar topics.
4. _____ I can request and provide information on everyday topics.
5. _____ I can request and provide information on familiar topics.
6. _____ I can express basic needs related to familiar activities.
7. _____ I can interact with others to meet my basic needs related to routine everyday activities.
8. _____ I can express basic preferences or feelings.
9. _____ I can express my own preferences or feelings and react to those of others.
10. _____ I can express, ask about, and react to preferences, feelings, or opinions on familiar topics, and ask questions to keep the conversation on topic.
11. _____ I can introduce myself effectively.
12. _____ I can present information about myself, my interests and my activities.
13. _____ I can present personal information about my life and activities.
14. _____ I can express my likes and dislikes on familiar topics.
15. _____ I can express my preferences on everyday topics of interest.
16. _____ I can compare cultural products and practices from my culture and those of Spanish-speaking cultures.
17. _____ I can converse with Spanish speakers in familiar situations at school, work, or play.
18. _____ I can show interest in basic cultural similarities and differences when conversing with Spanish speakers.
19. _____ I can recognize that significant differences in behaviors exist among cultures.
20. _____ I can use culturally appropriate behaviors and avoid major social blunders.

Appendix C. Attitude Survey Instrument

For each statement, please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree using this scale.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never true of me; strongly disagree		*Somewhat true, sometimes true of me; neither agree nor disagree; neutral*				*Always true of me; strongly agree*

1. _____ Learning Spanish is important to me because I would like to travel internationally.
2. _____ I feel excited when hearing Spanish spoken.
3. _____ I am very interested in the values and customs of Spanish-speaking cultures.
4. _____ I look forward to taking SPN1131 in the future.
5. _____ Studying Spanish can be important to me because I think it will someday be useful in getting a good job.
6. _____ If I make more effort, I am sure I will be able to master Spanish.
7. _____ I am only taking this class because it is a requirement.
8. _____ I like the atmosphere of my Spanish classes.
9. _____ I am interested in the way Spanish is used in conversation.
10. _____ I am working hard at learning Spanish.
11. _____ I get nervous and confused when I am speaking in my Spanish class.
12. _____ I find learning Spanish very interesting.
13. _____ I find the differences between English and Spanish interesting.
14. _____ I am prepared to expend a lot of effort in learning Spanish.
15. _____ I always look forward to Spanish classes.
16. _____ Studying Spanish can be important for me because I think I'll need it for further studies within my major/field of interest.
17. _____ Whenever I think of my future career, I imagine myself using Spanish.
18. _____ I really enjoy learning Spanish.

About the Authors

Amy Rossomondo (PhD, Indiana University) is Associate Professor of Spanish at the University of Kansas, where she directs the Spanish Language Program. Her specializations include second language acquisition, language pedagogy and technology, and language teacher development. She is the author of *Acceso*, one of the longest-running OER programs to date.

E-mail: arossomo@ku.edu

Gillian Lord (PhD, Pennsylvania State University) is Professor of Hispanic Linguistics and Associate Dean at the University of Florida. Her specialization is in instructed second language acquisition, including the development of pedagogical materials. She directed the language program at UF for many years and served as department chair for over a decade.

E-mail: glord@ufl.edu