



# The TFLTA Journal

*☞ An annual online journal ☞*



**TFLTA**  
Tennessee Foreign Language Teaching Association

Volume I  
Issue I  
Fall 2009

# *The TFLTA Journal*

---

**Volume 1, Number 1**  
**ISSN 2151-3384**

**Fall 2009**  
*Languages: The Bridge to the Future*

**EDITOR**  
Patricia Davis-Wiley  
The University of Tennessee  
Knoxville, TN

**Copyright 2009**  
**The Tennessee Foreign Language  
Teaching Association**

**TECHNICAL EDITOR**  
Charlotte Gossett  
The University of Tennessee  
Knoxville, TN

## **EDITORIAL BOARD**

Christine Brown  
Glastonbury Public Schools  
Glastonbury, CT

Todd A. Hernández  
Marquette University  
Milwaukee, WI

Doug Bright  
Webb School of Knoxville  
Knoxville, TN

Robert D. Peckham  
The University of Tennessee  
Martin, TN

Paul A. García  
University of South Florida  
Tampa, FL

Virginia Scott  
Vanderbilt University  
Nashville, TN

Marcella Gerber  
Hockaday School  
Dallas, TX

Mark K. Warford  
Buffalo State University  
Sunny, NY

*The TFLTA Journal*, published each fall, is a peer-reviewed, online publication of TFLTA, the Tennessee Foreign Language Teaching Association, an affiliate of ACTFL. The journal publishes original scholarly articles (i.e., instructional methods and techniques, assessment, policy and accountability issues), that are of interest to modern and classical language educators in the K-16 arena.

# *The TFLTA Journal*

## Fall 2009

### CONTENTS

Message from the Editor.....1  
*Patricia Davis-Wiley*

Call for Papers and Submission Information for Authors.....2

#### Articles

Pathways to Ensure Our Students Are World-Ready.....3  
*Paul Sandrock*

A Retrospective Look at Language Instruction.....9  
*Christine Brown*

Considerations, Constraints and Joys: Remembering the Future of Language Immersion  
in the U.S.....15  
*Paul A. García*

Developing Language Skills for Success in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Work in Progress at the  
Center for Applied Linguistics.....32  
*Dora Johnson, Margaret E. Malone, Joy Kreeft Peyton, Ingrid Pufahl, and Nancy Rhodes*

Information Dynamics for Twenty-First Century Literacy Guides.....42  
*Robert D. Peckham*

Situating Grammar Instruction in the World Language Classroom: Four Content-Enriched  
Strategies.....50  
*Todd A. Hernández*

Can training influence teachers' intention to teach in the L2?.....61  
*Mark K. Warford*

---

## Message From the Editor

---

The inaugural issue of the new peer-reviewed, online *TFLTA Journal* showcases invited articles from world language educators across the United States. The first three contributions were written by Past Presidents of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Drs. Paul Sandrock, Christine Brown and Paul García, who were also former keynote speakers at the annual conferences of TFLTA in recent years. Their pieces take us on a retrospective look back at world language education and launch us on a journey forward to its immediate future.

Next, our friends at the Center for Applied Linguistics have contributed a special article, expressly written for us, highlighting their efforts to chronicle second language programs in the K-12 arena across the U.S. They have also included a detailed overview of the extensive resources available to K-12 WL educators, parents, administrators and interested parties, from their Washington, D.C. office. Next, Dr. Bob Peckham, affectionately known throughout the globe as *Tennessee Bob*, presents his very own provocative insights into 21<sup>st</sup> century literacies.

Our first issue ends with two fine scholarly pieces. Dr. Todd Hernández presents a ready-to-use-in- the classroom set of four content-enriched strategies, having as their theoretical background the Standards, that we adhere to in the world language classroom. Our journal ends with a research study conducted by Dr. Mark Warford, who has a research interest in exploring the efficacy of professional development for classroom teachers.

A very special acknowledgment is gratefully extended to Allison Davis, Director of Design | Emma®, located in Nashville, Tennessee, who graciously created our exquisite stained glass journal front and back covers.

The Editorial staff and the Board of *The TFLTA Journal*, in concert with the officers and Board of Directors of the Tennessee Foreign Language Teaching Association, trust that you will enjoy our new peer-reviewed journal. We also invite you to read the Call for Papers and Submission Information for Authors (page 2), and consider making a scholarly contribution of your own to future issues of the journal.

Patricia Davis-Wiley  
Editor

---

## Call for Papers and Submission Information for Authors

*The TFLTA Journal*  
Volume 2  
Fall 2010

---

The Editorial Board of *The TFLTA Journal* would like to invite you to submit scholarly articles (i.e., research conducted in the classroom; language approaches/strategies; meta-analyses; assessment issues; integration of authentic literature, music and the arts into the classroom; context-based instruction; digital literacies; position papers) of interest to K-12 world language (modern and classical languages) educators. The main focus for the Fall 2010 journal issue will be directly tied into TFLTA's annual conference theme, *Live the Language, Learn by Doing*.

*The deadline for submission of articles for the 2010 Fall issue of the journal is August 1, 2010*, in order to allow ample time for a blind review of submitted manuscripts and editing of accepted articles. Upon receipt of submissions, authors will be notified as soon as possible by the Editor.

*Submission guidelines to be followed are:*

1. Manuscripts need to be sent electronically to Patricia Davis-Wiley, Editor, *The TFLTA Journal*, at: [pdwiley@utk.edu](mailto:pdwiley@utk.edu) and should have *TFLTA Journal submission* in the subject line of the email.
2. The primary author of the manuscript needs to enter *TFLTA Journal article* in the subject line of the email and include his/her name, title, school/office affiliation, email address, contact phone number(s), and working title of the manuscript in the body of the email.
3. Manuscript maximum length (including references) is 20 (double-spaced) pages with 1" margins all around.
4. Create a Microsoft WORD 2003 document using Times Roman 12-point.
5. Follow APA '10 (6<sup>th</sup> edition) format for headings, references, figures and tables.
6. Include a separate title page *with* names and affiliations of all authors, in addition to a title page *without* names; this will expedite the blind review process.
7. Use [insert Table X here] or [insert Figure Y here] in the body of the text where tables and figures need to be placed; insert a separate page for each table and figure at end of the paper, following references; tables and figures may need to be re-sized in the final manuscript so be sure to save them as either *.jpeg* or *.doc* files.
8. Include a brief (150-word maximum) abstract of the article (to be placed following the title page), and a 75-word maximum biographic statement for each author (at end of the article).
9. Manuscripts are accepted year-round but will follow the posted submission deadline.

---

## Pathways to Ensure Our Students Are World-Ready

---

**Paul Sandrock**

*Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction*

*How can we get our students ready to be global citizens in this century? What essential skills need to be taught through our schools' curricula to ensure this? This paper will explore answers to these and other millennial-timely questions.*

In December 2006, the New Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce issued its report to better prepare U.S. students for the world they will enter following their K-12 education. The commission concluded that too much of America's educational energy is focused on minimum competencies in math and reading. In its cover story on the report of the New Commission, *Time* magazine said the challenge is to prepare students with these four 21<sup>st</sup> century skills:

- Knowing more about the world
- Thinking outside the box
- Becoming smarter about new sources of information
- Developing good people skills

This is a story about the big public conversation the nation is *not* having about education, the one that will ultimately determine not merely whether some fraction of our children get 'left behind' but also whether an entire generation of kids will fail to make the grade in the global economy because they can't think their way through abstract problems, work in teams, distinguish good information from bad, or speak a language other than English. (How to build a student, 2006, p. 52)

### **What Value Is Added By Learning Languages?**

Languages are in the public consciousness today. News and magazine articles as well as reports from different organizations are shaping Americans' perceptions about the value of languages. What effective arguments will help convince the public of the value added from learning languages in addition to one's native tongue? Helene Zimmer-Loew (2005) urges language educators to build support for language learning by understanding the "perspectives of your diverse audiences, be they students, parents, administrators, superintendents, fellow faculty members, school board members, deans, provosts, institution presidents, taxpayers, local clubs, civic associations, the press, government agencies, and the list goes on" (p. 229). Zimmer-Loew (2005) identifies seven key arguments we should use to advocate for expanded language programs:

- Because of an increasing number of heritage languages and cultures represented in our country
- Because of the needs of U.S. business and industry
- Because your English and your critical thinking skills will improve
- To support U.S. political, military, and security interests
- Because of the success factor, that competitive edge in college and career
- For fun and personal satisfaction
- For life-enriching experiences by exploring other cultures here and abroad  
(Zimmer-Loew, 2005b, p. 229)

### **Languages Add Value to Our Economy**

Media reflect the American consensus on the value of languages as an essential skill for competing in today's interconnected global economy. Thomas Friedman in his recent book, *The World is Flat*, makes the point that today's worldwide access to technology and education flatten the economic playing field, so that countries such as China and India can now play major roles in supplying services across the globe. The U.S. Department of Commerce website shows the destinations for each state's exports (<http://tse.export.gov>), positioning languages as a critical element in selling U.S. products abroad. Public support for language learning is strengthened by today's economic realities.

Today's employees need to speak more than one language and function in more than one culture. That is the message from Michael Eskew, Chairman and CEO of United Parcel Service (UPS), as he addressed the December 2005 States Institute, a gathering of leaders in international education including several state superintendents. Specifically, Eskew outlined six specific traits he says are critical for his company and others to seek in future employees:

Trade literate  
 Sensitive to foreign cultures  
 Conversant in different languages  
 Technology savvy  
 Capable of managing complexity  
 Ethical

### **Languages Add Value to Our Diplomacy**

Our federal government is spreading the word that languages are critical for national security and defense. The result of this belief is a growing commitment to languages at all levels of the U.S. Departments of Defense and State. Documents describing how to build the language capacity for broader diplomatic needs include the *Defense Language Transformation Roadmap, 2005* (<http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Mar2005/d20050330roadmap.pdf>). The roadmap outlines strategies to develop, encourage, and tap knowledge and skills in languages and cultures at all levels of the military. This year, Gov. Jon Huntsman of Utah was tapped to become the U.S.

Ambassador to China based in no small part on his command of Mandarin Chinese. A knowledge of language and culture provides access.

### **Languages Add Value for Heritage Cultures**

When Americans look at the variety of cultures right in their own community, they find the very resources of language and culture sought for the nation's diplomatic and economic needs. The Language Map provided by the Modern Language Association provides a wonderful tool to examine our mosaic of languages by county or state ([http://www.mla.org/census\\_main](http://www.mla.org/census_main)). As language educators, we need to speak up for education policies that maintain and strengthen these heritage languages, rather than watching the elimination of these valuable language resources.

### **Languages Add Value Through Their Impact On Academic Achievement**

Research on academic achievement also supports the value added by learning languages. In numerous studies, students studying languages outperformed those who did not study languages on state academic assessments in language arts and math, regardless of race, gender, academic background, or socioeconomic level. A recent study in Louisiana showed that students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds performed just as well as their traditionally advantaged higher socioeconomic background peers (Taylor-Ward, 2003). In this Louisiana study, elementary grade language students outperformed non-language students on every subtest of the state assessment. The College Board has shown that four or more years of language study raised SAT scores more than four or more years of study in any other subject area (Cooper, 1987). Additional research reports outlining what we know about how language learning supports academic achievement are available at the ACTFL website (<http://www.actfl.org>), click on "Publications," then click on "Resources."

### **Languages Add Value By Adding Perspectives**

The value at the heart of our passion for teaching languages is the value given by adding global perspectives. Through integrated projects, students adopt new ways of seeing issues, from attitudes toward environmental concerns to political events to ways of expressing friendship. The global perspectives students acquire through their study of new languages and cultures will impact their lives in whatever career path they follow. This is the greatest gift language educators develop in their students, the deepest value added through languages.

### **Do World Language Educators Have a Common Focus for Their Instruction and Assessment?**

While valuable, few students continue their study of world languages long enough to develop a career-level proficiency. I would suggest that students' frustration from instruction that keeps changing focus year-to-year is one strong cause for an alarming percentage of language dropouts. For too long, students have not experienced seamless transitions in their



language learning as they moved from elementary schools to middle schools to senior high schools and then to postsecondary levels. Instead of providing a balanced curriculum, programs traditionally focused on listening, speaking, and culture in elementary grades; a brief exploration of multiple languages in middle school; a perceived “real” start in high school that added reading and writing skills to grammar instruction; and postsecondary instruction that covered all the grammar before moving on to civilization & culture courses and ending with a focus on literature. Students faced multiple starts and repeated content, if they continued to enroll in language courses.

The answer comes from our national standards, which provide the common focus to link instruction from level to level. The standards balance instruction for all levels around the three modes of instruction (interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational) taught with and through cultures, connections, comparisons, and communities. Standards connect the learning targets for each level and assessments capture the expectations for both teachers and students. A matching and seamless system of assessment would develop both accountability and consistency as students move in and out of different institutions.

A Modern Language Association (MLA) Panel recommended in 2007 that university content from 101 to the Ph.D. level be re-evaluated; that programs move away from a literature-centered model, to an interdisciplinary approach; and that faculty teach language, culture, and literature as a continuous whole (Modern Language Association, 2007). Georgetown University’s German Department developed a focus for language learning that illustrates these principles. Reframing the curriculum from the first semester of instruction through the graduate level, the department designed each course to foster continuous development of all aspects of language. The mantra is “content from the beginning and language to the end” (Georgetown University, 2009). In this integration of content and language, students use language in motivating ways.

The more we can show through our students’ use of their new language that they are learning something to impact their future, the more parents and the larger public will support language learning as an essential part of students’ education. The evidence needs to come from our classrooms. While there is a place for worksheets and quizzes in helping the teacher identify what specific language components students have at their command, if that is all that goes home, the value of learning language is not visible beyond being an interesting intellectual activity. Think, however, of the impression made when students bring home evidence of using their language skills to explore neighborhoods, ask questions of someone living in another country, conduct research for other classes, or provide services in their school or community.

Assessment is as important as standards for connecting language learning across each level of instruction. With the standards as the content, assessment captures what students can do. Assessment needs to evolve to a balanced system of classroom learning checks and true assessments of performance. The ACTFL Oral Proficiency Guidelines provide holistic targets to identify how good is good enough as teachers develop their classroom assessments. The Performance Guidelines for K-12 Learners also help teachers design assessments that truly cap-

ture program goals. The Linguafolio self-assessment grid helps both teachers and students know what is expected in clear statements that begin with “I can” (National Council, 20009).

### **What Will It Take to Position World Languages as an Essential Competency in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century?**

Our united professional response needs to focus on preparing students for the global economy not by trying to predict the one language they will need in their future job, but by preparing all students to learn languages and interact with people from other cultures. These *portable* skills come from learning *any* language beyond their native one. Schools across the country are reporting that students who begin one world language in elementary grades often add another language in middle or high school. Such language layering gives students differing degrees of proficiency. In Finland, administrators refer to students’ third language as their “travel” language, acquiring a degree of proficiency that makes students comfortable to explore the world, but not to negotiate a contract. This can frame our collaboration across languages instead of the teachers of one language competing against the teachers of another language for students’ enrollment and public support.

The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) has launched a project to identify the framework of skills that make up global competency. Through its EdSteps project, project (<http://edsteps.org/CCSSO/Home.aspx>), CCSSO convened a team to outline a matrix of global competency. Currently, EdSteps is asking teachers to work with students to design projects demonstrating the elements of global competency and then submit students’ work, demonstrating various stages in the development of global competency. Based on the student work, the design team will refine the common set of goals as well as identify benchmarks supported by examples submitted. The resulting resource will illustrate how global competency is developed from preschool through adulthood.

Students acquire these global competencies, practice them, and demonstrate them through the languages they acquire to differing levels of proficiency. The global literacies are acquired and demonstrated through students’ native language, through the languages they study to advanced levels of proficiency ready to use in future careers, and through the languages learned to more limited levels of proficiency that help students make global connections, through travel, exploration of their family heritage, or for accessing resources and conducting research. Students acquire global competency through all subject areas, using language skills and seeking international connections through projects, units, and courses.

All students, indeed all citizens, need global competency in order to be successful in the world today. Information, communication, research, and commerce are no longer limited by place and language. All of these can flow throughout the world, accessible to those who have the skills and knowledge to understand other languages and cultural perspectives. Let’s collaborate to ensure that our students acquire and value these skills.

## References

- How to Build a Student for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. (December 18, 2006). *Time*, p. 52.
- Zimmer-Loew, H. (2005). The power of languages: Why we learn them. In P. Boyles & P. Sandrock (Eds.), *The year of languages: Challenges, changes, and choices* (pp. 229-247). Milwaukee, WI: Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Zimmer-Loew, H. (2005). The power of languages: Why we learn them. In P. Boyles & P. Sandrock (Eds.), *The year of languages: Challenges, changes, and choices* (pp. 229-247). Milwaukee, WI: Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Taylor-Ward, C. (2003). *The Relationship between Elementary School Foreign Language Study in Grades Three through Five and Academic Achievement on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS) and the Fourth-grade Louisiana Educational Assessment Program for the 21st Century (LEAP 21) Test*. Ph.D dissertation, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA. Retrieved from <http://etd.lsu.edu/docs/available/etd-1103103-111054/>
- Cooper, T. C. (1987) Foreign language study and SAT-verbal scores. *The Modern Language Journal*, 71(4), 381-387.
- Modern Language Association. (2007). Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World. Retrieved from <http://www.mla.org/flreport>
- Georgetown University. Retrieved from <http://www1.georgetown.edu/departments/german/programs/undergraduate/curriculum/>
- National Council of State Supervisors for Languages. (2009). Linguafolio Self-Assessment Grid. Retrieved from <http://www.ncssfll.org/links/LFGrid.pdf>

## The Author

*Dr. Paul Sandrock is the Assistant Director of the Content and Learning Team for the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. In 2006, Paul was President of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL).*

---

## A Retrospective Look at Language Immersion

---

**Christine Brown**

*Glastonbury Public Schools*

*The following speech was written and given by Christine Brown to the Tennessee Foreign Language Teachers Association on the occasion of their 40<sup>th</sup> annual conference in Nashville, Tennessee, November 2007.*

I decided to share a bit about those who have gone before you in the United States, as this is our history and our teaching context and you have a pivotal role to play in the future of American language education. By looking backward, as Edward Bellamy<sup>1</sup> said, “we can gain some important insight and perspectives on our future.” Today it is my hope to share with you some of the events that have shaped foreign language education in the United States, and then look ahead at the promise of the future with you all as language leaders.

This will be a quick journey through U.S. history with apologies to those who wrote the history standards, my version will be a little bit skewed toward language and culture issues.

### **The First 100 Years**

If we look at the first 100 years of our nation, we find a multilingual and multicultural society able to co-exist relatively peacefully around issues of language use and language learning. Although there were concerns about certain language groups gaining power in the founding year of democracy, very little local or federal policy was even discussed about the use and learning of other languages. Probably the need to accept settlers from a variety of countries quieted the fears and attitudes of some of the early founders.

Throughout these early years, former colonists and new arrivals and their children maintained native language skills and learned English. Native speakers of English used private tutors to study languages. Modern language learning was seen as a skill to be learned to use; whereas the classics were seen as valuable disciplines to be studied in schools and colleges. In the 1750s, private schools in Philadelphia were instructing students in the languages of French, German, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Latin, Arabic, and Hebrew.

Native Americans taught their young in a variety of native languages. In the late 1700s, and early 1800s, there were still 500 indigenous languages spoken. In the 1830s the Oklahoma Cherokee had created an alphabet for Cherokee and had established a bilingual school system using a writing system developed by Sequoyah. The literacy rate among Cherokees was 90% in Cherokee and higher in English than that of White neighbors in Texas and Arkansas. But, by

the mid 1800s, Native American language did not fare well for political reasons. In an effort to strip the Native American of his or her culture, a cavalry officer, Richard Henry Pratt, came up with a plan to remove children from the homes of Native Americans and send them away to public boarding schools. In these boarding schools, children were separated from their parents and forbidden from speaking their native languages.

### **On the Contrary**

In the late 1800s, large waves of immigration from Germany and other European countries created situations locally where even public schools were offering instruction in the native language of the immigrant group and in English. In many states and regions, parents felt that children needed to maintain the native language so that they would have a tie to their ethnic background and to their families.

In the late 1800s, parallel to these bilingual schools, was significant development in modern language teaching and at the turn of the century, there was a great effort to extend language programs into the elementary schools. Thousands of elementary students in Buffalo, Cincinnati, Milwaukee, New York City, Toledo, and San Francisco studied languages. In 1890, the Modern Language Association was formed, and by 1890, hundreds of newspapers and periodicals were published in languages other than English. There was great excitement about the coming of the new century and the need to educate children for the new age.

### **The State of the Schools**

Up to the 1890s, all of the private schools leading to the university were organized around the Latin and Greek academic traditions of European schools. Public schools employed Latin and Greek. English, as we conceive of its instruction today, was of very little importance in those schools. People considered that an educated individual would learn how to think and that thinking was derived from the mentalist study of the classics. Modern languages generally weren't taught in those private academies. In the 1880s and 90s, with the increase in urbanization and the need for people to have other skills, new subjects were being encouraged in schools that did not lead one necessarily to college. Those subjects such as Algebra, Geometry, Drafting or Drawing, as well as French and German, the less commonly taught languages, were suggested because of their importance *as work and life skills*.

In the 1890s, the Progressive education movement was formed – an enormous effort to reform education began. In the 1890s, we find an unprecedented event taking place, the formulation of a special committee of distinguished educators in the United States to study the system of elementary school and secondary schools and to make recommendations about secondary school education particularly in the United States. This Committee of Ten was appointed by the National Education Associations, National Council on Education in 1892. The general committee made recommendations to improve the educational system and also identified certain broad goals that had to be put into place.

## Identity of Instruction

There was perfect unanimity in the opinion that the same studies should be pursued by all in the same way as far as taken. One of the committee members, President James Baker of the University of Colorado, "In this country we have no fixed conditions of rank and the poor man's son has the same privileges as the sons of position and wealth." Hence, the station in life is not determined by the differentiation in courses at an early period. The Committee also called for:

1. better teachers
2. choice and length of study of courses
3. uniformity,
4. 4) connection between high schools and colleges,
5. 5) standards for professional schools and,
6. 6) analysis of studies.

President Baker of Colorado described the broad goal by saying that, "In addition to the training in observation, memory expression and inductive reasoning, which most studies offer, we must consider the development of imagination, right emotion and right will." In other words, aesthetic and ethical training is most essential. In regard to Latin and Greek languages being high on the list, the study of them provides the insight into the character of the peoples and their institution, the concepts of their civilization, the beauty of their literatures, [and] the practical contribution to the knowledge of our own language. Indeed, these elements form an important content to be realized in Analysis of Studies, or as we might say today, *critical thinking skills*.

The Committee's recommendations about foreign languages were summarized in the final report made in 1895. The Latin Committee recommended, "that the study of Latin be introduced into American schools earlier than it now is." The Conference also urged that 3 years be the minimum time for the study of Greek in schools, provided that Latin is studied for 4 years. They would not have a pupil begin the study of Greek, however, without knowledge of the elements of Latin.

The most novel and striking recommendation made by the Conference on Modern languages is that an elective course in German or French be provided in grammar school, and that the instruction to be open to children at about 10 years of age.

The Conference made this recommendation "in the firm belief that the educational effects of modern language study will be of immense benefit to all who are able to pursue it under proper guidance."

In fact, they pleaded that, "all pupils of the same intelligence and the same degree of maturity be instructed alike, no matter whether they are subsequently to enter a college or scientific school, or intend to pursue their studies no farther." The Conference also stated with great precision what, in their judgment, may be expected of pupils in German and French at the various

stages of their progress and performance outcomes. An important passage of the report talks of the best way to facilitate the progress of beginners: “pupils should be lifted over hard places; frequent reviews are not to be recommended; new *texts and ideas* stimulate interest and enlarge vocabulary.”

In regard to college requirements, the Conference agreed with several other Conferences in stating, “that college requirements for admission should coincide with the high school requirements for graduation.” Finally, they declared that, “the worst obstacle to modern language study is the lack of properly equipped instructors; and that it is the duty of universities, states, and cities to provide opportunities for special preparation of modern language teachers.”

They mentioned that, “the extent to which the study of the sources of English words can be carried in any school or class will depend on the acquaintance the pupils possess with Latin, French, and German.”

It was from the report of the Committee of Ten that we have the standardization that we do today in our educational system, as well as many other reforms in the type of subjects offered, and at least the rhetoric for educational equity and opportunity for all. In the case of foreign languages, however, the recommendations and reforms were short lived for historical reasons.

Early in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, American Imperialism, World War I and the events that led up to it created an unprecedented level of xenophobia. Not only were native speakers of languages other than English forbidden from speaking those languages, but foreign language newspapers and public school foreign language programs were eliminated. A new ethic emerged in the United States, that of *Americanization for national unity*. For the first time, mandates made English the languages of schools in New Mexico, and citizenship was denied to immigrants unable to speak English.

With the unprecedented levels of immigration between 1890 and 1914, and the ensuing ethnic conflicts in Europe, the price for immigration education in the United States became giving up one’s native language. Theodore Roosevelt stated in several speeches to civic and academic groups, “A hyphenated American is not an American at all.” In Columbus, Ohio Public Schools, all books and periodicals published in foreign languages were sold, while many other school districts burned them. Several states banned foreign language teaching in the elementary grades. Roosevelt made his message clear in a speech to the American Defense Society. “We have room but for one language here, and that is the English language. For we intend to see that the crucible turns our people out as Americans, of American nationality, and not as dwellers in a polyglot boarding house.”

Against the backdrop of Americanization and severely restricted immigration stands the plight of foreign language in general, but elementary school foreign languages in particular. Americans who were of ethnic origin learned quickly that there was no value to their child keeping his or her native language. In fact, to hang on to the languages of the past and to keep the cultural trappings meant that you were denied access to mainstream American culture.

Gradually, second and third generation immigrants moved from the urban areas and away from religious schools where language and culture were still maintained. They were not interested in having their children learn foreign languages, nor was it truly American to learn other languages. Grammar Translation, a throw back to Latin instruction, was resurrected at the primary methodology in language classes. In some districts, Latin was the only language offered.

Certainly, we have experienced a roller coaster of changes in perceived value of language education since the dark days of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. It's astonishing, and just a little eerie, to note that the reports of the Committee of Ten were released exactly 100 years before the National Standards for Foreign Languages and that the recommendations are nearly identical in substance.

### **Toward the Standards for Our Look to the Future**

I would like to encourage you to consider the national generic and language specific standards as collective mission statements and draw your attention to the fact that not only have thousands of language teachers heard about these standards and contributed to their development, but thousands of teachers have reviewed and changed the national and state documents. I am sure that you have all heard of the 5C's of language learning. They represent the embodiment of the collective and historical commitment of educators to help the children of the United State be able to participate fully in this diverse society and world. The work of the language standards task force also represents the first time in 100 years that language educators have had the opportunity at a national level to conduct a dialog and build consensus around a mission.

As foreign language teaching moves further and further away from the grammar translation approaches used in the 40s and 50s and the audio-lingual approaches used in the 60s and early 70s, the chasm between building administrators such as principals and vice principals, and the language classroom grows wider. It is important to recognize that most school administrators and college professors studied, at best, 2 years of a foreign (now called world) language in high school. Most school administrators today have little knowledge of what an elementary program could offer, little knowledge of language learning tied to adolescent interests and motivation, and virtually no knowledge of the communicative and cross-cultural approaches being presented today. The concept of being able to deal with interdisciplinary content material in the target language eludes the vast majority of school administrators and policy makers, and yet, it is here in this interdisciplinary space, that we have the connections for students and parents to see the true value and absolute necessity for American students to learn languages as a part of the core curriculum.

Today, there are signs that we have support for language learning and language teaching from many sectors of society. Recent polls of American college students and their parents have shown that more than 80% feel that learning and speaking languages is extremely important for Americans. The Department of Defense has repeatedly called for millions of dollars to be pumped into what they are calling *K-16 language pipelines* that would help provide students



with advanced proficiencies in critical (i.e., Chinese, Arabic, Japanese, Korean) languages. They have acknowledged that without these pipelines, American diplomacy and defense will be compromised.

Brain research in the last 5 years has shown that the brain is positively affected by the study of languages in addition to one's native tongue. Older and younger Americans have heard about the cognitive benefits of studying other languages and hope to build their thinking skills and stave off Alzheimer's disease and dementia through the study of other languages.

To further promote language study at this critical time in our history, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) has declared 2005, as the *Year of Languages* in the United States. ACTFL launched a new campaign entitled, *Discover Languages in 2006*. This campaign built on the successful *Year of Languages* effort. New legislation has even been put forth to create a cabinet level language czar position reporting directly to the President. With the help and lobby of the language profession and parents, there may be increased funding for language learning.

With Challenges come opportunities and responsibilities. I call these the *5 C's of Language Teacher Advocacy*, and they will form the basis for an important part of all of our jobs over the next 5 to 10 years. We need to be:

- *committed* to the profession and to professional development
- *compassionate* for your students and their families; life is hard for many American families. Therefore, language learning has to be accessible in every way to every student.
- *collaborative*. Work with other content area teachers; be a team player. Learning needs to be meaningful and perceived to be as useful as other disciplines. Be a part of the total school.
- *cognizant*. Be aware of the context in schools, in your community and in the lives of your students.
- *clever*. Stay up to date and on the cutting edge, ready to spring into action with students, parents, the community, the senior citizens and the policy makers.

### Note

<sup>1</sup>Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward: 2000-1887*, was first published in 1888, and, according to Wikipedia, "it was the third largest bestseller of its time, after *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and *Ben-Hur: A Tale of the Christ*" (¶2). Retrieved from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Looking\\_Backward](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Looking_Backward)

### The Author

Dr. Christine Brown is the Assistant Superintendent of Glastonbury Public Schools in Glastonbury, Connecticut and became President of ACTFL in 2002.

---

## Considerations, Constraints and Joys: Remembering the Future of Language Immersion in the U.S.

**“Our future may be beyond our vision, but  
it is not completely beyond our control.”**  
Eulogy for Sen. Robert F. Kennedy, June 6,  
1968, by Senator Edward M. Kennedy

---

Paul A. García  
University of South Florida

*This paper is a call to action for those in school leadership positions who will be charged to establish, develop, and maintain a K-12 immersion program based on the writer’s twenty-plus years of experience in immersion administration, teaching, and planning. These reflections present an overview of the major concerns that will challenge tomorrow’s proponents of early-start, sequential world language (WL) study. Simultaneously, we affirm the joys that a community and its pupils will derive from the carefully considered nurturing that language immersion programs require. The subject of continuing immersion at the middle or secondary level is afforded special recognition due to its positional and philosophical importance when an articulated and sustained sequence of instruction is offered.*

During July of 2009, this author once again had the privilege to serve as the consultant for a new language immersion site. The public school district that extended the invitation seeks to build a bridge to the future for its patrons, and thereby provide the students new and special opportunities for academic achievement. To do this, the hosts began the total restructuring of all their schools in 2008. They opted for a district-wide magnet system of choice. Spanish immersion is one component being inaugurated in 2009-2010 at an elementary school (Kindergarten-Grade 5) that serves 275 children.

Now this particular district, with a population of approximately 4,000 students, is located in a state that is known historically for not funding public education at high levels. Indeed, recent statistics put it in the bottom half of the lowest quintile of the 50 states. The district’s patrons reside in an economically-challenged community (a rural county seat) that is surrounded by rich, verdant farmland. The schools’ academic rankings place them among the state’s low scorers. In the face of such sobering numbers and somber results—and despite them, this community nevertheless believes in the power of education reform. It has the will to assist their children to cross that bridge to tomorrow. Their plan for the children to compete for those career opportunities which await the Class of 2020, be the journey’s “goal” found at home or away. Their aspirations affirm all that is laudable in our American “can-do” spirit. And just as the district’s hopes and commitment are resolute and unrelenting, so too must their passion be unflagging as they undertake change and school restructuring.

The new immersion school's dreams are happily shared by world language educators. We are pleased that language immersion has been included as one of a select few magnet theme choices. And as a Latino, this writer—with a doctorate in German literature and over 30 years' experience teaching German and Spanish in K-12 schools—is delighted that the district, with a 70% African American student population, sees *all* children's future unequivocally situated in a multicultural, multilingual society where the ability to use more than one language is no longer the exception (and where Spanish functions as an important second language for others). But we must move beyond that optimistic sense of contentment when a new immersion program begins. We must help, too.

We veteran teachers, administrators, and parents of immersion children must share our perspectives, so that future planners are aware of the challenges to be faced. We must consider the implications that immersion implementation brings with it pragmatically, and therefore purposefully assist new colleagues to go beyond the planning/implementation phase and their resultant initial euphoria. Instead, they must become adept at *developing and maintaining* a program of quality. It simply is not enough, that is, to be satisfied that “word has gotten out” about the immersion students' initial language skills, their incipient fluency in Spanish, and the recognition that they are learning their academic subjects through the medium of a language other than English. For however salutary such joy at witnessing the first strides across the “bridge under construction,” those initial steps surely will not be the last. More work must continue: more bridge-building, and many more steps.

Our preoccupation with sustaining change and producing a successful immersion school affirms the premise that an experienced perspective is a contributory variable to any measured success. Enumerating the *do's* and *don'ts*, or the *how* and *why* and *what* for on-site leadership by seasoned language educators is a desirable source of strength. The continuous monitoring of progress by an on-site team of dedicated administrators and teachers and parents ensures that the barely-begun journey will result in the children's successful traverse. It logically follows, we posit, that conceptualizing a nascent immersion program as a K-12 continuum is beneficial to others who undertake the tasks of implementing such a project.

The reflections that follow are a call to action on behalf of tomorrow's students today. Essential to our argument supporting deliberate language immersion planning through conscientious and careful deliberation are two fundamental principles. The first is the principle of providing *access*, which we define as unequivocally affording all students the opportunity to enroll in a well-conceived, articulated program. The second cornerstone of immersion design is the principle of *stability*. It is that pervasive, essential, and (in far too many school localities) sadly elusive quality of seeing a project through to its developmental conclusion—in this case, a guaranteed K-12 immersion experience. If absent, that sense of permanence—which an anchored educational environment produces—ultimately proves to be programmatically fatal. Both the aspirations of the planners and the parents' investment of their children school years will have been dashed by a recurrence of professional ineptitude that more often might be found in larger education venues, where, it seems, an uncontrollable modern-day belief system has begotten the notion that change is synonymous with upheaval, and comes in the guise of a *mid-course cor-*

*rection*. Flatly stated, that sense of insecurity is not what immersion education can or should be.

To understand the implications of these principles as basic to creating a bright future for immersion instruction in American education fully, we discuss three interrelated topics below. First, we introduce a brief primer or “ABCs” of what to look for in the initial stages of immersion planning. Second, we employ the recent history of U.S. immersion in terms of K-12 stability to propose a remedy to an unhealthy circumstance: that of immersion in our nation having become a K-6 phenomenon *by default*. This should not be the case. Immersion, we argue, must be conceived and “grown” as a continuing experience—for K-16 and beyond; the middle school aspects of continuing immersion require significant attention, for example, as was established by Garcia, Lorenz & Robison (1995). We maintain and advance that opinion as last we delineate key features and desiderata of continuing secondary-school immersion programs.

### **The ABC’s at Large: An Inclusive Administrative and Philosophical Perspective**

**Authenticity.** As planners formulate their program through mission statements and a review of goals and objectives, it is important that they give full discussion to and achieve consensus on the availability, relevance, and infusion of what we generally refer to as culturally-authentic language and materials. These are not only *print* items; they are also *oral* and “*visual*.” The decision must be based upon the immersion model that is being considered (partial immersion or total immersion?) and the immersion language itself. As the program is being planned, for example, then the question of curriculum fidelity—to district or regulatory dictates and parental preferences—is a foregone conclusion: immersion syllabi must match the official (English) curriculum to the extent possible. Therefore, *cursive* readers for Grade Two from Belgium, say, are inappropriate if cursive writing is not introduced until Grade Three. Aside from visual materials and classroom decorations, authenticity must also be understood very carefully to mean the language employed by the teacher. The vocabulary used must be appropriate to the experiences provided in the classroom setting. Game words, children’s rhymes and songs of childhood, counting and rounds/chants are obligatory. The teacher adds cultural continuity from both the American experience as well as from the second language culture. Administrators must ensure that the funds and the time to prepare the repertoire are available to those who establish the program and those who are its teachers.

**Ballyhoo.** Public relations will continue to play a significant role in the flourishing growth industry that characterizes immersion’s appearance. Programs, publications (newsletters), press releases, and networking activities should be planned with the well-done style if not professional skill that experience and training in media provide. Publicity must extend itself to embrace the notion that the teacher is to be in continual communication with students’ parents/guardians. Good PR is plain common sense, with more than a dollop of time and funding added. Advertising and recruitment attest to this, especially if the elementary school program is born out of a series of choice or magnet school activities, where parental preference and interest and support must be thoroughly considered and actively sought.

**Certification and core faculty.** While licensure is a regulatory matter that state officers in an

education department provide answers to, it is nevertheless important that those who embark on an immersion journey consider the array of concerns that may befall them in this area of identifying staff and having their educational attainments recognized. It can be argued that despite the assertion that immersion programs can cost less than sequential FLES programs, for example, there are hidden costs that become all too visible to the administrator. (And these may well contribute to the low percentage of immersion programs nationally.) Planners must be aware of the type of programmatic needs that immersion imposes from the linguistic standpoint. It is this author's belief that near-native and native speakers with extensive background experience in childhood learning and the culture of the second language make formidable and successful teachers. Finding them is also a formidable task not to be taken lightly at the "last moment." Issues of alternative certification, course work of the pre-service period for the language major, and emergency certification, not to mention the entire issue of visas for foreign nationals, will continue, and implicitly and explicitly play a role in determining the growth of immersion (where "imported" native speakers are demonstrably important as well as a desirable co-component of an otherwise American-born and raised teacher corps). To not contemplate and resolve the issues of staff recruitment for the immersion school is to condemn the program to an untimely end.

**Developmentally appropriate.** As plans are made for immersion, staff members' roles on planning committees assume a vibrant hue: it is incumbent upon the group that curricular activities and learning/teacher strategies and styles be understood as a function of the child's physical/motor and cognitive development. If, for example, a physical education motor unit on tennis is taught in the target language, the essentials of how a 6-year old holds a racquet must be established before another *basic*, footwork on the tennis courts, can be taught. Manipulatives of large sizes exist at the primary level for good reason. Language teachers from the middle and senior high level who are called in as the language experts for their planning team must acknowledge their pedagogical and experiential limitations in terms of what children at the K-5 level can be expected to do, and not presume that a transfer of their language knowledge to other domains is possible or even commendable.

**Evaluation.** Different governing bodies have, in accordance with our culture's interest in measurement, trends, surveys, and percentiles, have long-established policies regarding evaluation and its partner, testing (which should not be mixed together). Planners must establish their goals and objectives and timelines, and willingly submit to group or sub-group review to evaluate if the stated goals are being met. Infusions of funds for start-up programs are limited, that we know. How well the human and material resources are utilized should be the responsibility of all planners. Additionally, the matter of testing is a serious concern for immersion program planners. Our informal survey among immersion school administrators has shown that many immersion students are not exempted from standardized testing programs at the elementary school level. The confusion that results from having mixed language signals is apparent here, and does impair program effectiveness, parent support, and administrative implementation. If a child in a total immersion program is administered a standardized test in English, how valid are those results for even longitudinal record-keepers? How does the child react to taking a test or a battery of tests that he/she *knows* that they are incapable of understanding? How important is

test-taking in and of itself? How do negative experiences color one's acceptance of testing as one more aspect of our educational life? Parents will exert pressure on schools and planners from multiple perspectives if an immersion program is being developed. On the one hand, they justifiably want assurances that their children will be able to function effectively in English. They will not accept the proposition that scores of an immersion school being published simultaneously with scores of non-immersion students are not for comparative purposes. They will accept, if the trust and sense of community are there, the relative *newness* of the program and the data gathered from both Canadian and American immersion programs that document that the immersion students eventually perform at least as well on standardized tests, if not better than their non-immersion peers), and not worry about each year's group of test scores. (Some advocate for the deferral of annual major standardized test-taking procedures for all children until after they have developmentally assimilated the early elementary school curriculum.) Much has to be done at the local level to ensure a compromise position on a matter whose resolution may be some time in coming--if ever.

**FLES/FLEX/immersion.** While professionals discuss *which program is best*, or *which program offers more*, planners will need to recommend the model which can be funded and established with the resources available or expected. Regardless of the outcome, whether the shortage of trained immersion staff forces a decision to establish a FLES program or a FLEX model, planners should ensure that standards of success are established, including among these a successful model of articulation with middle school (and high school) language offerings.

**Gown and town.** As with certification, in those areas where post-secondary institutions are located, the school family must include decision-makers who are outside the normal planning loop. Academic interest in the program from colleagues at the college level may need to be cultivated. Quite often, faculty from university language departments may have had little or no experience in immersion, and/or little experience in bottoms-up planning, for language programs and articulation. As has been generally noted, we affirm the notion that viewing one's colleagues with suspicion—a two-way street, that—hampers the development of sound language programs. Instead, we recommend that “Town” (a.k.a. the K-12 school) and “Gown” respond to the common needs of language learners. Goals of K-5/6 programs are different than those of the college students' classroom, to be sure. Maturity and other factors cannot simply be erased and used as judgmental arguments for or against any planned program. As the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and other professional organizations continue to concern their constituents—the professional educator—with standards and priorities, unity of purpose can surely be achieved. It will be each individual's responsibility to ensure that locally the time line for unity of purpose is shortened.

**Homework.** In addition to this heading signifying the commonly-held view of paper and pencil activities from the classroom reviewed at home (as well as cassette or videotape or computer-driven activities), planners must assist parents with the opportunity to enroll in course work of formal/informal types so that they become involved in their children's newly-acquired second language skill. Not every parent will have the ability to take advantage of the program; not every teacher in the school, for example, will enroll. That a course be offered, with serious

undertaking and support from planners and administrators, will send a signal that the program is not considered a frill. Parents and teachers in such classrooms will understand not only some aspects of the language the children are learning, but will also have the opportunity to reflect on the cultural and social openness they must model for their children as our country continues to undergo great demographic changes in urban, suburban, and rural settings in the coming decades.

**Immersion as a concept of the imagination.** There is more to this one topic than a few sentences can even hope to cover. Supporters of immersion and teachers must be conversant with a variety of needs and phrases, from *content-based* language to *motherese*. Actual site visits to immersion programs are obligatory for planners and implementers, not once but more than once, to profit from the perspectives of others who have worked to sustain a quality program. Planners and others are referred to bibliographies, and to read and think, think, think. Immersion programs' wealth of contributions to the future of our citizenry has yet to be tapped, even today!

**Justification.** In discussions on program rationale, planners must review the reasons why they expect the model they have decided upon to be successful. They must also be articulate in the area of justifying the need for second language programs. Schools and committees should therefore assemble an *album* of articles on the benefits of second language learning, and develop the necessary *brochure* to sell the concept, and ultimately, immersion (see Ballyhoo.) Truth in advertising will help: studies by Thomas Cooper (1987, MLJ; 2008, FLA) and Patricia Davis-Wiley (The University of Tennessee) demonstrate the importance of learning another language for its contribution to overall academic achievement.

**Kindergarten.** Again, planners must begin activities at the earliest levels; issues of attrition--the mobile American--and teacher availability, as well as the importance of the wonderfully innocent world of childhood classes and affection that Kindergarten classrooms should have, mandate that immersion begin as early as possible, with organizational and time structures in place to benefit the stakeholders.

**Language.** Under this heading, planners must understand the importance of staffing requirements in order to achieve the model of authentic language acquisition that they have decided upon. They must also encourage the continuing dialogue among one another and other representatives of the school and community whose children are to be enrolled in the program. Teacher preparation falls under the rubric of serving children's needs, and is a connecting point between planning dialogue and staffing requirements. As pointed out in *Gown and Town*, there is an expectation that staff members will be more than perfunctorily skilled at enhancing a child's language. Academic discourse is not appropriate; the *Nacherzählung*, for example, or the discussion about a literary or cultural topic that serves as a vehicle for the German language major in a college classroom, will not assist the beginning immersion teacher in conducting classroom activities that focus upon a graphing activity. If, therefore, the pre-service program of the immersion specialist lacked the adequate information, then it is the responsibility of the in-service program to ensure that funding and resources exist to promote the success-

ful activities desired by affording the instructor opportunities for continuing education and professional growth.

**Management.** From a macro-perspective, developers should understand the commitment that needs to be made to immersion. There will be attrition among students, as previously pointed out, for example. The consequence of shrinking class numbers is that the attrition must be *swallowed*. Adding children into a closed system at the inappropriate juncture limits the *purity* of the program's language acquisition goals as surely as it detracts from the child's academic and linguistic success. Immersion programs probably provide the greatest *hidden cost* in terms of administrative responsiveness and adjustment. Inasmuch as foreign national or resident alien staff are not so plentiful as desired, a new factor in human resource management, the Visa and Immigration Office, may have to be developed. Recruitment travel to other nations, establishment of various connections to others across the ocean and our national borders, and the involvement of state offices of teacher licensure—all become integral to planning and financing. A sub-set of this issue is the need to acculturate the new teacher from abroad to the American education system (yet again a management consideration/cost). Ultimately, the notion of *business as usual* takes a back seat to a reality that is at times difficult to achieve in the centralized environment that people and finance issues continue to be. Flexibility in thinking and problem-solving are important in order for the immersion program to flourish. *Minor* matters, such as classroom management and building administrator influence on the program, take on the *micro* perspective.

**Natural language.** Planners who operate from the premise that teachers talk and students quietly sit and listen will lead others naive enough to follow to an untimely (programmatically) end. If there are no team members who have experienced first-hand a lower elementary classroom, site visits and debriefing sessions are mandatory. Only then will decision-makers understand the need for funding needed programs to provide in-service activities for staff who must use parenting language, repetition, paraphrase, body-language, facial expressions, game songs, and other first-language techniques to fill the classroom air with *learnable language*.

**Open door policy.** Part of the team planning effort is the shared empowerment of that group. While we note that often “things” get better at schools--apparently--with time (i.e., stability), it is the dialogue of sincere criticism and evaluation that is a necessity. All have to insist that their time be available to direct service providers (teachers, aides, paraprofessionals) in order to facilitate change. Stability of the program evolves, certainly, but must not be confused with an academic *rigor mortis*.

**Planning.** The essence of a successful program is that time is taken to think about what is to come, what has come, and why. Be they *Five Easy Pieces* for the professional development of teachers (García, 1991), or daily lesson-planning duties, immersion team members must commit to continued review of their work. Self-review and paired or shared empowerment based upon the various cooperative strategies frequently mentioned in education circles, do not diminish the vision that has been decided upon. Rather, it serves as a device for fulfilling the dream planners have. Various planning activities, such as grade-level involvement of the immersion



teacher with her or his English-language counterpart, programs of report card grading by the immersion teachers and their English colleagues, and building-level committee work, are important factors in the successful school environment.

**Quest.** Know the goals, know what one needs to have ready by what date, be articulate in the exposition of the plan under development, and know that any quest will run at right angles to the quest of some other group! Planning for the quest means understanding the process of change, and taking the time to understand what the change in the elementary school day means for others who are presently teaching and working in the building. An immersion program will probably mean that some teacher transfers (involuntary and voluntary) will take place. That quest could dismember the friendship and cooperation of two kindergarten teachers that mandates one immersion class and one English class. Similarly, the FLES teacher who is given a classroom rather than a cart may displace an activities area or program that was formerly popular and fought-for. If the planners' quest does not take the human element into account, several negative consequences will result that inevitably damage language program effectiveness.

**Research.** Reading is fun, we tell our children. Reading research is rewarding, especially prior to and during the planning period. Research is powerful, and contributes to the group's ease that it is not alone. Using the results of what is learned is an important step in the process. Contacts with others *who have been there*, their visits to your site, and your writing to them--all these and more--are contributions you make to establishing a well thought-out program.

**Stability.** Staff permanence, continued administrative support, parent cooperation--all are hallmarks of successful immersion programming. Added to the list may be a variety of local resources, including the development of appropriate materials for teachers to utilize. Again, as statistics and trends demonstrate, the extent to which children at risk exist in our society means that we must accept the reality that the schools of today and tomorrow, and the responsibilities that they must assume, are different from the classrooms and responsibilities of yesterday.

**Techniques for learning about immersion.** From the planners' perspective, the notion of *this has never been done before* must give way to *what can we learn from others who have done this?* Several excellent studies, videotapes, and internet resources exist to assist in sustaining a quality immersion program. Again, research is fun and enlightening!

**Unanimity (for infusion).** Immersion and other elementary school language programs cannot exist in environments that do not respect the multicultural reality of our nation. If the planning team expects children to acquire a second language, the role models—Adults—must be found throughout the school. Classes for adults have already been mentioned; visual impact (signs, displays, performances) is important. Celebration, however, is not enough! Celebration must occur. What aspects of the curriculum can be used to support the language program is a question that must be asked at the same time that the question is raised, "What does the language program do to support the entire school program?" If measurement in mathematics is a topic, then perhaps the study of pyramids in Mexico is in order. If healthy foods and *basic food*

*groups* are considered, then those foods that comprise family staples in Cuba or Belgium might be reviewed. Unanimity of purpose means, therefore, that the individual language teachers become a cooperative collaborative of ideas and seeker of insights from others. Shared planning must continue to underline the essential feature of immersion to underscore the nature of future immersion success, and, to the extent that the immersion program chosen changes the school in question, that school must reflect its new reality.

**Vendors.** Planning teams that make site visits will quickly find out how important self-made materials are for a sound immersion program (and what the consequent budgetary needs will be). Visitors will return from other programs knowing names of vendors who can provide suitable immersion materials for the classroom and the library. Spanish immersion programs, for example, have greater access to items than do French and German immersion programs; the large investment by American publishers in parallel Spanish-language materials for native speakers comes to mind, although these texts are usually one to two grades “ahead” of the immersion student. Identifying vendors from other nations means that a planning team would do well to establish the necessary relationships and policies that govern the activities of a centralized purchasing division. The substructures that need to be in place include time and personnel devoted to contacting supplies (often in another language), understanding issues of customs, billing and payment activities, and, not least, the understanding of others’ vacation periods. (No, it is not a good idea to order materials from Europe in late July for an early September delivery: August is a vacation month.)

**Warnings.** If these few paragraphs make you feel confident, start worrying! Your work has only just begun. Exercises in thinking of emergencies happening at the same time and how you and your team would respond to the potentially volatile situation should be part of strategic planning meetings.

**Xerox.** Almost a generic term like Kleenex, let *X* stand for equipment needs. Copying equipment, desktop publishing machinery, “smart boards,” etc., are necessary hardware support items and technologies for all.

**Yield.** Don’t expect an early harvest. The labors of immersion are arduous and lengthy. Expect the program to bear fruit after five to seven years. Ensure that stakeholders continue to toil daily to see their fields become academically bounteous.

**Zest and zeal.** If *walking on water* is a characteristic we often dream that immersion people have, the *wind beneath the wings* must also be supported by those who have previously demonstrated the *Z’s* (as opposed to the *Zzzzz*)! Zip, Zest, Zeal, and Zeroing in on the activity tasks are essential planning and developing the model program. Long meetings, summer work, 9-day weeks and 14-month years do tend to burn one out. But their half-life is lengthened by the support group members who are simultaneously sharing their wind-making and foot-floating devices.

These recommendations provide program developers more than a simple overview or intro-

ductory commentary that helps them to anticipate and thus manage the challenges of implementing immersion better, because they are basic to the modest but distinguished growth pattern already achieved by immersion in the primary grades. These same admonitions, though frequently couched in terms of K-5 restructuring, enhance their applicability for Grades 6-12 as next we review the complementary matters of recent U.S. immersion history and the viability of continuing immersion program in the secondary school. Their validity for future programs is further manifested in a brief investigation of immersion's numerical realities in recent years.

### **Continuing Immersion at the Middle/Senior High School Level**

Planners do well to remember consider that it was the last generation of immersion advocates who witnessed the rebirth of language study—and immersion—at the elementary school level. The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), in its *History of Immersion Program Development* (2006), confirms that the previous decade, the 1990s, bred unparalleled growth for immersion in this nation. Languages offered ranged from Spanish or Mandarin to Hawaiian or French, and more. Lamentably, however, that expansion has not continued.

Instead, we have seen in this first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century the simultaneous appearance of three phenomena: modest growth of immersion programs in some areas; a contraction of offerings in others; and, last, the consciously-planned or perhaps *de facto* confinement of immersion to the elementary school classroom. Language immersion, we conclude, has not fared well in the secondary school. Evidence supports this dismaying conclusion. From 1987, when, arguably, one might date the resurgence of elementary school language programs, to the present, our American secondary immersion programs are weak numerically and geographically. Thus, they are rendered pragmatically insufficient to aid in the growth of immersion. The data that CAL compiled include some surprising information. They tell us that not every immersion child is afforded the opportunity of a continuing immersion experience—the numbers and locales simply do not match up. Most K-5 immersion students cannot continue their language and academic schooling through immersion at the middle or senior high school level. The numbers and locations tell the story without unnecessary comment:

- There are 181 K-5 programs listed across 32 states and the District of Columbia;
- There are 89 middle school entries for 25 states;
- There are 37 high school immersion sites in 14 states.

Such numbers do not make much of a case for educational excellence and academic achievement through immersion (“If immersion is so good, why aren’t there more programs?”), or substantiate the claim of future *national security concerns* as grounds for creating and extending immersion programs (“How do we justify creating long-goal programs for very infrequently taught languages from the tectonically shifting geopolitical landscape when we need immediate results?” Any and every call for a resurgence of immersion in the next decade cannot prevail under such conditions. If such implementation issues persist locally, as presumably the CAL statistics tell us, they ultimately militate against a *seamless* K-12 immersion model becoming the rule rather than the exception. Currently, that is, we provide neither the requisite quantity

nor variety of successful immersion models for supporters and public entities to emulate. Nor can we focus much-needed media and cultural attention on our extant, wonderful programs to promote immersion's growth as a significant part of America's future educational palette. The pleasing vision of immersion as a ubiquitous (national) school offering falters when it fails to take root locally. If we cannot and do not establish sustained immersion programs in the near term, then the vision we contemplate for immersion remains but an unfulfilled reverie.

Rather than grieve over low student numbers or the paucity of immersion classes in our nation, however, we suggest instead a possible remedy to our numerically undernourished condition: planning. Again. While our statistical dilemma is indeed related to those perennial *natural* and perennially mutable variables of student attrition, parent/student disaffection with immersion, family mobility, a lack of executive-level support, and available faculty, it is that circumstance of *nurture*—planning for growth—that in the long term will prove to be the vital factor for successful future immersion endeavors. Consequently, we now offer ten considerations for the middle/senior high school planner. The centrality emphasized in this final section is not of the nature of things that happen, but rather on the nurturing of making good and smart things happen for immersion children and their families.

Be the continuing immersion offerings part of a K-8 site or a *stand-alone* or immersion-only middle school building, or (as is most frequent) a school within a school, stakeholders need time in order to succeed. Time to prepare for continuing immersion is *the* fundamental characteristic of our suggestions. Task completion, timelines, and start-up discussions must commence as soon as possible--within 2 or 3 months--after the first class of Kindergartners begins immersion. Time and its ideological sibling, change agency, are our principal recommendations. They come even before challenges of pedagogical substance. One example is illustrative. If the continuing immersion site is that of a school or a "team" within a school, then planners must focus on getting middle school faculty and staff ready for the changes in the building, "their" building, which immersion makes inevitable. These will range from signage or even school name-change, to room assignments, to the matter of involuntary transfer of faculty, and finally to a bilingual school setting that will have evolved to that point where the immersion language and English share primacy of place.

Any planning outline that is conceived for continuing immersion at the middle level rests appropriate timelines and adaptability to change, therefore. And any attempt to enumerate the (frankly) innumerable tasks that comprise establishing a continuing immersion program must contain the *caveat* that our suggestions, despite the well of experiences they draw from, cannot possibly consider all local conditions and intricacies that either exist or will come to be. For that reason, the following reflections are given in summary fashion, with the proviso that they must be considered user-mutable and user-adaptable for them to be effective as a global primer for deliberative local work.

**Planning.** There is never enough time to begin planning for the continuing immersion middle school program. Committees should begin thinking about Kindergarten students' future five years prior to the middle school. The list of challenges, from *alternative language/content courses* to International Baccalaureate and changing attitudes, can be addressed by proper time

commitments on the part of stakeholders.

**Staffing/staff development.** First, continuing immersion program must consider changes in immersion interest based on student attitudes. Which content-area programs need to be selected (or deleted)? How many hours per day will be defined as *immersion subjects*? Teacher training activities, and even bringing in the staff “earlier” than the middle school year--so as to get to know students, are all questions in need of resolution. Ongoing staff development for both foreign national teachers and their U.S. counterparts must cover the alphabet soup, from *student attrition* to *zones of adolescent indifference*.

**Articulation.** This complexity--for there must external as well as internal articulation, can make adults weep. We cannot have a continuing program that does not challenge students in an age-appropriate manner. Take the example of student travel, a function of internal articulation: the students who get to go on a 5th-grade trip to France, for instance, will have little interest and fund-raising willingness to make preparations for a 7th grade trip to a local area program that is “merely” Francophone in flavor. (The song, “...after they’ve seen Patee,” comes to mind.) External articulation suggests that the immersion program work towards student advancement on standardized tests, such as those relevant to No Child Left Behind. In brief, articulation can stop the progress of the continuing program, period.

**Advocacy.** Among the pantheon of deities for foreign languages since the 1970s, there must be special abeyance paid to its staunch supporters and advocates. There must also be a special devotional niche for that network of *immersionists*, consequently, be they teachers or parents or community activists. Their tasks are numerous; they provide middle school adherents a rallying point and a comparative measure, for they start in some locales before their children begin Kindergarten. We who are the educators must continue to work in tandem with a team of people who often do not take *no* for an answer, but insist on *yes*, even in matters of staffing. (And yes, sometimes the advocates can be wrong, too, as can educators.)

**Equity.** Some immersion programs began as part of a larger focus, such as magnet schools created for the purpose of desegregation. It is this writer’s opinion that public school districts and charter groups do not “enable” others to see their program as some kind of deficit education event, especially if the continuing immersion program in the middle school is a two-way Spanish program into which newcomers--the children of immigrants--are placed. There are so many aspects of middle school that can appear discriminatory, such as who gets to be a singer in choir class because of scheduling, and who does not because of immersion. Advocates must consider the demographic make-up of the school, the community, and the classes, and thus ensure that there is no de facto tracking system, whereby the monolinguals are *privileged*, and the *bilinguals* are cordoned off by dint of being bilingual.

**Finances.** Continuing immersion costs money. Beyond that, it connects to matters of equity. The library, for instance, has to make available its funds for the appropriate and necessary books and journals and magazines that the immersion reader may be interested in or may have need to refer to for a student essay. Those trips to another country (Mexico, Germany) cost

money, and often, parents have modest means and cannot pay 100% of the journey. The committee members of the middle school immersion must be aware of the special needs that the immersion enterprise sees as fundamental. Establishing a grants or aid foundation is obligatory.

**Curriculum development.** Funding is also needed so that teachers on site can adapt appropriate materials for their students. One issue is indeed connected to the others, that is. The teaching staff should be paid a fair sum for the creation of materials that relate to the immersion program. Science experiments in Spanish that follow a district's curriculum, for instance, do not always exist in textbooks purchased abroad. Continual revision of language and content goals is important for staff to assist students in their achievement.

**Assessment.** Here we see the connection issue--to finances (purchase/adaptation of materials) and to articulation. Are the course goals in sync with those of the school in that content area? How do we measure language achievement for immersion youngsters at the middle school? How do we place them in Grade 9, when they enter the high school? Do they have the language skills of an OPI *advanced* level speaker, for example, whereby their discourse can offer other speakers an opportunity to hear the students' growing knowledge of subject matter as well as every-day activities?

**Scheduling.** Middle school immersion students want to enjoy the *togetherness* aspect of different *group classes*, and so the scheduling managers and the parent advocates have to recognize the prospect of putting favorite classes at different times of the day. This is not always easy, and is frequently impossible. Among the big *no-no* aspects: one, immersion is not an *exploratory* or *on the wheel* activity. Two, immersion and band/choir should not conflict. Three, is anyone "tired" of math in German? Is it time for *art* in German? Again, adults will recognize the limits of the possible and not expect the impractical.

**Classroom materials.** Students are more than the sum of the worksheets that they accomplish. If curriculum developers present the funds necessary for materials, then the department for immersion can select appropriate textual materials, if they exist, or create/adapt those that suit their curriculum. Continuing immersion students should be challenged by the availabilities that technology makes possible, and not be left without resorts in this area.

## Discussion

The above reflections derive from years of presentations, conversations, essays, and personal experiences as an immersion planner and practitioner, and (for 5 years) as an immersion charter school board member interacting with parents, fellow board members, teachers, colleagues, and community supporters. They do not pretend to be exhaustive; they seek to support planners of today to help construct the immersion bridges to tomorrow.

## References

Center for Applied Linguistics. (2006). *Directory of foreign language immersion programs in U.S. schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/resources/immersion/>

- García, P. A. (1991). Allegro sostenuto: A baker's dozen of concerns for the FLES\* administrator. In G. Lipton (Ed.), *National FLES\* Commission Report*, (pp. 92-101). Urbana: AATF.
- García, P. A. (1998). On implementing an elementary school language program: Reflections & considerations. In M. Met (Ed.), *Critical issues in early second language learning*, (pp. 213-248). Chicago: Addison-Wesley.
- García, P. A. (1998). A delicate balance: Continuing immersion in U.S. middle and high Schools. In C. Klee, D.T. Tedick, & E. Tarone. (Eds.), *Research and practice in immersion Education* (pp. 45-50). (CARLA Working Paper Series #10). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- García, P. A. (1998). Allegro sostenuto: Concerns for the FLES\* administrator. In G. Lipton (Ed.), *A celebration of FLES\*: Sequential FLES, FLEX, and immersion* (pp. 29-44). Lincolnwood: NTC.
- García, P. A., E. B. Lorenz, & Robison, R. E. (1995). Reflections on implementing middle school immersion programs: Issues, strategies and research. In R. Donato & R. M. Terry (Eds.), *Foreign language learning: The journey of a lifetime* (pp. 29-44). Lincolnwood: NTC.
- National Center for Education Statistics. The author has purposely not disclosed the specific municipality or state, but refers the reader instead to funding and state assessment information found in related pages from NCES, such as <http://nces.ed.gov/quicktables/index.asp>. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/>

### **Recommended Bibliography**

- Barr-Harrison, P. (Winter, 2000/2001). High school immersion in the United States: A research study. *ERIC/CLL Newsbulletin*, 23(2), 1-2.
- Bernhardt, E. B. (Ed.) (1992). *Life in language immersion classrooms*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.
- Bernhardt, E. B., & Schrier, L. (1992). The development of immersion teachers. In E. B. Bernhardt (Ed.), *Life in Language Immersion Classrooms* (113-131). Philadelphia, PA: Multilingual Matters.
- Caldas, S., & Boudreaux, N. (1999). Poverty, race, and foreign language immersion: Predictors of math and English language arts performance. *Learning Languages*, 5(1), 4-15.
- Cantoni-Harvey, G. (1987). *Content-area language instruction: Approaches and strategies*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Cummins, J. (2000). Immersion education for the millennium: What we have learned from 30 years of research on second language immersion. Retrieved from <http://www.iteachilearn.com/cummins/immersion2000.html>
- Day, E., & Shapson, S. (1996). A national survey: French immersion teachers' preparation and their professional development needs. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/ La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 52(2), 248-270.
- de Courcy, M., Warren, J., & Burston, M. (2002). Children from diverse backgrounds in an immersion programme. *Language and Education*, 16(2), 112-127.
- Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- García, P. A. (1990). Adelante! The Spanish immersion program of the Kansas City, Missouri Schools. *Hispania*, 73(4), 1130-1133.
- García, P. A. (Spring, 1991). The Mount Washington Story: German immersion in Kansas City, *Die Unterrichtspraxis*, 14-24.
- Genesee, F. (1985). Second language learning through immersion: A review of U.S. programs. *Review of Educational Research*, 55(4), 541-561.
- Genesee, F. (1991). Second language learning in school settings: Lessons from immersion. In A.G. Reynolds (Ed.), *Bilingualism, multiculturalism, and second language learning* ( pp. 183-202). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Genesee, F. (1994). Integrating language and content: Lessons from immersion. *Educational Practice Report #11*. Santa Cruz, CA: The National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.
- Hakuta, K. (1990). Language and cognition in bilingual children. In A. Padilla, H. Fairchild, & C. Valadez (Eds.), *Bilingual education: Issues and strategies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lyster, R. (1998). Immersion pedagogy and implications for language teaching. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.), *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education* (pp. 64-95). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Met, M. (1987). Twenty questions: The most commonly asked questions about starting an immersion program. *Foreign Language Annals*, 20(4), 311-20.
- Met, M. (1989). Walking on water and other characteristics of effective elementary school foreign language teachers. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22(2), 175-183.



- Met, M. (1991). Learning language through content; Learning content through language. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(4), 281-95.
- Met, M. (1995). Foreign language instruction in middle schools: A new view for the coming century. In R. Donato & R. M. Terry (Eds.), *Foreign language learning: The journey of a lifetime*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.
- Met, M. (1998). Curriculum decision-making in content-based teaching. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.), *Beyond bilingualism: Multilingualism and multilingual education* (pp. 35-63). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Met, M., & Lorenz, E. (1997). Lessons from U.S. immersion programs: Two decades of experience. In R. Johnson & M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion education: International perspectives* (pp. 243-264). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Montgomery County Public Schools. (1989). *What it means to be an immersion teacher*. Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools.
- Rhodes, N. (1998). Assessment instruments for immersion students and programs. In C.A. Klee, A. Lynch, & E. Tarone (Eds.), *Research and practice in immersion education: Looking back and looking ahead*. Selected Conference Proceedings (pp. 117-132). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, CARLA Working Paper Series #10.
- Snow, M. Ann. (1987). *Immersion teacher handbook*. Center for Language Education and Research. Los Angeles: University of California. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291 243)
- Tedick, D., Jorgensen, K., & Geffert, T. (2001). Content-based language instruction: The foundation of language immersion education. *ACIE Newsletter* 4(3), Bridge Insert, 1-8.
- Tedick, D. J. & Walker, C. L. (1994). Second language teacher education: The problems that plague us. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(3), 300-312.
- Walker, C.L. & Tedick, D.J. (2000). The complexity of immersion education: Teachers address the issues. *Modern Language Journal*, 84(1), 5-27.
- Wilburn Robinson, D. (1998). The cognitive, academic, and attitudinal benefits of early language learning. In M. Met (Ed). *Critical issues in early second language learning: Building for our children's future* (pp. 37-43). Reading, MA: Scott Foresman-Addison Wesley.

### Notes

<http://nces.ed.gov/> is the web address of the National Center for Education Statistics. The author has purposely not disclosed the specific locality or state, referring the reader instead to funding and state assessment information found in related pages, such as: <http://nces.ed.gov/quicktables/index.asp>

<sup>2</sup> The demographics of this district currently implementing magnet schools is similar to that of the Kansas City, Missouri, School District, where this writer served for 25 years, first as a teacher and then as Instructional Specialist for Foreign Languages and International Studies. He was responsible for creating ten language immersion sites, K-12, in French, German, and Spanish, during the years 1987-1995, in close collaboration with many teachers and parents and administrators. The district was under a federal court order designed to reduce racial isolation (Jenkins et al. v. State of Missouri). Students of all groups and backgrounds were enrolled in the magnet program, which was one of the few successful themes that helped to reduce racial segregation during that period.

<sup>3</sup> “Reflections on implementing middle school immersion programs: Issues, strategies and research” in R. M. Terry & R. Donato. (1995). *Foreign languages: the journey of a lifetime* (pp.37-74). A recent rereading of the twenty major issues therein discussed--more than pride of co-authorship--merits recommending of this essay for its continued relevance. Contained therein are extended discussions of the ten considerations for a success with a continuing immersion program—and more.

<sup>4</sup> Center for Applied Linguistics. (2006). *Directory of foreign language immersion programs in U.S. schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/resources/immersion/>.

<sup>5</sup> In addition, the reader might refer to the articles by the author, as well as the items listed in the Recommended Bibliography.

## **The Author**

Paul A. García (Ph.D., University of Illinois) has been a teacher of German and Spanish since 1965 in New York, Illinois, Ohio, Kansas, and Missouri. After teaching 33 years as a K-12 teacher, he retired from the K-12 area and subsequently taught World Languages and English as a Second Language methods at the University of Kansas and presently the University of South Florida (Tampa). Dr. García was elected President of ACTFL in 2000.

---

## Developing Language Skills for Success in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Work in Progress at the Center for Applied Linguistics

---

**Dora Johnson, Margaret E. Malone, Joy Kreeft Peyton,  
Ingrid Pufahl, and Nancy Rhodes**  
*Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, DC*

*The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) is one of many groups concerned with developing students' proficiency in languages in addition to English. In this article, CAL staff share highlights from their recent survey on foreign language education in U.S. schools, comparing it to similar surveys conducted by CAL in 1987 and 1997. They also briefly describe other projects underway and guidance and tools they have developed to help promote foreign language learning in schools. Key components of CAL's activities include the development of reliable and valid assessment instruments, the evaluation of language programs, and the conducting of professional development. Through these and other efforts, CAL hopes to build a bridge to the future of achieving a multilingual society.*

For over five decades, the U.S. government and the academic community have consistently reminded us that there is a critical need for proficiency in languages other than English. There is also a general growing awareness that developing advanced language skills is not just an educational challenge, but an important economic, social, and national security issue as well.

Where are we today in making progress toward developing language proficiency among individuals and promoting the teaching and learning of languages in the United States? What processes and tools are in place, and what is needed to support the development of a multilingual society that ensures that we can compete successfully in a global world? How can we mobilize our forces to make advanced language proficiency in the United States a reality? These questions are being asked regularly by government agencies, language and linguistic associations, as well as professionals in K-12 education. The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) is one of the groups concerned about language proficiency in our country.

CAL's history is rooted in addressing multi-faceted issues relating to language and culture, including highlighting the need for language proficiency through improved language teaching and learning. In addition to our own work, we work closely with other champions of foreign language education, such as the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC), the National Heritage Language Resource Center (NHLRC), the National K-12 Foreign Language Resource Center (NFLRC), the National Capital Language Resource Center (NCLRC), the Joint National Committee for Languages (JNCL/NCLIS), and the Interagency Language Roundtable. We collaborate with

schools and districts in highlighting the importance of language learning. CAL's mission, improving communication through better understanding of language and culture, illustrates our commitment to developing this critical capacity through improved teaching and learning.

In this article, we share highlights from our recent survey on foreign language education in U.S. schools, comparing it to similar surveys conducted by CAL in 1987 and 1997. We also describe briefly other projects underway and guidance and tools we have developed to help promote language learning in schools. Key components of our activities include the development of reliable and valid assessment instruments, the evaluation of language programs, and the conducting of professional development. Through these and other efforts, we hope to build a bridge to the future of achieving a multilingual society.

### **National Survey on Foreign Language Education In U.S. Schools**

U.S. policy makers, educators, parents, the business community, and major research organizations and institutions are calling for an education system that equips students with the language and culture skills necessary to become competent world citizens. (See Jackson & Malone, 2009, for discussion.) CAL has responded to this call with a comprehensive survey of K–12 foreign language programs nationwide, describing how our schools are meeting the need for language instruction to prepare global citizens. The survey is based on research that has produced statistical information collected in 1987, 1997, and 2008.

The report of the survey, *Foreign Language Teaching in U.S. Schools: Results of a National Survey* (2009), provides detailed information on current patterns and shifts over the past 20 years in languages and programs offered, enrollment in language programs, curricula and teaching materials, assessments, teacher qualifications and training, and reactions to national reform issues, such as the national foreign language standards and the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation. CAL's survey provides an up-to-date national and regional portrait of K–12 foreign language education as well as information about the impact of previous initiatives while pinpointing areas that need to be addressed in the future. Elementary and secondary schools from a nationally representative sample of more than 5,000 public and private schools completed a questionnaire during the 2007-2008 school year.

### **Key Findings**

The survey results are disappointing to those who recognize the importance of increasing students' language skills. They indicate a serious disconnect between the national call to educate world citizens with high-level language skills and the current state of foreign language instruction in schools across the country. Highlights from the report follow.

#### **Amount of Foreign Language Instruction**

Fewer elementary schools are teaching foreign languages than a decade ago: 25% vs. 31% of all elementary schools. This decline in language teaching has occurred primarily in public ele-

mentary schools; the percentage of private schools teaching languages has remained about the same. The number of middle schools offering languages has also decreased (58% vs. 75%). The number of high schools teaching foreign languages has stayed steady over the past decade (about 91%). There are inequities in access to language instruction at all levels of instruction: rural schools and schools with high numbers of low socioeconomic status students are less likely to offer language classes.

### **Languages of Choice**

Spanish continues to be the most frequently taught language, offered at 88% of elementary schools and 92% of secondary schools with language programs. Traditional favorites, French and German, are offered at fewer schools today than they were a decade ago, while Chinese and Arabic are on the rise (although still taught at few schools).

### **Program and Class Types**

The most common type of public elementary school foreign language program, the exploratory model (offered by 48% of schools with language programs), provides introductory exposure to the language. Language focus programs (in 39% of schools) emphasize listening, speaking, reading, writing, and culture. The immersion model (in 13% of public schools) allows students to attain the highest levels of proficiency. Little change was noted in the percentages of program types over the past decade. At the high school level, more schools are offering Advanced Placement language classes than in previous years (12% in 1987; 16% in 1997; 21% in 2008.)

### **No Child Left Behind (NCLB)**

Nearly one-third of public elementary and secondary schools with language programs report that they have been affected by NCLB legislation, citing mostly negative effects, including an intense focus on tested subjects (mathematics and reading), to the detriment of other subjects, and a shortage of highly qualified language teachers.

### **Program Articulation**

Well-planned articulation of language programs from one level to the next continues to be a challenge on all levels of K–12 education. Fifty percent of elementary schools with language programs report that their students have no continuation of language study when they enter middle school. Thirty four percent of high schools place incoming students who have studied languages previously in language classes that do *not* provide continuity from the previous language study. On the positive side, more high schools than a decade ago place students with prior language experience in advanced classes specifically designed to provide continuity from their previous level.

### **Integration of Standards**

Language teachers report using the national standards for foreign language learning and/or

state standards in their teaching more than a decade ago. Implementation of the goals of the standards has increased from 25% to 76% in public elementary schools and from 31% to 89% in public secondary schools.

### **Use of Foreign Language in the Classroom**

Teachers report that they use the foreign language more in the classroom than they did a decade ago. About one-third (33%) of elementary and secondary schools say that their teachers use the target language more than 75% of the class time. In 1997, only about one-fifth (22%) of secondary schools reported that their teachers use the target language as frequently. (Elementary schools were not asked the question previously.)

Survey trends clearly show that we have been losing ground over the past decade while showing progress in only a few areas. Report recommendations focus on developing more rigorous language programs and include the following: (1) encourage the establishment of new language programs, (2) improve articulation patterns for those schools that already offer languages, (3) offer more intensive language programs, (4) offer programs in the major world languages, and (5) address the major issues highlighted by the survey, including inadequate funding, language teacher shortages, and inequities in access to language instruction.

### **CAL's Professional Development Efforts for Language Teachers**

CAL's activities in professional development for language teachers cover a number of areas. They include teacher training institutes, evaluation activities, the improvement of instruction in the elementary grades, the development of assessment instruments, and the hosting of an electronic discussion list for educators and the general public.

One example of these efforts is CAL's participation in STARTALK, one component of a presidential initiative to enhance the nation's capacity to develop proficiency in critical languages. CAL has served as an advisor on the project since the planning phases in 2006 and collaborates with the National Foreign Language Center, which leads the STARTALK initiative, to evaluate the programs' successes each year. In 2008 and 2009, CAL was awarded a grant to develop and conduct a blended learning professional development course on the assessment of beginning learners of less commonly taught languages. Course participants completed five initial online modules and then came to CAL for a 2-day workshop to plan and reflect on the assessment methods used in their own summer STARTALK programs. CAL followed up with additional online modules, which provide technical support to these programs. CAL is also documenting STARTALK programs that focus on heritage language speakers.

CAL and the National K-12 Foreign Language Resource Center (NFLRC) at Iowa State University have teamed up to help improve and expand the teaching of Chinese in Grades K-5 by establishing an articulated long-sequence language instruction model and conducting research on that model. Project activities include developing a Chinese K-5 conceptual overview, drafting a proficiency-focused and standards-based Chinese curriculum for Grades K-3, mentoring pilot teachers in classroom techniques that reflect best practices, training teachers in the admini-

stration of the Chinese *Student Oral Proficiency Assessment (SOPA)*, collaborating with two schools in the implementation of their Chinese programs, and researching students' language development in those schools (and in two matched control schools) over a 3-year period. Under a grant from U.S. Department of Education International Research and Studies program, CAL is also developing online training materials for assessing children's Chinese language development using the *SOPA*. CAL also maintains the *Nanduti* Web site [www.cal.org/earlylang](http://www.cal.org/earlylang) and *Nanduti* Listserv to provide up-to-date foreign language resources to early language educators and the public at large.

In 2006, the National Academy of Sciences was tasked to review U.S. Department of Education's Fulbright-Hays/Title VI programs and their effectiveness in meeting U.S. needs for international research, study, and foreign language (Committee to Review the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays International Education Programs, 2007). As part of that effort, CAL was commissioned to research and report on the state of oral proficiency assessment with a focus on the oral proficiency interview and promising new approaches in oral proficiency assessment (Malone, 2006). In addition to reviewing the history of the oral proficiency interview in the United States, the report describes controversies over the validity and reliability of the oral proficiency interview as reported in the professional literature. Despite the controversies, however, oral proficiency assessment has consistently gained in popularity during the past 50 years; at present, in addition to the official ACTFL oral proficiency interview, informal measures to determine student oral proficiency abound. However, no comprehensive national study has addressed the actual outcomes of students enrolled in foreign language programs at the K-16 levels since 1967. Based on the research conducted, CAL staff made a number of recommendations to bring national attention to foreign language assessment in the United States, including the following:

**Provide incentives for the assessment of all skills.** At present, there is little, if any, incentive for programs to assess their students' proficiency. If incentives were provided and more programs assessed their students' proficiency regularly, understanding of reasonable expectations and outcomes for student learning would increase.

**Publish the results of language assessments.** In addition to conducting assessments, it is important to share their results. If more programs conducted assessments of their students and published the results, the field would have a better picture of reasonable expectations than it has at present.

**Improve the assessment literacy of instructors.** In a 2006 study of foreign language assessment, ACTFL and CAL found that many foreign language teachers lack an understanding of proficiency levels and aspects of assessment that could improve teaching, learning, and classroom assessment. For example, professional development focused on assessment could help improve foreign language teachers' understanding of and comfort with assessment (Malone, Gallagher, Montee, & Whitcher, 2007).

While the recommendations above are not exhaustive, they provide suggestions for ways to improve knowledge of foreign language teaching and learning in the United States.

## Language Assessment

CAL has developed a variety of tools for rating oral language proficiency and training teachers in using those tools. Because face-to-face courses can cause logistical difficulties for classroom teachers, CAL has developed both online and self-directed instructional materials for language teachers. For example, a moderated online training course on oral proficiency assessment for students learning foreign languages at the secondary, postsecondary, and professional levels, the *Assessment Training OnLine (ATOL)* course [www.cal.org/topics/ta/atol.html](http://www.cal.org/topics/ta/atol.html), uses interactive units to introduce teachers to oral proficiency assessment and gives them hands-on practice in rating the oral proficiency of real student speech samples. This course is recommended for educators considering incorporating CAL's *Simulated Oral Proficiency Interview (SOPI)* [www.cal.org/topics/ta/sopi.html](http://www.cal.org/topics/ta/sopi.html) and *Computerized Oral Proficiency Instrument (COPI)* [www.cal.org/topics/ta/copi.html](http://www.cal.org/topics/ta/copi.html) into their foreign language curriculum and who may be interested in learning more about these assessment tools.

The *COPI* is a technology-based alternative to the *SOPI*. A computer-based, semi-adaptive test of Arabic and Spanish oral proficiency, the *COPI* is intended for upper high school students, college students, and professionals. The *COPI*'s computerized delivery uses up-to-date technology and its semi-adaptive design and self-assessment features allow for efficient testing. The *Multimedia Rater Training Program (MRTP)* is a computer-based professional development tool that teaches language professionals to rate oral proficiency by listening to and learning to rate language samples from the *SOPI*. The interactive program combines the benefits of live rater training workshops with the convenience of CAL's *Self-Instructional Rater Training Kits*. The result is a hands-on introduction to oral proficiency assessment that teaches rating skills conveniently and effectively via CD-ROM. Each version includes a workbook, CD-ROM, and the appropriate language version of the *SOPI*. The Spanish *MRTP* is a companion resource to the *COPI*, described above.

The *SOPA (Student Oral Proficiency Assessment)* and *ELLOPA (Early Language Listening and Oral Proficiency Assessment)* interviews and the *COPE (CAL Oral Proficiency Exam)* [www.cal.org/topics/fl/sopaellopa.html](http://www.cal.org/topics/fl/sopaellopa.html) are CAL's language proficiency assessment instruments designed to allow elementary and middle school students to demonstrate their highest level of performance in oral fluency, grammar, vocabulary, and listening comprehension. CAL offers *SOPA Online Training* [www.cal.org/topics/ta/sopaonline.html](http://www.cal.org/topics/ta/sopaonline.html), along with live workshops, to make these teacher professional development courses more readily available. *Introduction to SOPA* is the online self-paced course that provides a basic orientation to the *SOPA* and teaches participants how to rate students' oral proficiency. The *Moderated Introduction to SOPA* provides all the content of the self-paced introductory course, but includes interactive discussions, advice, and feedback by an experienced *SOPA* trainer. *Rating the SOPA* is a moderated course that provides teachers with language-specific rating practice.

The Foreign Language Assessment Directory (FLAD) [www.cal.org/CALWebDB/FLAD/](http://www.cal.org/CALWebDB/FLAD/) is a free, searchable directory of information on nearly 200 tests in over 90 languages. The FLAD



serves as a starting point for teachers and educators to search for foreign language assessments. Available information about assessments includes grade and proficiency levels, languages for which each test is available, skills targeted by a test, information about the test's development and the publisher's or developer's contact information for further inquiries. A companion tutorial, *Understanding Assessment*, helps educators use the FLAD to choose the most appropriate test for their needs. CAL has also developed a moderated user review for the FLAD, where users can review tests, read comments and learn best practices from other users to inform their decisions about testing programs.

### Resources from CAL

CAL also offers a variety of informative digests--short reports designed to highlight current topics of interest--with many relating to foreign language education and assessment. For example, *Oral Proficiency Assessment: The Use of Technology in Test Development and Rater Training* (Malone, 2007) [www.cal.org/resources/digest/oralprof.html](http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/oralprof.html) describes ways to use technology to improve test development and administration and to improve the training of raters. The digest *Attaining High Levels of Proficiency: Challenges for Foreign Language Education in the United States* (Malone, Rifkin, Christian, & Johnson, 2005) <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/attain.html> investigates the availability and adequacy of teaching methods and tools, information technologies, and testing procedures to help language learners achieve high levels of proficiency, and suggests ways to help develop highly proficient speakers of languages other than English in the United States. Examples of other digests include *Foreign Language Immersion Programs: Features and Trends Over 35 Years* (Lenker & Rhodes, 2007) [www.cal.org/resources/digest/flimmersion.html](http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/flimmersion.html) and *Raising Bilingual Children: Common Parental Concerns and Current Research* (King & Fogle, 2006) [www.cal.org/resources/digest/RaiseBilingChild.html](http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/RaiseBilingChild.html). These digests and others can be downloaded free of charge from the CAL Web site.

Providing information for the general public has also been a focus of CAL's efforts from its earliest years. Informational brochures, which can be downloaded free from our Web site, highlight the importance of language learning and provide information and insights for those interested in advocating for language education in schools and communities. For example, *Working Together to Build a Multilingual Society* offers tips for parents, teachers, school administrators, and policymakers to help establish or improve a multilingual environment in homes and schools ([www.cal.org/resources/pubs/multilingual\\_brochure.pdf](http://www.cal.org/resources/pubs/multilingual_brochure.pdf)). Doing so not only addresses American security and economic needs, but also creates opportunities for Americans, both at home and abroad. *Why, How, and When Should my Child Learn a Second Language?* [www.cal.org/resources/pubs/whyhowwhen\\_brochure.pdf](http://www.cal.org/resources/pubs/whyhowwhen_brochure.pdf) helps parents and schools become aware of the benefits of helping children learn a second language at an early age. It can be used with school boards, parents, and school and district staff to advocate for new or improved early foreign language programs. *Why Start and Maintain an SNS Program?* ([www.cal.org/resources/pubs/sns\\_brochure.pdf](http://www.cal.org/resources/pubs/sns_brochure.pdf)) can be used to advocate for a Spanish for Native Speakers program in a school or district, start one, or improve one already in place. The brochure can be used with school board members, school and district administrators, Spanish teachers, and parents of

Spanish-speaking students.

### **Heritage Languages in the United States: Preserving a National Resource**

Another key component to filling the need for language proficiency in the United States is the maintenance and development of heritage languages, the languages other than English that are spoken in homes and communities across the country. Many students come to school speaking one or more languages other than English. This proficiency can be developed rather than replaced by English (the goal is that students' English will develop along with the development of their heritage languages, with the ultimate goal of developing bilingual individuals). One effort to support heritage language development is the Alliance for the Advancement of Heritage Languages (Alliance), which was formed to promote the conservation and development of the heritage language resources of this country. The Alliance, with CAL providing a leadership role, fosters community among professionals working in heritage language education and research by providing information, resources, and opportunities for collaboration. The work of the Alliance includes partnerships and projects with heritage language associations and the National Foreign Language Center.

The Alliance is collecting profiles of heritage language programs across the United States and making them available in a searchable online database. Heritage language programs in community-based and K-12 settings can use this database to form a network to exchange ideas and resources with one another. CAL has also created the Heritage Voices Collection [www.cal.org/heritage/research/voices.html](http://www.cal.org/heritage/research/voices.html), which spotlights heritage language programs and highlights languages from the perspective of heritage language speakers.

### **Building a Bridge to the Future**

Countries around the world are implementing effective language programs designed to make their students multilingual citizens of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, able to take their place on the world stage. The United States is at a watershed moment, facing a decision point as to whether to prepare its students with the languages skills necessary to participate effectively in a global society. As Gene R. Carter, Executive Director of ASCD (formerly the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development), states, "At stake is whether an entire generation of learners will fail to make the grade in a global economy." CAL is part of a national effort to help our nation's schools develop high quality language programs so that young people can develop superior language skills, increased cultural sensitivity, and be better prepared to succeed in an increasingly competitive world. Much work remains to be done. Collaboration among a variety of key stakeholders may offer the best hope for making and sustaining meaningful progress to achieve the goal of language proficiency in the U.S.

One example of such successful collaboration is demonstrated by the recent paper written in 2009 by Frederick H. Jackson at the National Foreign Language Center, University of Maryland, and Margaret E. Malone at the Center for Applied Linguistics, *Building the National Language Capacity We Need: Toward a Comprehensive Strategy for a National Language Framework* ([www.cal.org/resources/languageframework.pdf](http://www.cal.org/resources/languageframework.pdf)). As the introduction to the paper argues,

There is a critical national requirement for skilled speakers of languages other than English. The need is not new. It has been recognized and documented for more than fifty years in reports of high-level commissions, published analytical studies, and testimony by government and private figures before both houses of Congress, reports in national and local news media, and in a major presidential initiative. As a result of 21st century economic globalization and international terrorism, it has never been more urgent to develop American citizens who fully understand and can communicate effectively with people of other cultures. Although several steps are being taken to begin to address this need, they are isolated and lack central coordination and accountability; to meet the need requires a comprehensive long-term national strategy.

The paper recommends the necessary components of such a strategy and can be downloaded for free from CAL's Web site.

In summary, as we build a bridge to the future, CAL is committed to working toward a society where communication on all levels is improved through a better understand of language and culture and where the benefits of multiple languages are recognized and valued. As evidenced by the research, services, and resources described in this article, CAL seeks to generate knowledge to improve the teaching, learning, and assessment of languages and to provide resources to support that aim.

### References

- Committee to Review the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays International Education Programs. (2007). *International education and foreign languages: Keys to securing America's future*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from [www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record\\_id=11841](http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11841)
- Jackson, F.H., & Malone, M. E. (2009). *Building the foreign language capacity we need: Toward a comprehensive strategy for a national language framework*. College Park, Maryland: National Foreign Language Center. Retrieved from [www.cal.org/resources/languageframework.pdf](http://www.cal.org/resources/languageframework.pdf)
- King, K., & Fogle, L. (2006). *Raising bilingual children: Common parental concerns and current research*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved from [www.cal.org/resources/digest/RaiseBilingChild.html](http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/RaiseBilingChild.html)
- Lenker, A., & Rhodes, N. C. (2007). *Foreign language immersion programs: Features and trends over 35 years*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved from [www.cal.org/resources/digest/flimmersion.html](http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/flimmersion.html)
- Malone, M.E. (2006) *Oral proficiency approaches to foreign language assessment*. Unpublished manuscript, Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, DC.

- Malone, M. E. (2007). *Oral Proficiency Assessment: The Use of technology in test development and rater Training*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved from [www.cal.org/resources/digest/oralprof.html](http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/oralprof.html)
- Malone, M.E., Gallagher, C.E., Montee, M. J. & Whitcher, M. (2007). *AAPPL survey of assessment uses and needs: Data, analysis, and recommendations*. Unpublished report, Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, DC.
- Malone, M .E., Rifkin, B., Christian, D., & Johnson, D. (2005). *Attaining high levels of proficiency: Challenges for foreign language education in the United States*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. Retrieved from [www.cal.org/resources/digest/attain.html](http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/attain.html)
- Rhodes, N. C., & Pufahl, I. (2009). *Foreign language teaching in U.S. Schools: Results of a national survey*. Washington, DC and Doral, FL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Santillana.

### **The Authors**

Dora Johnson is a Senior Research Associate at the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), where she is a specialist in the teaching of less-commonly-taught languages and coordinates a network of K-12 Arabic teachers.

Margaret E. Malone is Senior Testing Associate at CAL, where she directs projects on technology-mediated tests of oral proficiency and provides professional development on language assessment to teachers.

Joy Kreeft Peyton is Vice President of CAL and serves as a member of the steering committee of the Alliance for the Advancement of Heritage Languages and of the editorial advisory boards of *Language Learning and Technology* and the *Heritage Language Journal*.

Ingrid Pufahl is the Project Coordinator for CAL's national K-12 foreign language survey and also leads CAL's web-based work promoting early language education via the Ñanduti Web site and Ñandu Listserv.

Nancy Rhodes is Director of the Foreign Language Education Division at CAL, where she coordinates work in language education research, teacher education, and curriculum development, with a special focus on the K-12 level.

---

## Information Dynamics for Twenty-First Century Literacy Guides

---

**Robert D. Peckham**

*University of Tennessee at Martin*

*Literacy is a complex continuum, requiring the learner's active contact with information sources and the habit of practice. In spite of its educational status, it is not fully appreciated or supported outside of school. Among the discipline-specific literacies supporting general literacy, examination information literacy underscores why foreign language teachers must all integrate an active knowledge of digital communication technologies into their professional skills. This claim is supported by reliable data about the extent to which digital communications media are integrated into the lives of our students. Educators must be cautious about the extremes in Luddite opposition and a trend-bound "culture of change". Serving specific learning and institutional goals and objectives, media can reduce teacher and textbook centrality and dependency. However, it must step out of its ancillary role to accomplish what is outlined at near the end of this article, which provides a resource appendix leading to major CALL journals and a gold mine of language learning media reviews.*

Walter Ong (1982) wrote that, "if not universal, literacy, necessitating leisure time to acquire and often practiced in closed private session, is considered elitist and somewhat anti-social, whereas orality tends to be open and public, functioning in a more egalitarian way" (p. 92). Indeed, literacy, though fundamental in our programs, carries with it some negative cultural baggage. There is the myth that reading makes you crazy. We have learned mad scientist types from Daedalus to Dr. Strangelove. Then, there is the absent-minded professor, whose obsession with things academic seems to exclude real-life commonplace contexts. Books themselves are often controversial. Every year there are thousands of complaints about books in the collections of public and school libraries. Historically, banned books and book burnings are not uncommon. The underlying social reality behind Ray Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451* is the book that offends.

Negativity aside, I ask that you become *literacy guides* in the context of your role as foreign language teachers, because our discipline is, and has always been, a part of the literacy process. To do this, you need to understand what I mean by literacy, which is fairly traditional. I have no serious issues with most dictionary definitions, saying that literacy is two things: 1) the ability to read and write; one that is adequate for communication, and 2) having adequate knowledge about a subject for communication or for some informed operation in a particular field. These literacies contribute greatly to each other: a subject-specific literacy (i.e., *type 2*) will inform a general one and visa-versa. We are all of us limited in *type 2* literacies because of our basic individuality and the obvious fact that you cannot know everything. UNESCO has drafted this functional definition of the term,

Literacy is the ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, communicate and compute, using printed and written materials associated with varying contexts. Literacy involves a continuum of learning to enable an individual to achieve his or her goals, to develop his or her knowledge and potential, and to participate fully in the wider society.

So, no matter how you look at it, literacy is never a finished product, where the specific feeds the general and visa versa, It should or grow or diminish in proficiencies, depending on use and personal knowledge informing it, and is in itself dynamic.

### ***Type-2 Literacies***

There are light-weight *type-2* literacies, which probably don't deserve much of our time. Nevertheless, some *type-2* literacies seem as indispensable as general literacy. I believe political and economic literacies are essential for citizens of a republic who claim to be proponents of free enterprise and market capitalism. Strong cases can be made for visual and spatial literacy, historical and cultural literacy, scientific and mathematical literacy, geographic and international literacy, because these clearly add more than specific knowledge to our lives, appear to leverage other knowledge and abilities, and represent foundational learning disciplines in our education. Often, they stand as a pre-reading experience and as a frequent component in the horizon of expectations, which render interactive our efforts to make it through the recognition-comprehension continuum. Foreign Languages have difficulty holding a place among literacies, mainly because they are stake holders in many literacies and cannot be held simply within a single *type-2* literacy.

To be information literate, a person must be able to notice when information is needed and have the ability to locate, evaluate, and use the needed information effectively. This, I contend, is where we can rightly claim necessity for a literacy in digital communication technologies. Why? Before the information revolution brought about by these technologies, our abilities to fill information gaps as we discovered them were dependant on our proximity to information centers like large libraries, adequate home libraries or the knowledge, understanding and willingness of human resources accessible to us. At one time, in the library, the analog collections of images and sounds were difficult to access, search and reference. Though there may be multiple exemplars of analog documentary resources, the number of people using each at the same time is generally limited to one. If you are a college student, this means you have to be fast enough to get to the library first after your teacher makes that infamous research assignment; if you cannot, you pray that the first person will not take forever, will not hide the journal issue in the stacks, or worse yet, rip the article pages from the volume.

On the other hand, many can access the same digital document simultaneously from computers on the Internet. These researchers in turn become mobile with laptops and *wifis*. This mobility is enhanced as researchers use the Internet on hand-held devices connected to G3 networks via satellite and cell sites, greater if mobile users saunter down by the riverside with their podcasts on 16 *Gigabite nanos*, and more enhanced if these mobile researchers text or *tweet* about what they read. There can be no question about the obvious dynamics and multi-

directional evolution of our 21st century information delivery system, including devices, networks and applications.

However, there has always been change in information delivery, and there have always been those who felt more than hesitant to move on. Imagine if you will, the objections posed by the each era's Luddites: those who did not want to abandon the multiple-millennia-old technology of the scroll for the easier to handle and much more referenceable codex. Imagine those who refused the exchange hard-to-prepare writing surfaces like parchment or vellum for paper, those who decried the rapid and efficient *pecia* manuscript transcription system begun in 13<sup>th</sup> scriptoria, because it dehumanized the art of book copying. It is not hard to picture Luddites who may have denounced the printing press for cheapening the value of reading by mechanically increasing the availability of reading materials, by gradually substituting vernacular for Latin as the language of the printed word, and by putting the slow and inefficient scribe out of work. It is then highly predictable that there would be critics of digital information and technologies. One of the most famous of these is Kentucky author, Wendell Berry, whose argument is flawed by his passion for agrarianism (Berry, 1987). Opposition in education is complex, but still counterproductive (Levin & Arafeh, 2002). While digital interfaces can imitate most any written document, they can also move away from print and much closer to reality. Computer-adaptive and branching logic environments facilitate a profoundly disturbing decentralization potential, where teacher and textbook are no longer the focal point in learning situations, and digital technology has absorbed a large part of education budgets. Finally, there are still a number of teachers who have computer anxiety.

### **New Technologies and Media Literacies**

Do you remember the old language labs? I have been studying in them or staffing them since 1960, close to their beginnings. But I am talking about the disco-slick mid to late seventies. It is in this analog environment I encountered lab technology at stages where students could not experience anything even close to communication reality, listening to sanitized conversation with no hesitations or errors, manipulating multi-track tape recorders they would never encounter in the world outside, wondering at the recorded student voice they could still hear, because the listening heads were out of line or the cassette was in upside down. I have seen teachers convinced that they had to seize this chance to monitor their students live by plugging their earphones into a monitoring jack in the students' booth or secretly from a state-of-the-art console, which usually gave a very obvious signal to students that they were being monitored. Today, the school language lab experience available to students can be nearly seamless with what they themselves are used to outside the school walls. Indeed, digital information technologies are now not only omnipresent, but also foundational as information sources and as communication facilitators.

In 2004, an American Academy of Pediatrics study noted that, "The average American child grows up in a home with 3 televisions, 2 music CD or audiocassette players, 3 radios, 2 VCRs, 1 video game player, and 1 computer (Etzetel, 2005, p. 19) According to a 2005 study at Ball State University, "... the average American spends more time using media devices: television, radio, iPods and cell phones, computers than any other activity while awake."

I have charted some relevant very recent statistics, from the Pew Internet and American Life Project:

- 93% of teens from 12 to 17 are on line
- 65% of teens have a social networking profile
- 64% online teens are content creators
- 28% online teens have blogs
- 48% of Internet users go to video sites
- 49% of Internet users consult search engines daily
- 70% of Internet users webmail and other cloud-computing services
- 28% of Internet users *infotag* online, having news services send them articles on their choice of topics
- 84% of teens have their own digital media devices
- At least 70% of teens use cell phones daily, and 60% send text messages daily
- 54% of teens use some kind of online messaging service daily
- 62% Americans are mobile through the use of portable wireless digital communication devices. (Rainie, 2009).

Twenty-first century communication and information gathering is dominated by digital media, but how do we know that some benefit may come from using it in education? The corpus of *no significant difference studies*, that is the comprehensive bibliography of hundreds of research reports, summaries and papers that document no significant difference in student outcomes, based on the mode of education delivery (face-to-face at a distance or through media), are together worthy of our active attention for corollary conclusions and action (Russell,2009).

On the opposite end of the scale from the Luddite is another thing we must avoid: That is the psychotically frenzied state known as a *culture of change*, where frantic administrators and faculty, terrified at the pace of change in the world outside, are constantly chasing down the latest gadgets, hoping have them in the classroom, before the bloom is off the rose, and someone says their school has become *a museum*.

I often hear people speak of digital information and communication technology in foreign languages as though it were solely a computer-in-the-classroom issue. While I often bring my computer into our classrooms, all of which have plug-and-play, with high-speed network redundancy, I generally do so to demonstrate how to use applications from a lesson-specific web-based media board. I use less media in class than English, History, Philosophy, Business, Nursing and other colleagues. One of my goals in all of this is to encourage independent learning, independence in learning, autonomous learning. I hope that more and more of the change I want to see in student linguistic behavior will take place outside the classroom, some in those closed private sessions that are demonstrations of literacy. It is perhaps very much in keeping with my situation at work, where we do not have enough teachers to cover all 4 hours of our 4-hour classes, that I have labored to see that our use of technology, directly related to the *nitty gritty* of the course, generally done solo, and tested, effectively replaces one face-time hour of the



public and social classroom. Our lower-division students (at the University of Tennessee, Martin) are all required to attend 2 hours of lab each week.

For language teachers, it is ironic that digital technology's simple binary base can craft within a learning system something as complex as Mandarin's 6000 to 7000 character reformed writing system. But using digital information technology adds so much more. Let us look for a moment at the cross-skill and cross-literacy dynamics made possible through digital information technology. We have all made use of analog audio technology, but it was so complicated. If we wanted to record voices speaking after a model, we did this on special two-track tape recorders and students generally got no feedback unless their teachers listened to them on the same machines. With digital, students can make the same kinds of recordings using the right software, but they can also get some immediate feedback, using speech-recognition graphics, and they can email recordings to their instructors or put them in a digital drop box. There is so much audio and video reception and creation software, such as Real Audio, Windows Media, Quick Time, Camtasia Studio, iVocalize and Talking Communities.

Our department is currently using Wimba voice tools, which, when delivered through Blackboard, make possible online, live discussions between students and teachers, class audio announcements, emailable recordings of students reading aloud, dictations, and threaded voiceboards.

All of the above tools foster a *dynamic cross-literacy*. So, what do I mean by this term? To put it simply, we know that our ability to interpret an image will aid our ability to comprehend a spoken passage related to that image. The same is true for a written passage if we read it aloud, record it, and then look at a related image while we are listening to it again, animating or manipulating graphics, while being read descriptions. We manipulate graphics according to written commands, or produce oral and written commands by manipulating graphics. One feeds or informs the other. My own students work from digital video applications on topics with accompanying vocabulary in the textbooks until they can demonstrate a sufficient progress in the recognition-comprehension continuum. The fact that we work from online digital resources, where students practice on their own schedule, at their own pace, picking from a variety of activities those that seem most appropriate, may be in part responsible for an evolution in their ability to handle multi-skill activities and the increase in speed for accomplishing an end-of-spectrum comprehension for whole language passages.

### **The Globe-Gate Research Center**

The Globe-Gate CALL Research Center page states my views on student use of media outside of class:

Unless language teachers are willing to hand part of the learning load over to students and appropriate media (analog and digital recorded material, courseware, web, TV, radio) several negative things are destined to occur. 1) Students will be more likely to depend on their teachers and a book to learn, and will not become independent learners. 2) The learning

process will not attain its potential efficiency. 3) Everything outside the teacher and the book will become 'ancillary' (=nice little extras). 4) Students will protest the fact that they paid so much for 'ancillaries.' 5) Every native target-language speaker will sound oddly unlike their teacher's model.

When teachers hand part of the learning load over to students and appropriate media, participants in the learning community are blessed in some very positive ways: 1) The media brings learners closer to the reality in which they must eventually immerse themselves...much more real than the teacher and the textbook. 2) It brings not only a variety of native target-language speakers into the mix, but it can also present a visual context filled with learnable gestures and memorable cultural icons. 3) It can insist that each student have good answers for all questions. 4) It can offer learning situations presented in several different ways, thereby accommodating different learning styles. 5) If the media is truly integrated, either by its designers or the manipulation of the instructor (visual, situational, lexical and grammatical links with the rest of the program, part of the homework grade, and on the test), students will not question why they had to pay for it. (Peckham, 2006, ¶ 1, 2)

Here are some general guidelines:

1. The use of digital information and communication technology should never be a goal; it is always *part* of a strategy.
2. Make sure students understand and can execute the procedures you intend for the use of this technology. It should be obvious to students that what they do with this technology is connected to what they do in class and that they are held academically responsible for anything assigned.
3. Take care that material presented using this technology be comprehensible or rendered comprehensible through activities. Students should be shown techniques, which will allow them learning autonomy by using this technology.
4. As in all we do, we should gage what we practice by where students are on the proficiency scale we use, and by the departmental, state and national standards we follow.

### **Concluding Remarks**

In conclusion, we have seen that the dynamic cluster of proficiencies and knowledge, which we often refer to as *literacy*, is a continuum whose effectiveness will wax or wane with the frequency and quality of its use. It is as dependant on communication as it is on the recognition of words, numbers and images; it often carries its own stigmatism because of a presumed elitism.

We have seen that cross literacy situations, made plentifully available through the use of digital communication technologies, can contribute to both kinds of literacy. While digital commu-

nication technologies do not hold any special powers to make us or our foreign language students literate, we recognize that they have become our chief information-bearing and even interactive communication media, and can no longer be labeled *ancillary*. For this reason, educators can no longer allow these tools for literacy to be eclipsed by ideological platitudes of Luddite colleagues, nor can we permit ourselves to enshrine our frenzied pursuit of these constantly changing technologies in the center of our concern. With the constant growth in the processing capacities of chips, as described by Moore's Law, with innovations in photonics driving optical interconnects in chips and wavelength routing, with the imminent advent of the first 4G wireless network, it is obvious that portability is the next standard for digital communications media. Interacting with 3-D characters in a virtual mini-immersion experience is yet another possible kind of mobility. We are also heading for an overwhelmingly international future. Only 29.1% of Internet users were native English speakers in 2008 (Internet World Stats, 2009). Thus, we must learn to deal with the rest of humanity in another way. The adoption of unicode character encoding in computer operating systems is good start (Burston, 2003).

Digital communication will bring us the world. What we *can* do as teachers is make these technologies servants of our goals, and allow ourselves to become reliable literacy guides by exploiting intelligently and methodically their possibilities for the sake of our students.

### References

- Levin, D., & Arafah, S. (2002). The Digital Disconnect: The widening gap between Internet-savvy students and their schools. Retrieved from The Pew Internet & American Life Project, <http://www.pewInternet.org/Reports/2002/The-Digital-Disconnect-The-widening-gap-between-Internetsavvy-students-and-their-schools.aspx>
- Ball State University. (2005). Ball Education Redefined. Retrieved from Ball State University, <http://www.bsu.edu/up/article/0,1370,32363-2914-36658,00.html>
- Berry, W. (1987). Why I am not going to buy a computer. Retrieved from North Glen, <http://home.btconnect.com/tipiglen/berrynot.html>
- Burston, J. (2003). The role of instructional technology in foreign language teaching: State of the art and future directions. *The IALLT Journal of Language Learning Technologies*, 35(2), 17-29.
- Etzel, R. A. (2005). Typical pre-teen TV, video, and computer game time. *AAP Grand Rounds* 13(2), 19.
- Internet World Stats. (2009). Usage and population statistics: Internet world users by language. Retrieved from <http://www.Internetworldstats.com/stats7.htm>
- Ong, W. J. (1982). *Orality & literacy: The Technologizing of the World*. New York: Routledge.

Peckham, D. (2006). Globe-Gate CALL Research Center. The Globe-Gate Project. Retrieved from the University of Tennessee at Martin, [http://globegate.utm.edu/french/globegate\\_mirror/call.html](http://globegate.utm.edu/french/globegate_mirror/call.html)

Rainie, L. (2009). Pew Internet and American Life Project. Retrieved from <http://www.pewInternet.org/>

Russell, T. L.(2009). No Significant Difference Phenomenon. Retrieved from <http://www.nosignificantdifference.org/>

UNESCO Institute for Statistics. Literacy Assessment and Monitoring Programme (LAMP). Retrieved from UNESCO [www.unesco.org/education/efa/global\\_co/.../WGEFA4\\_UIS.ppt](http://www.unesco.org/education/efa/global_co/.../WGEFA4_UIS.ppt)

### **Reference Appendix**

Peckham, R. D. (2009). Computer-assisted language learning research. Retrieved from the University of Tennessee at Martin, <http://www.utm.edu/staff/globeg/callr.html>

### **The Author**

Robert D. Peckham is a Professor of French, co-founder and director of the Globe-Gate Intercultural Web Project at the University of Tennessee at Martin, and former national Vice President of the AATF. He has taught French in 6 states, in public, private and federal government institutions, from middle school through graduate level. (*Editor's note: Dr. Peckham is affectionately known, on a global scale, as Tennessee Bob.*)

---

## **Situating Grammar Instruction in the World Language Classroom: Four Content-Enriched Strategies**

---

**Todd A. Hernández**

Marquette University

*The role of grammar instruction in promoting communicative competence continues to be a controversial issue for the world language classroom teacher. Second language acquisition research suggests that critical to sustained progress in language use is a focus on form, which we define as attention to linguistic form in the context of performing a communicative task. We therefore offer here four content-enriched strategies for situating grammar in a communicative context: textual enhancement, input flood, structured input, and dictogloss. We present these tasks and activities within the framework of the Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (SFLL, 2006) to illustrate how a standards-based approach that integrates form-focused instruction with content increases student achievement in the target language.*

The role of grammar instruction in promoting communicative competence continues to be a controversial issue for the world language (WL) classroom teacher. Traditional grammar instruction, which often consists of an explanation of grammar rules and then manipulative exercises to practice the new structure or structures, remains prevalent in WL textbooks and classrooms (Aski, 2003; Wong & VanPatten, 2003). This is true despite the fact that traditional approaches to grammar instruction do not engage students in communicative and interactive language learning experiences. Second language acquisition research (Doughty & Williams, 1998; Swain, 1995, 1998, 2005) suggests that critical to sustained improvement in language use is a focus on form, which we define as attention to linguistic form in the context of performing a communicative task. Given the importance of integrating attention to form and meaning, I therefore offer here four content-enriched strategies for situating grammar in a communicative context: textual enhancement (TE), input flood (IF), structured input (SI), and dictogloss (DG). These activities are presented within the framework of the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (SFLL, 2006) to demonstrate how a standards-based approach that integrates form-focused instruction with content can increase student achievement, as well as foster motivation and interest in language learning.

### **Textual Enhancement**

TE activities, my first example, attempt to draw second language learners' attention to a specific target structure within a communicative context through the use of textual cues such as bolding and italics. TE is designed to induce students to notice and process specific target forms in the input. The guidelines for implementing TE activities in the WL classroom are:

1. *Choose an appropriate text.* The instructor should choose a text that students will be able to read for comprehension and that provides them with opportunities to notice and process the target form.
2. *Enhance the text.* The instructor should use textual cues such as bolding and italics to draw students' attention to the target form. If the text does not contain sufficient examples of the target structure, the instructor might want to increase the number of instances the form appears to give students more opportunities to notice and process it (Gass, 1997). The instructor might also give students exposure to several texts with the target form.
3. *Focus on meaning and form.* Wong (2005) points out that students must attend to both meaning and form in order for them to make form-meaning connections. Leow (2008) suggests that attention to enhanced forms should be encouraged after students have had opportunities to process a text for meaning. Furthermore, research suggests that TE is most effective when students are presented with explicit instruction in addition to exposure to the target forms (Alanen, 1995; Leow, 2008; Robinson, 1995).

Figure 1 depicts the use of TE with an authentic newspaper article to direct students' attention to third person singular preterite verbs. This task occurs within the context of a standards-based unit on the 2010 World Cup Soccer tournament to be held in South Africa. The integration of the World Cup qualification process as an ongoing thematic unit provides a meaningful context for addressing the *SFLL* as students read, view, discuss, record, and present the results of soccer matches throughout the entire semester (National Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3.2, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2). Students read the text in Figure 1 and then answer the questions in Figure 2 in complete sentences in Spanish.

*Puerto España, Trinidad (AP)-Con un gol de Ricardo Clark, Estados Unidos derrotó el miércoles a domicilio 1-0 a Trinidad y Tobago y quedó a un triunfo más para conseguir su sexto boleto seguido a la Copa Mundial. Clark anotó a los 62 minutos con un soberbio remate desde 30 metros, culminando una combinación de pases de Clint Dempsey y Landon Donovan. Estados Unidos ahora suma 16 puntos en la CONCACAF. Cerrará con una visita a Honduras, el 10 de octubre, y jugará de local ante Costa Rica, cuatro días después en Washington. Trinidad se estancó con cinco puntos y quedó eliminado. Por su parte, México ahora está en segundo lugar con 15 puntos después de derrotar a Honduras. Cuauhtémoc Blanco hizo un penal en el segundo tiempo para dar la victoria de 1-0.*

*Figure 1. Estados Unidos acaricia su pase al Mundial de 2010*

1. Who won the soccer match between the U.S. and Trinidad and Tobago?
2. Where is the U.S. in the CONCACAF standings?
3. Who scored the goal in the U.S versus Trinidad and Tobago match?
4. Where is Trinidad and Tobago in the CONCACAF standings?
5. What is the meaning of *se estancó* in the context of this newspaper article?
6. Where is Mexico in the CONCACAF standings?
7. Who scored the goal in the Mexico versus Honduras match?
8. What are synonyms for *derrotó* and *anotó*?

*Figure 2.* Questions to be answered after reading text in Figure 1.

**Reflection.** After reading the newspaper article on the results of the most recent soccer match between the United States and Trinidad and Tobago, students answer questions which focus their attention on both form and meaning (Standards 1.1, 1.2, 4.1). Student attention is also drawn to form through the highlighting of preterite verb forms. Further activities might require students to read or view the results of other matches and then present this information to the class in the format of a target language television or radio newscast (Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 4.1, 5.1, 5.2).

### **Input Flood**

My second example is IF. As with TE activities, IF attempts to make specific features of target language input more frequent and salient. With IF, the input a learner receives is saturated with numerous examples of the target structure with the expectation that this artificial increase will aid him or her in noticing and then acquiring the form (Wong, 2005). IF can be conducted with both written and oral input. VanPatten and Leiser (2006) argue that one of the advantages of IF is that it is not difficult to implement. The authors maintain that a WL teacher can inundate oral and written texts with adjective agreement, prepositions, reflexive pronouns, verb tenses, discourse markers (de la Fuente, 2009; Hernández, 2008, 2009) and others structures in order to provide learners with increased exposure to target forms. A number of empirical studies have indeed found that IF techniques have a positive impact on language learning outcomes (de la Fuente, 2009; Hernández, 2008, 2009; White, 1998; Williams & Evans, 1998). The results of these studies have suggested, however, that learners benefit most from IF activities that combine brief explicit instruction with exposure to flooded texts. Bardovi-Harlig and Reynolds (1995) recommend the use of focused-noticing activities with IF to further draw learners' attention to form-meaning relationships. Indeed, Hernández (2008) found that explicit instruction

combined with IF was more effective in promoting students' use of discourse markers to narrate a past event than IF alone.

Figures 3 and 4, taken from an intermediate-level Spanish classroom, show how a teacher might combine explicit instruction with IF to draw student attention to the important function of discourse markers in narrating a past event (Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 4.1). A speaker uses discourse markers to sequence and structure ideas and information in paragraph-length discourse in order to produce a cohesive and coherent narration—an important feature of advanced language competence. de la Fuente (2009) and other researchers point out that observational data from third- and fourth-year WL classes indicate that learners often do not incorporate appropriate discourse markers into their speech even after several semesters of exposure to target language input. Because of their lack of salience for language learners, discourse markers are thus an excellent candidate for input-focused practice activities. The activities presented here demonstrate how a WL teacher can connect input- and output-oriented practice through a sequence of communicative tasks that maximize student participation and language acquisition (Standards 1.1, 1.2, 4.1). In Figure 3, students read an e-mail from a friend who recounts for them an amusing incident that happened to a classmate. In Figure 4, students answer questions in Spanish about the e-mail.

*No vas a creer lo que le pasó a mi amiga Olivia el otro día. Primero, llegó tarde a la universidad...más o menos a las 12:45 de la tarde. Al llegar tarde estaba nerviosa porque tenía un examen de historia a la una. Por eso, decidió estacionar su auto en el estacionamiento de la universidad para ahorrar tiempo. Sin embargo, estaba por entrar en el estacionamiento cuando se dio cuenta de que no tenía efectivo. Así que tuvo que ir a un ATM para sacar dinero. Después de sacar el dinero, volvió al estacionamiento donde finalmente pudo pagar. Entonces Olivia estacionó su auto y caminó a clase. Después de tomar el examen, Olivia volvió al estacionamiento para buscar su auto. Pero, al llegar al auto, se dio cuenta de que no tenía las llaves. Se le ocurrió a Olivia que las llaves estaban en el auto. Por lo tanto decidió hablar con la gente de seguridad que trabajaba ahí en el estacionamiento para saber si podía ayudarla. Después de explicar lo que le había pasado, la gente de seguridad ofreció abrirle la puerta del auto para que pudiera sacar las llaves. Sin embargo, mientras el señor estaba abriendo el auto, Olivia descubrió que, al final, no había dejado las llaves en el auto. ¡Las llaves estaban dentro de su mochila! Así que sacó las llaves de su mochila para abrir el auto. ¡Por eso ahora nosotros le decimos “Olivia la olvidadiza!”*

*Figure 3. Olivia la olvidadiza.*



1. What time did Olivia arrive to MU?
2. Why was she nervous?
3. What did she do?
4. Why did she have to go to the ATM?
5. What did Olivia realize when she returned to her car?
6. What did she do?
7. What happened while the employee was opening her car?
8. How did Olivia earn her nickname?

*Figure 4.* Questions to be answered after reading text in Figure 3.

**Reflection.** In Hernández (2009), students responded to questions concerning the content of the reading passage, and were then directed to underline preterite and imperfect verbs and discourse markers in order to encourage noticing and processing of the target forms. Responses to both activities were reviewed with the teacher. Students then performed a series of three information gap activities that provided them with practice in narrating a series of events in the past. The first task required students to exchange information about an unfortunate incident that happened to a friend. Students then exchanged narratives concerning a disastrous spring break vacation in the second task. In the third task, students had to situate a series of events in chronological order. The teacher asked students to direct their attention to the preterite and imperfect, as well as to the appropriate use of discourse markers in narrating the events in each of these information gap activities. Post-task activities required students to report the results of their communicative exchanges to the class, and thus presented the teacher with further opportunities to focus student attention on both the preterite and imperfect and discourse markers within a meaningful context.

### Structured Input Activities

SI activities, the third example, have received much attention as an alternative to traditional grammar instruction. SI activities are a component of processing instruction (PI). PI consists of three aspects: (1) explicit information about the target form; (2) information about input processing strategies; (3) SI activities (Farley, 2005; Lee & VanPatten, 2003). Here we will focus on SI activities. The reader is encouraged to consult Lee and VanPatten (2003) for a more detailed discussion on PI. SI activities seek to draw second language learners' attention to form-meaning relationships and thus assist them in better converting input into intake. With SI activities, the input is structured to make specific target forms more salient and frequent, and input-focused activities are designed to induce students to notice and process these forms. VanPatten and Cadierno (1993) found that PI was superior to traditional approaches to grammar instruction: explicit presentation of grammar rules and output practice consisting of mechanical, meaningful, and communicative exercises. The positive results of PI were then confirmed in a series of replication studies in French, Italian, and Spanish (Benati, 2004; Farley, 2004; Sanz & Morgan-Short, 2004; Wong, 2004). Lee and VanPatten (2003) outline the guidelines for developing SI activities:

1. *Present one form or structure at a time.* The instructor should present one grammar rule or form of a paradigm at a time. The authors state that this allows the teacher to give a brief and focused grammar presentation and explanation of the most relevant aspects of the grammar structure needed to complete the learning task. This, in turn, enables the students to better direct their attention toward the target item.
2. *Keep meaning in focus.* Students should have to attend to both form and meaning in the input.
3. *Move from sentences to connected discourse.* With SI activities, it is best to begin with short sentences—which are easier for students to process—and then progress to connected discourse.
4. *Use both oral and written input.* SI activities should provide students with opportunities to receive input in oral and written modalities. As the authors observe, although all learners need oral input, some learners benefit from “seeing” input as well (p. 158).
5. *Require learners to do something with the input.* SI activities must require that learners respond to the input in order to encourage processing of the grammar. Learners indicate their comprehension of the input through Yes/No statements, agreeing/disagreeing, checklists, matching, and ordering.
6. *Keep the learners’ processing strategies in mind.* Learners should focus their attention during processing on the specific grammar items and not on other elements of the sentence.

Figure 5, adapted from Farley (2005), illustrates the use of a SI task to introduce first-semester Spanish students to subject-verb agreement. The teacher explains that students will read excerpts from a recent article in a pop culture magazine about the lives and contributions of famous musicians. Students must decide whether the author of the article is referring to Bruce Springsteen or to Bono and the Edge.

	Bruce Springsteen	Bono
1...viajan por todo el mundo.	_____	_____
2...toca la guitarra.	_____	_____
3...dan conciertos para muchas personas.	_____	_____
4...escribe muchas de sus canciones.	_____	_____
5...recaudan fondos para la caridad.	_____	_____

*Figure 5.* SI student task to practice subject-verb agreement.

**Reflection.** This SI task encourages students to attend to form in a meaningful context (Standards 1.2, 4.1). We activate students' background knowledge to enhance their understanding of the content of the task through the introduction of recognizable artists. Subsequent SI tasks might expose students to Latino or Latina musicians. The use of such tasks provides appropriate scaffolding and context to then incorporate their music (Standards 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.2, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2).

### Dictogloss

In addition to comprehensible input, Swain (1995, 2005) argues that output is important for second language acquisition, as it (1) prompts learners to "notice the gap" between what they want to say and what they can say; (2) provides opportunities for them to formulate hypotheses about how the target language works, test these hypotheses, and then receive feedback, and (3) allows them to reflect about language in order to strengthen their awareness of form-meaning relationships (p. 69).

With this in mind, I offer the DG procedure (Wajnryb, 1990) as my fourth and final example. DG activities provide learners with opportunities for input, output, interaction, and negotiation of meaning in the target language. In a DG task, students listen to a short text containing a specific target form. Students collaborate to recreate the text, and then compare their version with the original text. Research suggests that DG activities do indeed draw students' attention to target language forms in meaningful contexts (Izumi, 2002; Kowal & Swain, 1997; Swain, 1998). Kowal and Swain (1997), for example, found evidence of noticing, hypothesis testing, and student discussion and reflection of form-meaning relationships when using the DG procedure in French immersion classrooms. The four steps for implementing DG activities as outlined in Teddick (2001) are:

1. *Preparation.* The instructor creates or finds a short text containing a specific target form. He or she discusses and models for students the processes and procedures involved in DG tasks in order to maximize participation. The instructor then directs students' attention to new language features and provides them with a brief review lesson on the target form.
2. *Dictation of Dictogloss Text.* The instructor reads the short text to students, and asks them to listen without taking notes. The text is read a second time, and students are asked to take notes in order to reconstruct the text.
3. *Reconstruction.* Students collaborate to reconstruct the text. The instructor should remind students to recreate the text so that it is as similar to the original text as possible in grammar and content.
4. *Feedback.* The instructor asks students to share their texts. The students' texts are then compared to the original text with attention and discussion focused on the target forms.

Figure 6 shows the use of the DG procedure to practice the *ir + a + infinitive* construction for expressing future events. The DG task is part of a thematic unit on Argentina.

*El viernes 15 de diciembre va a estar parcialmente nublado con una temperatura máxima de 25 grados centígrados. El sábado va a estar soleado por la mañana. Después, por la tarde, va a llover. La temperatura máxima para el sábado va a llegar hasta los 35 grados centígrados.*

Figure 6. El pronóstico para Buenos Aires.

**Reflection.** The instructor reads the semi-authentic weather report for Buenos twice (Standards 1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2). Students recreate the text and then compare it with the original version (Standards 1.1, 1.2, 4.1). The instructor draws students' attention to the use of *ir + a + infinitive* to express future events: the weather forecast (Standard 4.1). An important aspect of this listening task is also discussion of the weather in Buenos Aires and its connections to other academic areas. Discussion can focus on the inverted seasons, the conversion of Fahrenheit to Celsius, and climate and geography (Standards 3.1, 3.2). Further activities might require students to compare and contrast Argentine cities with cities in the United States. Students might also research and present a weather report in the format of a television newscast.

### Conclusion

The four content-enriched strategies presented here offer the WL teacher a strategic approach for situating grammar instruction within a meaningful context in order to promote the development of communicative competence. In integrating form-focused instruction with content, these standards-based tasks and activities have the potential for maximizing student participation and language acquisition, as well as enhancing student motivation.

### References

- Alanen, R. (1995). Input enhancement and rule presentation in second language acquisition. R. Schmidt (Ed.), *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning* (pp. 259-302). Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Aski, J.M. (2003). Foreign language textbook activities: Keeping pace with second language acquisition research. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36, 57-65.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Reynolds, D. (1995). The role of lexical aspect in the acquisition of tense and aspect. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 107-131.
- Benati, A. (2004). The effects of structured input activities and explicit information on the acquisition of Italian tense. In B. VanPatén (Ed.), *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary* (pp. 207-225). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

- de la Fuente, M. (2009). The role of pedagogical tasks and focus on form in acquisition of discourse markers by advanced learners. In R.P. Leow, H. Campos & D. Lardiere (Eds.), *Little words: Their history, phonology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and acquisition* (pp. 211-221). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). Pedagogical choices in focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114-138). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Farley, A. (2004). Processing instruction and the Spanish subjunctive: Is explicit information needed? In B. VanPatten (Ed.), *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary* (pp. 227-239). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Farley, A. (2005). *Structured input: Grammar instruction for the acquisition-oriented classroom*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gass, S. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hernández, T.A. (2008). The effect of explicit instruction and input flood on students' use of discourse markers on a simulated oral proficiency interview. *Hispania*, 91, 665-675.
- Hernández, T.A. (2009). Reexamining the role of explicit instruction and input flood on the acquisition of Spanish discourse markers. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis: An experimental study on ESL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24, 541-577.
- Kowal, M., & Swain, M. (1997). From semantic to syntactic processing: How can we promote it in the immersion classroom? In R. Johnson & M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion education: In international perspectives* (pp. 284-309). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, J.F., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Leow, R.P. (2008). Input enhancement and L2 grammatical development: What the research reveals. In S.L. Katz & J. Watzinger-Tharp (Eds.), *Conceptions of L2 grammar: Theoretical approaches and their application in the L2 Classroom* (pp. 16-34). Boston: Heinle. National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (2006). *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21<sup>st</sup> century* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Sanz, C., & Morgan-Short, K. (2004). Positive evidence versus explicit rule presentation and explicit negative feedback: A computer-assisted study. *Language Learning*, 54, 35-78.

- Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in Honour of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 64-81). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *The hand book of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 471-483). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Tedick, D. (2001). Dictogloss procedure. Retrieved from <http://www.carla.umn.edu/cobaltt/modules/strategies/Dictogloss.pdf>
- VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993). Input processing and second language acquisition: A role for instruction. *Modern Language Journal*, 77, 45-57.
- VanPatten, B., & Leiser, M. Theoretical and research considerations underlying classroom practice: The fundamental role of input. In R. Salaberry & B. Lafford (Eds.), *The art of teaching Spanish: Second language acquisition. from research to praxis* (pp. 55-77). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Wajnryb, R. (1990). *Grammar dictation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- White, J. (1998). Getting the learners' attention: A typographical input enhancement study. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 85-113). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, J., & Evans, J. (1998). What kind of focus and on which forms? In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 139-155). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wong, W. (2004). Processing instruction in French: The roles of explicit information and structured input. In B. VanPatten (Ed.), *Processing instruction: Theory, research, and commentary* (pp. 187-205). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Wong, W. (2005). *Input enhancement: From theory and research to the classroom*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Wong, W., & VanPatten, B. (2003). The evidence is IN: Drills are OUT. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36, 403-423.

## **The Author**

Todd A. Hernández (Ph.D., University of Kansas) is Assistant Professor of Foreign Language Education and Spanish, where he teaches methods courses, second language acquisition, and Spanish language courses. He is also the Coordinator of the First-Year Spanish Language Program at Marquette University. His most recent research project examines the role of motivation in shaping speaking performance in a study abroad context. His research has been published in journals such as *Applied Language Learning*, *Foreign Language Annals*, *Hispania*, and *Modern Language Journal*.

---

## Can Training Influence Teachers' Intention to Teach in the L2?

---

**Mark K. Warford**  
*Buffalo State College (SUNY)*

*In order to promote more teacher use of the second language (L2) in the world language classroom, a day-long training workshop was designed and implemented in two groups of WL educators. Results of pre- and post-test analyses revealed progress in commitment to teaching in the L2 across all 48 categories of teacher discourse, as depicted in the Foreign Language Teacher Talk Survey (Warford & Rose, 2007). Contrary to predictions, there were no significant differences between the groups. Both groups showed most significant movement toward L2 in common procedural/managerial dimensions of WL discourse.*

The introduction of standards for world language (WL) teacher preparation has re-centered the profession's attention on the importance of maximizing teacher use of the second language (L2), or the target language (NCATE, 2002; INTASC, 2002). Though SLA research is far from reaching consensus with regard to definitive and principled guidelines for teachers with regard to how and when to maintain the L2 in classroom discourse, even the most ardent critics of (near-) exclusive teacher use of the L2 in the WL classroom agree that the provision of opportunities for students to interpret and negotiate meaning in the L2 should be the central aim of language instruction (Cook, 2001; Schmidt, 1995).

Target language (TL) teaching is not a *Johnny-come-lately* as a pedagogical value. Moskowitz (1976), for example, in a study that analyzed characteristics of FL teachers who were considered exemplary by their students for conducting class in the L2, which emerged as a prominent characteristic. Support for teaching in the target language arguably reached its zenith during the Proficiency Movement of the 1980s, a time when maintaining the L2 became a central feature of *proficiency-oriented instruction* (Omaggio, 1984). Studies spanning several decades have unanimously pointed to the benefits of teaching in the target language for student achievement (Burstall, 1968, 1970; Burstall, Jamieson, Cohen, & Hargreaves, 1974; Carroll, 1975; Carroll, Clark, Edwards & Handrick, 1967; Turnbull, 1999).

At this writing, maximal teacher use of the L2 in FL/WL instruction as a professional standard is on a collision course with actual empirical realities in both K-12 and post-secondary second language classrooms, as well as with emergent trends in SLA research. In addition to trying to sort out the vicissitudes of the literature on code-switching in the WL classroom, I will share my own attempts to promote teacher use of the L2 in the classroom through formal training, and share some preliminary evidence revealing that this training can positively influence teachers' commitment to L2 teaching across a wide variety of discourse categories.



## Actual Use of the Target Language in the WL Classroom

With so much support for maximal teacher use of the L2 in the standards and research literature, one would expect to find extensive teacher use of the L2 in actual U.S. world language classrooms. Results of multiple survey and discourse analysis studies, however, point to a less than optimal picture of L2 integration into instruction. At the secondary level, Connor (1995) reported low levels of L2 integration across all levels, though there was a sharp increase beginning at the third year of instruction. In Rhodes and Branaman's (1999) national survey of K-12 schools (N=3184, 55% return) 1% of the respondents reporting using the TL all the time; 21% indicated use of TL 75-99% of the time; 47% reported 50-74% of the time; and 32% used the TL less than 50% of time. Allen's (2002) survey of K-12 teachers (N=699) found a similar proportion of teacher use of the L2. Teacher membership in ACTFL, or two other professional organizations, and familiarity with the national standards, predicted greater L2 integration. Teaching in the L2 is likewise meager, if not haphazard, at the post-secondary level. Duff and Polio (1990) report 10-100% L2 integration among instructors, with roughly equal distribution of the L1 and the L2. Levine (2003) reported that 50% of the instructors used the TL 80-100% of the time. Curiously, students were more receptive and less anxious regarding the prospect of L2-medium instruction than their instructors.

Recent studies that have employed discourse and conversation analytical (CA) research methodologies reveal that departmental mandates for maintaining the L2 are often disregarded (Chávez, 2006; Kraemer, 2006) or at least cleverly thwarted (Mori, 2004). This tendency is often either unintentionally or intentionally glamorized as a kind of exuberant show of agency by students and or instructors against what has been referred to as the *L2 straightjacket* (Cook, 2001). Certainly, there is at least a limited role for the L1 in the classroom. Vygotskian studies of WL classroom discourse have aptly pointed out (Anton, 1999; Brooks & Donato, 1994) that the L1 is an essential semiotic tool in engaging L2 learning tasks. Discourse-centered perspectives on SLA have produced convincing arguments for switching back to the L1 as a vital and natural form of language play (Belz, 2003), or as a tool for signaling the need for clarification (Liebscher & Dailey-O'Cain, 2003). The emergent socio-interactionist perspective imbued in such research approaches reminds us that learners are not just input processors but rather active social agents engaged in a rich process of meaning making that encompasses not only first and second languages and cultures, but also a multiplicity of interactional and socio-institutional competencies, the rules for which range from hidden to stated, local to global.

While recognizing advances in the research literature such as those just mentioned, I share Turnbull's (2001) and Wells' (1999) wariness about relaxing teachers' commitment to providing students with ample opportunities to interpret and negotiate meaning in L2; its integration into classroom discourse clearly falls short of levels that maximize students' opportunities for acquisition and the development of interactional competence. Besides, in FL teaching contexts, the teacher may be the students' only direct source of L2 input and interaction. Moreover, the current debate over code-switching in the L2 classroom lacks attention to one glaring omission that transcends decades of WL teacher preparation. Across several reviews of WL methods course curricula, including my own (Warford, 2003; Grosse, 1993; Wilbur, 2007), there is little

to no attention in the professional literature paid to training teachers in the skills of making L2 messages understood by their students, nor to the importance of classroom discourse study as tool for optimizing teacher talk for student SLA, as argued recently by Pearson, Fonseca-Greber and Foell (2006) in their article on the implications of the ACTFL-NCATE standards (NCATE, 2002). In a cursory review of the FLTeach website, I found just a few explicit references to the study of classroom discourse or tools and techniques associated with maximizing teacher use of L2. With very little attention to the topic of teaching in the L2 in most WL methods courses, we should not be surprised to find so little evidence of its implementation in K-12 and post-secondary classrooms.

## **Methodology**

In an effort to counter the training gap reference above, I crafted a day-long workshop. The model was framed by the pre- and post-test administration of the Foreign Language Teacher Talk Survey (Warford & Rose, 2007), which asks respondents to assign a percentage value to their estimation of L2 use (from 0-100%) in increments of 10% across several dozen categories of teacher discourse. In between, they receive training in the applied linguistics of the FL classroom as well as in tools and strategies for maintaining L2 across several areas of classroom discourse that tend to favor L1: 1) classroom management, 2) building rapport with students, 3) teaching grammar, and 4) culture teaching. Pauses for discussion and projects were also provided in order to take the learning deeper. The workshop concluded with a discussion of next steps, which addresses potential points of resistance among students, parents, administrators and colleagues, and finally, the sharing of projects.

On April 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> 2008, I administered the day-long workshop, “Maximizing L2 from day 1” to WL teachers in an urban school district as part of a mandatory in-service and to teachers from around the state who voluntarily registered for the training at the Language Resource Center of a mid-sized college, respectively. Though the essential program flowed in the same manner for both groups, there were slight variations that should be noted. SDT or Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000) served as a framework for the approach. (SDT hypothesizes that intrinsic motivation is enhanced to a significant extent by autonomy-supportive learning contexts, which are marked by choice (vs. coercion) and optimal challenge.) Some degree of choice was offered to both groups in terms of the amount of time spent on each of the core themes.

## **Results**

Those attending the mandatory in-service preferred not to fully engage the discussion of ways to maintain L2 through grammar instruction (see Table 1). Participants in both workshop administrations were given the opportunity to explore a variety of hands-on projects related to increasing their capacities for teaching in L2. With regard to optimal challenge, the workshop content featured engaging problem-solving exercises that offered participants the opportunity to reflect on and apply a variety of concepts related to WL classroom code-switching. In emphasizing information and rationales over mandates, the workshop transcended the coercive and

prescriptive tone often associated with the discourse on maximizing L2 in FL teaching.

In addition to the minimization of grammar as a targeted area of instruction for the training in the city in-service group, the other slight difference is that those who registered for the campus-sponsored training, because the schedule was slightly longer, were given more opportunity to work independently or collaboratively on projects related to maximizing L2 in the classroom. They also had the benefit of an encouraging address by a high-level administrator in FL instruction.

In considering the unique aspects of each training situation, I hypothesized that a combination of factors would point toward a more favorable impact of training on the campus-based group: 1) their decision to attend was their choice rather than being coerced; 2) they had more time to apply and further appropriate concepts explored in the workshop through individual or collective project time; and 3) they had the support and encouragement of a high-level administrator in WL teaching. Teachers reported that they generally taught about half the time in the L2 (about 55.8% of the time), though the presence of an ESL teacher in the data set, evidenced by '100% L2' across all 48 categories, may have further biased pre-test scores in the direction of the L2 (ESL teachers teach only in L2 because there is no common L1 among their students). In comparing the administrations of the survey, results show a positive impact for training across all 48 categories of language teacher talk. Teachers also, overall, indicated in the post test a commitment to teaching in the L2 about 73% of the time, a net gain of +17.3% over the percentage of the time they indicated teaching in the L2 prior to receiving the training.

With regard to the quality of the impact, some areas of teacher discourse were more affected than others. Table 2 details 13 categories of teacher talk that demonstrated a gain of at least 20% between the pre-and post-test. The categories generally center on class routines, which offer opportunities for students to acquire new grammatical and lexical forms, as well as improve their interactional competencies.

Two days later, WL teachers from all over the state were presented with the same training, with some variations, as noted earlier. Teachers reported (see Table 3 in Appendix A) that they generally taught about half the time in the L2 (about 63% of the time). In comparing the administrations of the survey, results show a positive impact for training across all 48 categories of language teacher talk. Teachers also, overall, indicated in the post test an impressive net gain of around 21% over the percentage of the time they indicated teaching in the L2 prior to receiving the training. In terms of the quality of the impact, some areas of teacher discourse were more affected than others. Table 4 (Appendix B) details 15 categories of teacher talk that demonstrated the most significant gain between the pre-and post-test. Eight categories indicated a 30-40% greater likelihood of staying in the L2 for the following features of classroom discourse: *General announcements*, *Explaining work for outside of class (homework, tests)*, *Reminder of rules*, *Giving directions for a class activity*, *Explicit correction*, *Culture instruction*, *Closure*, and finally, *Paired and or small group feedback on performance*.

Table 1  
Pre- and Post-Test Comparisons for City Inservice

Teacher talk categories: Scale: 0-10 = 0% in the target language to 100% in the target language.	Pre-test			Post-test			Net gain
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	
Calling roll/Attendance	45	5.5333	3.60303	52	8.1538	2.33796	2.6205
General announcements	47	3.4894	2.73363	51	6.2157	2.83064	2.7263
Attention signal	48	6.3333	3.32197	55	8.2	2.13784	1.8667
Preparation check	47	5.2979	3.26986	54	7.8704	2.41103	2.5725
Giving directions for a class activity	49	4.9184	2.72975	55	6.5273	2.47846	1.6089
Time check	46	5.8478	3.12671	54	7.3889	2.78416	1.5411
Explaining work for outside of class	46	3.413	2.91796	55	5.4909	3.13801	2.0779
Calling on students	47	6.3191	2.97165	54	8.0185	2.39095	1.6994
Courtesy markers	49	7.7551	2.61829	54	8.6852	1.86147	0.9301
Warm-ups	49	7.3061	2.96651	55	8.6364	1.7988	1.3303
Anticipatory set	47	4.9362	3.19241	55	6.8727	2.86133	1.9365
Overview of lesson	47	4.383	3.13849	54	6.2222	2.86598	1.8392
Transitions	43	4.907	3.19832	51	6.3922	2.93992	1.4852
Introducing vocabulary	48	7	2.64977	55	8.2727	1.72621	1.2727
Reviewing vocabulary	48	7.5208	2.46671	54	8.6667	1.38727	1.1459
Modeling	49	6.6939	2.64736	54	8.2407	1.75838	1.5468
Extension scenarios	46	6.2609	2.80028	53	7.3774	2.43553	1.1165
Grammar instruction	49	4.2245	3.26768	55	5.6	2.80608	1.3755
Culture instruction	48	4.6458	3.15884	53	6.4717	2.87298	1.8259
Book exercises/Worksheets	49	6.3265	2.76426	54	7.2778	2.00393	0.9513
Choral repetition	48	7.6875	2.61059	53	8.6415	1.59439	0.954
Oral practice drills, controlled Q&A	48	7.1875	2.7262	53	8	2.29548	0.8125
More open-ended, communicative activities	47	6.383	2.71512	53	7.6415	2.13122	1.2585
Interpretive activities	48	6.5208	2.64969	53	7.6415	2.06709	1.1207
Presentational activities: Oral	46	6.1304	2.6634	53	7.2642	2.25449	1.1338
Presentational activities: Written	45	6.0889	2.63561	52	7.6538	2.98942	1.5649
Praise (IRE)	47	7.4681	2.80412	54	8.6111	1.74201	1.143
Praise and repeat (IRE)	47	7.5745	2.77993	54	8.9444	1.37932	1.3699
Explicit correction (IRE)	44	5.25	2.95804	53	7.5849	2.42926	2.3349
Implicit prompt for self-correction (IRE)	44	5.9318	2.92064	49	7.7551	1.97411	1.8233
Answer to student question asked in L1	46	4.2609	2.8161	54	5.8704	3.00971	1.6095
Answer to student question asked in L2	46	5.8043	2.84893	54	7.5556	2.35257	1.7513
Individualized feedback on performance	47	4.1915	2.7791	54	7.0185	2.63854	2.827
Paired/small group feedback- performance	42	4.5	2.84776	51	6.9216	2.61414	2.4216
Whole-class feedback on performance	42	5.0238	2.89228	54	7.0926	2.73529	2.0688
Check for student comprehension	44	6.3864	2.98224	54	7.537	2.48553	1.1506
Closure	45	4.4444	3.14466	53	6.8302	2.91373	2.3858
Facilitating class discussions	42	4.4762	2.67999	52	6.1538	2.6523	1.6776
Incidental anecdote	43	4.186	2.64805	53	5.9623	2.89537	1.7763
Incidental cultural note	44	4.0909	2.541	52	6.1923	2.80782	2.1014
Eliciting more student talk (IRF)	45	6.0444	3.00723	53	7.7358	2.05829	1.6914
Spontaneous conversation	44	5.2273	2.7097	51	7.0392	2.60738	1.8119
Expressing sympathy/concern	45	5.3556	2.89322	53	7.1509	2.48376	1.7953
Expressing humor	43	5.3256	2.61608	54	6.963	2.53253	1.6374
Q/Comment related to student interest	42	4.9762	2.70039	53	6.8491	2.61207	1.8729
Encouraging on-task behavior	46	5.6957	3.06862	53	7.6981	2.3986	2.0024
Discouraging off-task behavior	45	4.8889	3.37923	51	7.451	2.54019	2.5621
Reminder of rules	44	3.8636	3.1519	51	6.9216	2.80602	3.058
		5.58492			7.31796		1.733042

Scale: 0-10 = 0% in the target language to 100% in the target language.

Table 2  
City In-Service. Teacher Talk Categories Most Affected By Training

Teacher talk categories: Scale: 0-10 = 0% in the target language to 100% in the target language.	PRE-TEST			POST-TEST			N
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	
Reminder of rules	44.00	3.86	3.15	51.00	6.92	2.81	3.06
Individualized feedback on performance	47.00	4.19	2.78	54.00	7.02	2.64	2.83
General announcements	47.00	3.49	2.73	51.00	6.22	2.83	2.73
Calling roll/Attendance	45.00	5.53	3.60	52.00	8.15	2.34	2.62
Preparation check	47.00	5.30	3.27	54.00	7.87	2.41	2.57
Discouraging off-task behavior	45.00	4.89	3.38	51.00	7.45	2.54	2.56
Paired/small group feedback on performance	42.00	4.50	2.85	51.00	6.92	2.61	2.42
Closure	45.00	4.44	3.14	53.00	6.83	2.91	2.39
Explicit correction (IRE)	44.00	5.25	2.96	53.00	7.58	2.43	2.33
Incidental cultural note	44.00	4.09	2.54	52.00	6.19	2.81	2.10
Explaining work for outside of class	46.00	3.41	2.92	55.00	5.49	3.14	2.08
Whole-class feedback on performance	42.00	5.02	2.89	54.00	7.09	2.74	2.07
Encouraging on-task behavior	46.00	5.70	3.07	53.00	7.70	2.40	2.00
Anticipatory set	47.00	4.94	3.19	55.00	6.87	2.86	1.94
Q/Comment related to student interest	42.00	4.98	2.70	53.00	6.85	2.61	1.87
Attention signal	48.00	6.33	3.32	55.00	8.20	2.14	1.87

Scale: 0-10 = 0% in the target language to 100% in the target language

In terms of the quality of the impact, some areas of teacher discourse were more affected than others. Table 4 (Appendix B) details 15 categories of teacher talk that demonstrated the most significant gain between the pre-and post-test. Eight categories indicated a 30-40% greater likelihood of staying in the L2 for the following features of classroom discourse: *General announcements*, *Explaining work for outside of class (homework, tests)*, *Reminder of rules*, *Giving directions for a class activity*, *Explicit correction*, *Culture instruction*, *Closure*, and finally, *Paired and or small group feedback on performance*.

### Discussion

Contrary to my predictions, the resulting picture suggests that workshop participants, whether they were prompted by an in-service mandate or voluntarily paid to receive training in ways to maximize L2 in the classroom, emerged from the experience with a common commitment and capacity to implement proficiency-oriented instruction. In spite of very distinct contextual factors, the amount of movement toward a commitment to teaching in the L2 was almost the same in both groups. Not a single area of WL teacher discourse demonstrated a slide toward the L1 in either group. At first glance, the areas of discourse most affected by training, the results appear fairly idiosyncratic. A closer look shows that in both groups the areas that demonstrated the greatest increase in commitment to the L2 appear to relate to various stock phrases used in managerial and procedural talk. The quality of impact, then, was

perhaps somewhat superficial; no single category showed dramatic gains as a result of the workshop. Perhaps, then the significance of training can best be felt in a general increase in awareness. Similar to Macaro's (2006) discussion of a central conductor that orchestrates FL learning styles and strategies, the practical outcome of training in ways of maximizing teacher L2 in the classroom is a general awareness of the various dimensions of teacher talk and a filter that heightens awareness of opportunities to maintain L2 through the different categories.

In order to assess the long-term impact of the training, it may be possible to repeat the post-test on the first anniversary of the training. Though there is no way to be sure, I expect that the individuals who had attended the first training will be agents of positive change as they return to the schools where they teach. The language supervisor for the mandatory in-service indicated that it was one of the most well-received in-service she had seen in some time. School district evaluations of the training indicated that a significant percentage of the participants felt that the training represented a *reasonable to important influence* on their teaching with regard to the following four factors: 1) *Meaningfulness of the program or event to the educator*' (87.5%); 2) *Improvement of educational practice* (93.5%); 3) *Degree in which instruction will be modified* (60%); and 4) *Degree to which I think student performance can be improved using this information* (69%).

Those who registered for the state-sponsored training were likewise appreciative. In write-in comments on the back of the post-tests, they offered their commentary on significant points of learning and areas they would have liked to explore further. As one participant stated,

The information is very helpful and I will share it with my department members. I am very interested in the research aspect of your workshop to support instructional changes and for mentoring purposes. Thank you for your workshop. I have much to reflect on!" Most of the comments reflected a range of commitments to integrating more L2, which was perhaps an artifact of the last activity of the day ('next steps').

Students need L2 input and interaction opportunities for acquisition and conversational competence-building in the FL classroom. A future WL classroom in which the L2 prevails is a worthy and attainable goal, but blocking its access is a torrent of L1 and complacency. Training is the potential bridge that has yet to be built in the service of promoting more FL teacher use of the L2. The ultimate impact of workshops such as the program depicted in this article ultimately rests on the resiliency of the participants' disposition to integrate more L2 into their teacher talk, and more importantly, the support or resistance they will encounter from their colleagues, administrators, students and parents. It is likely that teachers need more than just a one-day boot *camp* in classroom code-switching. Perhaps a more effective model would enhance the prominence of L2 teaching in the methods course curriculum and the practicum portfolio so that teachers could better develop confidence in their ability to maintain the target language across the maximum possible range of classroom practices.

### References

- Allen, L. Q. (2002). Teachers' pedagogical beliefs and the standards for foreign language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35, 518-529.
- Belz, J. (2003). Identity, deficiency, and first language use in foreign language education. In C. Blyth (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign language classrooms* (pp. 209-256). AAUSCDFLP, Boston, MA
- Brooks, F., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispania*, 77, 262-274.
- Burstall, C. (1968). *French from eight: A national experiment*. Berkshire, England: National Foundation for Educational Research.

- Burstall, C. (1970). *French in the primary school: Attitudes and achievement*. Berkshire, England: National Endowment for Educational Research.
- Burstall, C., Jamieson, M., Cohen, S., & Hargreaves, M. (1974). *Primary French in the balance*. Berkshire, UK: National Foundation for Educational Research.
- Carroll, J. B. (1975). *The teaching of French as a foreign language in 8 countries*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell Tryckeri AB.
- Carroll, J. B., Clark, J. L. D., Edwards, T. M., & Handrick, F. A. (1967). *The foreign language attainments of language majors in the senior years: A survey conducted in U.S. colleges and universities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chávez, M. (2006). Classroom-language use in teacher-led instruction and teachers' self-perceived roles. *IRAL, 44*, 49-102.
- Connor, L. B. (1995). What Illinois teachers do in the classroom: New research. *ICTFL Accents, 8*(2), 6-8. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 390 250).
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 57*, 402-423.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*, 227-268.
- Duff, P., & Polio, C. (1990). How much foreign language is there in the foreign language classroom? *Modern Language Journal, 74*, 154-166.
- Grosse, C. U. (1993). The foreign language methods course. *Modern Language Journal, 77*, 303-312.
- INTASC Foreign Language Standards Committee (2002). *Model standards for licensing beginning foreign language teachers: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Kraemer, A. (2006). Teachers' use of English in communicative classrooms: A qualitative analysis. *Foreign Language Annals, 39*, 435-449.
- Levine, G. S. (2003). Student and instructor beliefs and attitudes about TL use. First language use, and anxiety: Report of a questionnaire study. *Modern Language Journal, 87*, 343-364.
- Liebscher, G., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (2003). Conversational repair as a role-defining mechanism in classroom interaction. *Modern Language Journal, 87*, 375-390.
- Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use: Revising the theoretical framework. *Modern Language Journal, 90*, 320-337.
- Mori, J. (2004). Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *Modern Language Journal, 88*, 536-650.
- Moskowitz, G. (1976). The classroom interaction of outstanding foreign language teachers. *Foreign Language Annals, 9*, 135-157.

- NCATE Foreign Language Teacher Standards Writing Team. (2002). *Draft of program standards for foreign language teacher preparation (Initial Level)*. Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Omaggio, A. C. (1984). The proficiency-oriented classroom. In T. V. Higgs (Ed.), *Teaching for proficiency, the organizing principle* (pp. 43-84). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Pearson, L., Fonseca-Greber, B., & Foell, K. (2006). Advanced proficiency for foreign language teacher candidates: What can we do to help them achieve this goal? *Foreign Language Annals*, 39, 507-519.
- Rhodes, N., & Branaman, L. (1999). *Foreign language instruction in the United States: A national level survey of elementary and secondary schools*. Washington, DC: CAL.
- Turnbull, M. (1999). Multidimensional project-based teaching in French second language (FSL): A process-product case study. *Modern Language Journal*, 83, 548-568.
- Turnbull, M. (2001). There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but... *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, 531-540.
- Warford, M. K., & Rose (2007). The foreign language teacher talk survey. Unpublished manuscript. Buffalo State College, Buffalo, NY.
- Warford, M. K. (2003). The foreign language methods course: Where we've been and where we're headed. *NECTFL Review*, 52, 29-35.
- Wells, G. (1999). Using L1 to master L2: A response to Anton and DiCamila's socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 83, 248-254.
- Wilbur, M. L. (2007). How foreign language teachers get taught: Methods of teaching the methods course. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40, 79-100.

### **The Author**

Mark K. Warford, Ph.D., is an Associate Professor of Spanish and Foreign Language Education, at Buffalo State College (SUNY). He has published over a dozen articles in refereed journals within the areas of educational innovation, teacher development, educational linguistics and sociocultural theory.



## Appendix A

Table 3  
Results of campus-based workshop

TEACHER TALK CATEGORY	PRE	TEST		POST	TEST		
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	M	Std. Dev.	Net gain
Calling roll/Attendance	23.00	7.91	2.56	19.00	9.74	0.45	1.82
General announcements	26.00	4.65	2.88	21.00	8.38	2.27	3.73
Attention signal	26.00	8.50	1.96	21.00	9.62	0.92	1.12
Preparation check	26.00	7.77	2.23	21.00	9.24	1.26	1.47
Giving directions for a class activity	26.00	5.58	2.50	21.00	8.86	1.71	3.28
Time check	26.00	7.69	2.66	21.00	9.48	0.93	1.78
Explaining work for outside of class	26.00	3.85	2.75	21.00	7.57	2.52	3.73
Calling on students	25.00	8.28	1.93	21.00	9.52	0.93	1.24
Courtesy markers	26.00	9.27	0.78	21.00	9.57	0.60	0.30
Warm-ups	26.00	8.08	2.24	21.00	9.24	1.61	1.16
Anticipatory set	26.00	6.00	2.35	21.00	8.24	1.84	2.24
Overview of lesson	25.00	5.32	3.09	21.00	8.19	2.09	2.87
Transitions	25.00	5.40	3.04	20.00	8.35	2.13	2.95
Introducing vocabulary	26.00	6.50	2.40	21.00	8.81	1.29	2.31
Reviewing vocabulary	26.00	7.81	1.60	21.00	9.24	1.00	1.43
Modeling	26.00	6.85	1.91	21.00	8.90	1.45	2.06
Extension scenarios	25.00	7.56	1.94	21.00	8.43	1.63	0.87
Grammar instruction	26.00	4.42	2.56	21.00	6.86	2.10	2.43
Culture instruction	26.00	3.62	2.65	21.00	6.81	1.94	3.19
Book exercises/Worksheets	26.00	6.46	2.63	21.00	8.43	1.43	1.97
Choral repetition	26.00	9.23	1.14	21.00	9.52	0.98	0.29
Oral practice drills, controlled Q&A	24.00	7.67	2.79	21.00	9.10	1.26	1.43
More open-ended, communicative activities	26.00	6.77	2.42	21.00	8.38	1.80	1.61
Interpretive activities	24.00	6.50	2.32	21.00	8.52	1.33	2.02
Presentational activities: Oral	26.00	7.46	2.27	20.00	8.55	1.64	1.09
Presentational activities: Written	26.00	6.96	2.79	20.00	8.65	1.35	1.69
Praise (IRE)	26.00	8.04	1.89	21.00	9.14	1.24	1.10
Praise and repeat (IRE)	26.00	8.00	2.23	21.00	9.29	1.19	1.29
Explicit correction (IRE)	25.00	5.08	3.25	21.00	8.33	1.56	3.25
Implicit prompt for self-correction (IRE)	25.00	5.88	2.91	20.00	8.35	1.63	2.47
Answer to student question asked in L1	24.00	5.63	2.67	21.00	7.76	2.55	2.14
Answer to student question asked in L2	23.00	7.09	2.66	21.00	9.24	1.30	2.15
Individualized feedback on performance	26.00	5.15	2.78	21.00	7.57	2.16	2.42
Paired/small group feedback on performance	25.00	5.08	2.97	20.00	8.20	1.67	3.12
Whole-class feedback on performance	25.00	5.56	2.63	20.00	8.20	1.74	2.64
Check for student comprehension	26.00	7.50	2.82	21.00	9.00	1.00	1.50
Closure	23.00	4.39	2.87	21.00	7.57	2.06	3.18
Facilitating class discussions	26.00	5.00	2.38	21.00	7.81	1.97	2.81
Incidental anecdote	24.00	4.75	2.88	20.00	6.70	2.68	1.95
Incidental cultural note	25.00	4.04	3.09	20.00	6.80	2.63	2.76
Eliciting more student talk (IRF)	24.00	7.71	1.97	21.00	8.95	1.24	1.24
Spontaneous conversation	25.00	6.32	3.13	20.00	8.05	1.99	1.73
Expressing sympathy/concern	25.00	6.36	2.58	21.00	6.48	3.11	0.12
Expressing humor	26.00	5.27	2.68	21.00	6.81	2.79	1.54
Q/Comment related to student interest	23.00	5.74	2.77	20.00	7.95	2.11	2.21
Encouraging on-task behavior	26.00	5.81	2.91	21.00	7.52	2.87	1.72
Discouraging off-task behavior	26.00	4.96	3.21	21.00	7.76	2.68	2.80
Reminder of rules	26.00	3.85	2.91	21.00	7.52	2.62	3.68
Overall average:		6.32			8.36		2.04

Scale: 0-10 = 0% in the target language to 100% in the target language.

## Appendix B

Table 4  
State Workshop: Teacher Talk Categories Most Affected By Training

TEACHER TALK CATEGORY	PRE-TEST			POST-TEST			Net gain
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	
General announcements	26.00	4.65	2.88	21.00	8.38	2.27	3.73
Explaining work for outside of class	26.00	3.85	2.75	21.00	7.57	2.52	3.73
Reminder of rules	26.00	3.85	2.91	21.00	7.52	2.62	3.68
Giving directions for a class activity	26.00	5.58	2.50	21.00	8.86	1.71	3.28
Explicit correction (IRE)	25.00	5.08	3.25	21.00	8.33	1.56	3.25
Culture instruction	26.00	3.62	2.65	21.00	6.81	1.94	3.19
Closure	23.00	4.39	2.87	21.00	7.57	2.06	3.18
Paired/small group feedback- performance	25.00	5.08	2.97	20.00	8.20	1.67	3.12
Transitions	25.00	5.40	3.04	20.00	8.35	2.13	2.95
Overview of lesson	25.00	5.32	3.09	21.00	8.19	2.09	2.87
Facilitating class discussions	26.00	5.00	2.38	21.00	7.81	1.97	2.81
Discouraging off-task behavior	26.00	4.96	3.21	21.00	7.76	2.68	2.80
Incidental cultural note	25.00	4.04	3.09	20.00	6.80	2.63	2.76
Whole-class feedback on performance	25.00	5.56	2.63	20.00	8.20	1.74	2.64
Implicit prompt for self-correction (IRE)	25.00	5.88	2.91	20.00	8.35	1.63	2.47
Grammar instruction	26.00	4.42	2.56	21.00	6.86	2.10	2.43

Scale: 0-10 = 0% in the target language to 100% in the target language.

