

HOW FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS GET TAUGHT:
METHODS OF TEACHING THE METHODS COURSE

by

MARCIA L. WILBUR

Under the Direction of Margaret Graham

ABSTRACT

The focus of this dissertation study is the methodological formation of pre-service secondary foreign language teachers during 32 college or university teacher training programs across the U.S. For the purpose of this study, foreign languages include all foreign and second languages except English. A review of the literature which examines new teacher preparation, a review of second language acquisition theories, and an examination of the social, cognitive, and affective elements related to second language teaching and learning, serve to frame the context of the pre-service program. The study of post-secondary foreign language methods training was achieved through the lens of the syllabus for each of the participating courses, survey data from the related methods instructors and questionnaires from ten of the post-secondary methods instructors. The goal of the study was to unveil the content of foreign language methodological programs which, to date, remains unexamined in the professional literature.

The findings indicate that pre-service foreign language methodological training, while based on common beliefs that theory informs practice and that the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* should frame instruction and assessment, is accomplished in a great variety of ways. Most significantly, there appears to be a great array of content delivery methodologies presented across the syllabi in this study, yet because the number of courses which address meeting the needs of diverse learners is low, it becomes apparent that pre-service teachers may not be connecting an eclectic blend of instructional practices to learner needs. Second, there is evidence that the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* are recognized in theory as important to instruction, but not yet fully integrated into teaching practices nor into how pre-service teachers are assessed in their methods courses.

INDEX WORDS: foreign language teaching, pre-service foreign language methodology,
foreign language teacher training,

HOW FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS GET TAUGHT:
METHODS OF TEACHING THE METHODS COURSE

by

MARCIA L. WILBUR

A.B., University of Michigan, 1979

M.A.C.T., Michigan State University, 1985

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2005

© 2005

Marcia L. Wilbur

All Rights Reserved

HOW FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS GET TAUGHT:
METHODS OF TEACHING THE METHODS COURSE

by

MARCIA L. WILBUR

Major Professor: Margaret Graham

Committee: Hildebrando Ruiz
Sally J. Zepeda

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2005

DEDICATION

To my family for their love, patience, and support, to my parents for setting me on the path of education, to Judy Butler for inspiring me to teach foreign languages, and to God for the gifts entrusted to me and the joy of sharing those gifts with others.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The path to a doctoral degree has been one of self-discovery and of connecting with genuinely tremendous faculty. Dr. Peg Graham adopted me after a year into my program when my original chair moved away. Because we share a similar passion for new teacher training, I was confident that I could learn much from Peg. And although her changing personal circumstances could have justified her asking to be relieved of duties as my chair, she stayed by me all the way. I will always be grateful beyond words. Her knowledge, kind spirit, and unfaltering support have been monumental in the culmination of this work.

Dr. Sally Zepeda has supported my writing and encouraged me at every turn. She has taught me a tremendous amount about journal submissions, formatting, and publishing. Sally takes a very personal interest in all of her doctoral candidates and goes to great lengths to help them make appropriate professional connections. As a guardian angel of graduate students, she is truly without equal.

I am also deeply grateful to Dr. Hildebrando Ruiz for taking an interest in an unknown commodity. Having a foreign language member on the committee was extremely important to me, given my dissertation topic and areas of interest. Out of kindness he agreed to serve in this capacity, even though he had no obligation to do so. His insights into the process of language acquisition and foreign language learning have been extremely valuable to the dissertation process.

And, I owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Linda Gilbert and Dr. Kathy Roulston. They are both brilliant qualitative researchers who afforded me opportunities to grow into my own

research methods. Linda led me through my first archival data analysis and caused me to investigate methods of examining novice teacher induction support. Kathy patiently steered me through the development of data analysis methods that would eventually come to be used in this dissertation. Without such excellent guidance from these researchers, the final product would not have come to fruition.

Lastly, I would like to thank the post-secondary methods instructors who participated in this study. Without their cooperation with the data collection process, the study could not have materialized. Their efforts to shape and to inform pre-service foreign language teachers are indeed admirable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER	
1 AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Background	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study.....	7
Research Questions	8
Organization of the Dissertation.....	9
2 PRE-SERVICE TEACHER PREPARATION: KEY FINDINGS FROM THE LITERATURE	10
Essential Features of Pre-Service Teacher Preparation.....	10
The Influence of Beliefs on Teacher Identity	10
Career-long Reflective Practice.....	11
Subject-area Expertise vs. Pedagogical Content Knowledge.....	12
Connecting Theory to Practice	16
Bridging the New Teacher Preparation Continuum	18
Additional Issues Related to Foreign Language Teacher Preparation	19
Chapter Summary	25

3	THEORETICAL INFLUENCES ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING PRACTICES	29
	Second Language Acquisition Theories.....	29
	Other Theoretical Influences on FL Teaching Practices	38
	Learner Variables	45
	Implications for Novice Teacher Preparation	48
	Chapter Summary	49
4	THE STUDY DESIGN: AN EXAMINATION OF POST-SECONDARY PRE-SERVICE FOREIGN LANGUAGE METHODOLOGY INSTRUCTION.....	52
	Rationale for the study	52
	Assumptions of the Study.....	52
	The Research Questions	54
	Data Gathering Methods	54
	Survey Data Analysis Methods	55
	Questionnaire Data Analysis Methods	56
	Syllabi Data Analysis Methods	57
	Applying the Syllabi Data Analysis Methods	60
	Validity	62
	Limitations of the Study	63
5	FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....	65
	The Participants.....	65
	Instructor Survey Results	65
	Findings from the Instructor Questionnaires.....	68

Syllabi Data Findings	78
Chapter Summary	107
6 CONCLUSIONS AND QUESTIONS.....	109
Considering the Findings in the Context of the ACTFL/NCATE Standards.....	109
Conclusions	116
Recommendations for Further Research	119
In Closing	120
REFERENCES	122
APPENDICES	131
A ACTFL/NCATE PROGRAM STANDARDS FOR THE PREPARATION OF WORLD LANGUAGE TEACHERS	131
B INTASC APPLICABLE STANDARDS OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICE	133
C NBPTS WORLD LANGUAGES OTHER THAN ENGLISH STANDARDS OVERVIEW.....	134
D THE ACTFL K-16 STANDARDS.....	136
E LETTER OF REQUEST FOR STUDY PARTICIPATION WITH SURVEY	137
F LETTER OF REQUEST FOR STUDY PARTICIPATION WITH QUESTIONNAIRE.....	141
G POST-SECONDARY METHODS INSTRUCTOR SURVEY RESPONSES	143
H TOPICAL SUPPLEMENTARY READING LIST FROM THE SYLLABI.....	145
I SYLLABI FINDINGS TABLES	157

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Size of Participating Institutions.....	65
Table 2: Methods Instructors' Secondary Classroom Experience.....	66
Table 3: Correlations Between Instructor's Background and Theoretical Course Content.....	87
Table 4: Beliefs About Teaching	157
Table 5: An Educational Framework for FL Instruction	158
Table 6: Primary Texts in the Pre-Service Methods Courses	159
Table 7: Theories	162
Table 8: National Standards.....	164
Table 9: Pedagogical Content Knowledge.....	165
Table 10: The Use of L2 in the FL Classroom	167
Table 11: Technology in the FL Classroom	168
Table 12: Learning Strategies	169
Table 13: Learner Diversity	170
Table 14: Planning for Learning.....	171
Table 15: Classroom Management, Behavioral, and Affective Considerations.....	172
Table 16: Assessment	173
Table 17: Reflective Practice	175
Table 18: Teacher Voice and Identity.....	176
Table 19: Other	177

Table 20: Areas of Emphasis in a Single Syllabus	177
Table 21: Related Practicum Experiences	178
Table 22: Course Assignments and Grading	179

CHAPTER 1

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Background

As the foreign language department chairman for all but 2 years of a 25-year teaching career, I have generally been responsible for interviewing new candidates and mentoring them through the first few years of their teaching experiences. It is frequently astounding to discover that novice teachers bring to the teaching arena little practical knowledge, an inability to reflect on practice, and a poor ability to organize instruction. Outside of a textbook coverage model, most novice foreign language teachers I have encountered seemed to lack adequate tools of the trade. On inquiring about the usefulness of college-level methods training with regards to these areas, most novice teachers have reported that their methods training was “fairly useless.”

Since 1993, I have had countless opportunities to offer training to novice, mid-career, and veteran teachers, through the College Board Advanced Placement workshop program and at state, regional, and national conferences. These teacher training sessions have reinforced my sense of what teachers want, need, and thirst for, in their quest to create successful learning communities. Many of the strategies provided to workshop participants, as well as the rationale for the use of the strategies, represent concepts that are directly related to a teacher’s pedagogical content knowledge development. Thus, I am interested in how this development could be fostered in pre-career teachers so that they might complete their undergraduate studies and emerge better prepared and more confident to deliver effective instruction.

In terms of building successful long-sequence foreign language programs at local schools, in my experience, students and parents rally around a stellar teacher, and drive a weak one from the profession. Because foreign language programs are often elective courses, sustained program growth generally flourishes because of a highly effective teacher. In order for foreign language teachers to find success in and to receive support from the local community, it is critical that they possess immense ability in all areas of teaching: pedagogical content knowledge, classroom management, motivation, and second language fluency. Without these, the reputation of the profession is weakened. Therefore I believe that the development of outstanding future educators begins with their subject-specific methodological training.

Statement of the Problem

Many believe that teacher education has “failed to keep pace with the profound sociopolitical changes in society and have contributed little to the current efforts to dramatically restructure and reform American K-12 schools” (Imig & Switzer, 1996, p. 213). The challenge is compounded by a disconnect between the diversity found in the country’s school reform movements and efforts to include pre-service teacher education in those movements. Hower (1996) explains:

Major improvements in teacher preparation cannot go forward without also addressing the changing nature of P-12 schools in this vast and diverse country. Simultaneous renewal in pre-service teacher education and P-12 schools, however logical this seems, is nonetheless rare. (p. 144)

Since the pace of school change is not expected to slow, but rather to steadily grow as our population diversity increases (Dasenbrock, 1999), how will we shape teachers now to face the classrooms of the next few decades?

The trends of school change apply in great measure to second language learning.

Traditionally, foreign languages have been viewed in the U.S. as something that college-bound students study for the purpose of cognitive expansion in preparation for a liberal arts college.

Voght (2000) outlines the social changes that have occurred in our country in the last half a century and how those changes impact the face of foreign language education. He states:

Our present and future economic security depends on our ability as a nation to communicate effectively with potential business partners, customers, and competitors around the world. Our success in the global marketplace is directly related to our ability to understand, appreciate, value, and work within foreign cultures, differing sets of social customs, diverse economic contexts, and varied political systems. (p. 269)

Voght explains that the paradigm is shifting in American universities away from traditional assumptions that second language programs exist to prepare future teachers, to foster intellectual development, and to provide insights into the history of Western Civilization. Traditional post-secondary foreign language (FL) programs include vast amounts of literary and linguistic studies. He claims that because of global economic interdependence, the study of languages and cultures will grow primarily based on business needs, and that traditional programs in linguistics and literature will not increase in enrollment or purpose. Communication within a meaningful context is fast becoming the goal of both secondary and post-secondary L2 learning.

To date, similar attitudes that foreign language education is some sort of frill has kept it from being included in secondary and post-secondary graduation requirements to the same extent as other subjects such as science or social studies. Having remained outside of the “core curriculum” could account for yet another reason for the lack of published research on preparing teachers to deliver second language learning. Considering the No Child Left Behind legislature,

the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) is working to establish foreign language study as a legitimate part of the core K-12 curriculum. ACTFL, joined by the U.S. House and Senate, has nationally declared 2005 “The Year of Languages.” ACTFL hopes that 2005 will begin a decade of increased FL study, and this organization is sponsoring numerous summits, monthly panel discussions, and unprecedented outreach to state policy makers, intending to impact school curriculum. “Start early and stay long” has become a sub-theme for the Year of Languages.

Rapidly changing demographics in K-12 schools are resulting in changes in the value of the traditional European education our country was founded upon. Sixty-five percent of America’s population growth in the next two decades will be non-Caucasian. The largest ethnic groups to experience growth will be Hispanic and Asian immigrants (Hodgkinson, 2001). This shift in the cultural composition of the typical classroom warrants attention to the values, motivators, and culturally-appropriate behaviors belonging to the diverse student population. Given that the U.S. teacher population remains largely Caucasian (Jorgenson, 2001), further challenges arise as traditional teachers struggle to deliver instruction to increasingly diverse groups of learners. Because of the nature of FL teachers’ cultural backgrounds, they are in a favored position to understand many of the multicultural issues embedded in the classroom setting. However, is their pedagogical repertoire inclusive of a more contemporary, wider array of content delivery methods or does methodological training remain traditionally oriented?

The influx of Hispanic and Asian immigrants to the U.S. has brought with it an increased awareness of and interest in the study of Spanish, Mandarin Chinese, and Japanese (College Board, 2004). The shortage of highly qualified and certified teachers in these growing languages has contributed to a growth in alternative certification programs (Darling-Hammond, 2001).

Frequently, native or heritage speakers (persons who were born in the U.S. into a non-English-speaking community) of the target languages are hired by districts to teach classes that they could not otherwise staff with the existing teacher workforce. The placement of alternatively certified teachers in foreign language classrooms gives rise to questions about the types of methodologies used for content delivery as well as their effectiveness. Second language fluency is only one piece of the foreign language instructional equation; possessing the necessary pedagogical content knowledge completes the equation.

In addition to the economic and demographic forces shaping the purpose and means of second language learning in the U.S., the matter is further complicated by lagging teacher education, particularly in the area of foreign language education. Second language pedagogy has undergone numerous recreations over the past 50 years, largely in response to social forces and to a growing body of knowledge about second language acquisition (Schulz, 2000). Now, the profession is focused on the National Standards which are categorized into the “five C’s” (See Appendix D). Foreign language teachers spent the second half of the last century trying to figure out how to get it right, searching for the “one way” that would promise to result in L2 fluency for all students. According to Vélez-Rendón (2002):

The body of knowledge and skills that a second language teacher needed two decades ago is no longer sufficient in today’s global and rapidly changing world. While knowledge of subject matter—viewed as grammar and pedagogy—sufficed 20 years ago, today’s second language teacher faces challenges that require a wider array of competencies. (p. 461)

Several studies reveal that teachers tend to teach with methods and approaches very similar to how they themselves were taught (Britzman, 1991; Grossman, 1990; Wideen, Mayer-Smith, &

Moon, 1998), so the perpetuation of outdated methodologies is rampant. Typical L2 classroom instruction in the U.S. is slow to respond to the recommended pedagogical changes.

With the growing acceptance of the ACTFL (1999) *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century*, “At last there is a useful framework of anticipated content knowledge and skills upon which to build models for articulation from elementary school to college” (Seabold & Wallinger, 2000, p. 3). Prior to the clear articulation of student outcomes, the profession engaged in debates about methodology without having first agreed on what the result of the processes should look like. Seabold and Wallinger (2000) state, “Selecting a teaching method without defining the goal of instruction is like picking your travel route before you know your destination” (p. 3). Gradually, the K-12 teacher workforce is becoming more aware that the Standards exist. The integration of culture with the four skills (speaking, writing, reading, and listening), the use of authentic materials, and performance assessments are hallmarks of Standards-based teaching. The foreign language teaching profession is evolving, but clearly not all instruction is yet delivered in keeping with 21st Century practices.

Compounding the problematic nature of combining ever-changing methodologies with a slowly changing teacher workforce is the issue of post-secondary methodological training. College-level L2 instructors have reacted more slowly than their secondary counterparts to the adoption of the National Standards as the accepted means of content delivery (Guntermann, 2000). Vélez-Rendón (2002) states, “While it is true that many second language teacher educators are seasoned and reflective thinkers, it is also true that many need to rethink their roles and renew their practices” (p. 464).

Therefore, a great many factors are driving the need for the profession to carefully examine the preparation of new foreign language teachers. The addition of alternatively certified teachers

and a growing interest in non-European languages brings new challenges to pedagogical practices. A mono-ethnic teacher work force confronted with greater student diversity creates the need for increased reflectivity on content delivery. As our nation begins to recognize foreign language study as vital to economic growth and harmonious community relationships, how will we insure that the preparation of new foreign language teachers results in teaching practices which will lead students to assured L2 proficiency?

Purpose of the Study

Vélez-Rendón (2002) states that teacher education has been taking place for years, but at the same time, the process of teacher education, and especially of foreign language teacher education is rarely studied. “A review of a more recent version of the handbook . . . and of current indexes of general educational journals confirms that issues related to second language teacher education are largely absent from this literature” (p. 458). She proposes that qualitative studies on teacher education will create the greatest knowledge base about how a new teacher develops his/her way of knowing. Freeman and Johnson (1998) and Schulz (2002) claim that research on foreign language teacher education is lagging a decade behind that of more general types of teacher education. Very few studies specifically examine the preparation of new foreign language teachers (Brown, 2001; Shocker-von Dittfurth, & Legutke, 2002). The few studies that do exist (e.g., Amores, 1999) are primarily related to teaching methodology for graduate teaching assistants at the university level rather than to secondary educators. This lack of research emphasis could be the result of a combination of circumstances. Post-Secondary foreign language departments often focus their research efforts on literature, linguistics, or culture, without making common connections between those sub-areas of study (Tesser & Long, 2000). There can be a lack of cooperation or coordination between foreign language departments and

schools of education within the greater university community. Goodlad (1990) blames the university community itself for according less value, prestige, funding and time to schools of education compared to schools of science and technology.

The author of this dissertation hopes that a large-scale research study conducted to examine post-secondary foreign language methods courses will serve to establish a baseline for the current state of foreign language teacher methodological preparation. This study aims to present a clearer picture than is currently available in the published literature regarding the content of pre-service foreign language methods training at the post-secondary level. By examining course syllabi, supplemented by instructor survey and questionnaire data, I hope to determine and to describe the types of content that are presented in foreign language methods courses at this time in the U.S. And, I would like to examine how the content relates to the integration of theory and practice, and how novices' beliefs are examined and shaped related to the development and enhancement of their pedagogical content knowledge. Finally, I hope to discover if the course content addresses newer Standards-based pedagogies.

Research Questions

1. What is the current content of post-secondary foreign language methods courses as reflected in the course syllabi?
2. How do post-secondary FL methods instructors address the development of pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) in pre-service teachers?
3. How do post-secondary FL methodology instructors guide novices to make connections between theory and practice?

Organization of the Dissertation

In Chapter 2, readers will find a review of the literature which examines the essential features of effective new teacher instruction. This section outlines post-secondary pre-service program necessities as well as unique features of secondary foreign language methodological instruction. Chapter 3 reports on the most commonly referenced theories related to second language acquisition, relating these theories to the grounding of methodological training in best practices. Next, I address other components that affect L2 teaching and learning such as cognition and motivation. Chapter 4 outlines the study design and the research methodologies used to examine the research question as related to the data collected. Finally, I present the data findings in Chapter 5, and report the conclusions from the data findings as well as make recommendations for further study in Chapter 6.

CHAPTER 2

PRE-SERVICE TEACHER PREPARATION: KEY FINDINGS FROM THE LITERATURE

Essential Features of Effective Pre-Service Teacher Preparation

Based on published studies (cited below), educators and academicians have identified five general areas essential to the preparation of pre-service teachers. The essential areas are: recognizing that novice teachers' beliefs impact the development of the professional-self, encouraging reflective practice and action research, developing content area expertise as well as pedagogical content knowledge (PCK), linking theory to practice, and lastly, bridging the university experience to the first two years of new teachers' induction support.

The Influence of Beliefs on Teacher Identity

Lortie (1975) postulates that novices' beliefs about teaching emerge from their 13,000 previous hours of classroom observation. Based on this "apprenticeship of observation," newly forming teachers arrive at their education coursework with intricately formed notions about teaching and teacher behaviors (Britzman, 1991; Grossman, 1990; Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998). Novices use previous teachers as models or anti-models to shape their own practices (Veléz-Rendón, 2002).

Since overcoming novices' "apprenticeship of observation" is one of pre-service teacher programs' biggest challenges, creating university programs which thoroughly examine and seek to shape their beliefs about teaching their subject areas becomes paramount (Britzman, 1991; Grossman, 1990; Wideen et al., 1998). Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (1999) clearly establish

that the key to learning new knowledge is the transfer of prior knowledge to the new so that the learner can make sense of new concepts within a social context. Thus, part of a successful pre-service teacher education program helps novices identify and examine their beliefs so that they can be reshaped, reinforced, or deconstructed (Kagan, 1992). Novices also need to be reminded that what is gained by classroom observation does nothing to familiarize them with the many “behind-the-scenes” duties related to teaching.

Grossman and Stodolsky (1995) suggest that research needs to be conducted to determine how teachers are socialized into departmental subcultures within schools and how that enculturation establishes subject-specific beliefs. They also recommend examining how the representation of different subjects within the university setting may establish curricular beliefs that are unique to each area, thereby shaping pre-service teachers’ attitudes about teaching. Subject area beliefs flavor how teachers respond to school reform efforts, how they are valued within the local school community, and how they perceive their own power to affect positive change. Unless novices consider how they wish to shape and to maintain their identities within the school and the foreign language department before entering the practice, classroom management issues, committee work, parental requests, and administrative directives could easily lead a novice to feel powerless and without voice (Britzman, 1991).

Career-long Reflective Practice

As outlined in Chapter 1, the face of American education is undergoing perpetual change, mirrored in our social and demographic composition. Changing circumstances often necessitate changes in or at the very least a renewed consideration of instructional practices, attitudes, and values. Novice teachers may graduate from their teacher preparation programs with a sense that they are “done.” For this reason, it is important that pre-service teacher education demonstrates

the need for risk-taking, collaboration, and reflection that can result in effective ongoing change and to enhance success (Hargreaves, 1994). Vélez-Rendón (2002) calls for teaching developing educators to plan, execute, and examine their own action-research inquiries. By conducting small-scale classroom studies, educators can make more informed and better decisions about their instructional practices (Kwo, 1996; Mok, 1994; Zephir, 2000).

Two studies specifically examined the effects of reflection on novice teacher practices. Kwo (1996) studied the consistency of pre-service teacher's perceived development and their actual improvements. Mok (1994) examined pre-service teachers' ways of knowing and their evolution via reflective practice. Both studies showed that pre-service teachers' practices were shaped by a combination of background knowledge and beliefs, interactions with other practitioners, theory, and practice. They both claimed that the use of action research in the pre-service programs helped to equip the novices with reflective skills. Zephir (2000) also advocates for teaching novices how to effectively use action research as a means to reflect upon and improve classroom practices.

Since classroom collections of students will differ from year to year, the assumption that methods used in the first year of teaching will continue to fit years later can be false. Teacher education programs must promote life-long learning, encourage reflective, informed practice, and foster collaboration (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001). In this way, novice teachers can continually renew and revitalize their teaching for career-long success.

Subject-area Expertise vs. Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Knowing how to impart content knowledge in a variety of ways so as to promote student achievement is equally important (Bransford et al., 1999; Britzman, 1991; Grossman, 1990; Grossman & Stodolsky, 1995). Instructional delivery, especially at the secondary level, is

perceived to be a teacher's most important duty. Not knowing how to be an effective classroom instructor leads to reduced satisfaction on the part of both students and teachers, which in turn leads to new teacher attrition (Gold, 1996; Smith & Ingersoll, 2003; Wilkerson, 2000).

The acquisition of pedagogical content knowledge happens over time and as a result of observing instruction, methodology training, and practice. Considering the instructional strategies that novices mimic based on their apprenticeship of observation, Guntermann (2000) emphasizes the role that universities play in the evolution and application of National Standards-based teaching and calls on university foreign language courses to more fully espouse the Standards in their instructional practices in order to influence tomorrow's teachers' PCK through observation. According to Schulz (2000), one of the biggest impediments to the improvement of pre-service foreign language teacher training is a lack of communication and cooperation between foreign language departments and schools of education, responsible for teacher training and certification. Pre-service teacher education programs can foster the richest development of PCK by collaborating outside of schools of education with the specific academic departments related to the subject matter. Creating opportunities for pre-service teachers to observe practitioners in the field with specific components of instruction in mind also serves to develop PCK. Richards (1998) advocates for meaningful and focused observation tasks in order to permit pre-service teachers to fully benefit from observing their veteran counterparts.

Feiman-Nemser and Parker (1995) studied the development of PCK by examining the conversations between beginning and mentor teachers with a focus on how PCK was addressed in those relationships. They organized the audio-taped discussions around four aspects of learning to teach academic knowledge:

(a) Deepening one's own understanding of a subject matter, (b) learning to think about academic content from the students' perspective, (c) learning to represent subject matter in appropriate and engaging ways, and (d) learning to organize students for teaching and learning academic content. (p. 32)

Based on current bodies of research, these authors maintain that teacher educators assume that novices have acquired a sufficient body of academic knowledge, and therefore treat pedagogy as something separate from content. It is interesting to note that Feiman-Nemser and Parker (1995) found that not all of the beginners who participated in the study demonstrated a thorough knowledge of content, and concluded that by working with experienced teachers, the novices could improve on content as well as on how to present it to students. Seemingly, this finding underscores the importance of discipline-specific methodological training. These authors also noted that “. . . teachers deal with particular content and particular students in particular settings” (p. 42). This raises a question about the value of teaching “generic” sorts of teaching strategies to beginners. However, Feiman-Nemser and Parker (1995) also determined that “Beginning teachers do not have a large repertoire of strategies for presenting their content, nor do they have a grounded understanding of what students are like as learners . . . and what problems students may encounter in learning specific content” (p. 33). Thus, it would seem necessary to at least begin to offer basic content delivery strategies in pre-service methods courses as a place from which to begin building the repertoire. At the same time, novices must learn how to conduct their own means of feedback analysis and action research in order to reflect on learned strategies and to adapt them to unique sets of learners.

Lastly, Feiman-Nemser and Parker (1995) discuss the need to teach novices how to organize students for learning. This represents the intersection of PCK and classroom management. They

conclude that one of the factors influencing the content of teacher training programs is the perception that until a teacher can manage a class, instruction cannot occur. Yet, if one considers classroom management from a content-driven perspective, it is knowing how to establish “. . . appropriate routines and procedures, communicate clear expectations, [and] manage different types of tasks and activities . . .” (p. 41) as appropriate for different types of learning which will lead to the most effective sorts of content delivery.

Another consideration regarding pre-service teacher education in the post-modern era and PCK is the infusion of technology. Much of instruction is comprised of teachers interacting with students and knowledge. Since the use of technology changes the ways that information may be accessed and transmitted, it also changes the nature of teacher/student interactions, “. . . infusing an innovation into a complicated social environment” (Imig & Switzer, 1996, p. 221).

Shocker-von Ditfurth and Legutke (2002) designed a project that would foster both the use of new technology in FL teacher education and a university-secondary partnership. Believing that a new teacher’s expanding knowledge base must focus on the activity of teaching itself and on the context in which it takes place, they state that, “Dominant teaching formats at universities are transmission-oriented, and therefore contradict current ideologies of student-centeredness and communicative methodology” (p. 163). In the Shocker-von Ditfurth and Legutke study, student teachers were required to work in pairs to develop an Internet research project and to visit classrooms to execute the projects. Their tasks included helping with the web research, helping students process the information researched, and developing criteria for the evaluation of students’ research projects. During the project, student teachers communicated in the target language either face-to-face or by e-mail with their university instructors, with the classroom teachers, and with each other.

This type of reflective field study allowed the participants to consider how technology can support FL learning and how classroom contextual variables can affect its use. It also allowed the participants to reflect on their learning to teach skills, collect data, and compare their experiences with those of other participants. In addition to experiencing technology and teaching, the project leaders wished to model the creation of teaching practices. Like many others, they recognized the strength of pre-service teachers' "apprenticeship of observation" and used the technology project to demonstrate collaborative, reflective practice within a context.

Effective classroom practices spring from the development of subject area expertise and pedagogical content knowledge. Without subject specific expertise, new teachers will not likely establish respected relationships with peers, parents, and students. Lack of subject matter knowledge is one of supervising teachers' primary criticisms of student teachers (Cooper, 2004). We must be reminded that content knowledge alone does not signify a teacher. Without the ability to engage students, all that remains is a subject area expert, not a teacher. It is the negotiation and mediation of content knowledge that will support learning.

Connecting Theory to Practice

"There is evidence in the general teacher education literature that teacher education programs have little bearing on what pre-service teachers do in their classrooms" (Veléz-Rendón, 2002, p. 460). Numerous studies have documented new teachers' and student teachers' complaints that teacher education programs did little to prepare them for "real world" experiences, effective classroom management, and teaching in multi-cultural settings (Britzman, 1991; Cooper, 2004; Goodlad, 1990; Grossman, 1990; Shulman, 1990; Wideen et al., 1998). Pre-service teachers considered their methodological training far too theoretical, and once in the classroom, they relied more on their apprenticeship of observation and on their beliefs than they did on new

theoretical approaches presented in formative courses. In a study of 20 French and 20 Spanish teachers with secondary certification who were seeking FLES (Foreign Language in Elementary Schools) certification, follow-up survey data indicated a positive response to methodological training that was offered in direct conjunction with a classroom setting (Knight, Palka, & Richardson, 1998). In addition to PCK, the literature considers the incorporation of theory into pre-service methods training essential (Guntermann, 1993; Tedick & Walter, 1998). Therefore it seems that effective pre-service methodological training would encourage teacher candidates to ground the practices that they develop or that they observe in veteran teachers to the theoretical frameworks presented in their methods coursework.

Smagorinsky, Cook, and Johnson (2003) propose a change in terminology within teacher education circles, favoring the use of “concept development” instead of “theory” and “practice.” Based on 20 case studies of pre-service language arts teachers, Smagorinsky et al. explain:

This process of concept development is mediated by activity in cultural practice. Vygotsky (1987) argues that instruction in principles alone will not result in the development of a concept; rather, knowledge of abstracted governing rules must come in conjunction with empirical demonstration, observation, or activity. (p. 9)

Given that university and school cultures are not likely to be well synchronized, Smagorinsky et al. acknowledge the challenge created by the reformulation of the pseudoconcepts surrounding teaching gained in university courses. The authors believe that once new teachers arrive in their own classrooms, the values and even the language used to talk about concepts may be very different from that which has held students’ attention in the post-secondary setting. The findings from the Smagorinsky et al. study make a strong case for the need to develop partnerships between colleges and schools in the area of new teacher formation.

Bridging the New Teacher Preparation Continuum

Mellgren and Caye (1989) highlight that the key to successfully tying post-secondary methodological training to effective classroom practice is collaboration between institutions of higher learning and local schools, trust among the collaborating parties, time, patience, and an evolutionary approach. Clark (1988) notes that the term collaboration goes far beyond a cooperative, mutual agreement and encompasses “. . . development of the model of joint planning, joint implementation, and joint evaluation between individuals and organizations” (p. 38). Collaborating participants, from university personnel to school personnel to the pre-service teachers, need be involved in ongoing evolution and evaluation of the entire program.

Furthermore, the secondary/post-secondary collaboration must not be limited to the pre-service years, but rather extend through the first two years of novice teaching. Because “high-stakes testing” is currently the industry standard for measuring teaching success, beginning teachers will likely be frustrated by the prescribed needs to cover material and to teach to the test (Kauffman, Johnson, Kardos, Liu, & Peske., 2002). Novices can feel that they have been duped by all of the theory they have learned in college, which they cannot put immediately to use (Freiberg, 2002). Pragmatics generally win over creativity. Unfortunately, the type of process-product data gathered by standardized testing data usually results in the creation of lists of what teachers “should do” or “what works,” without addressing the question about *why* certain types of teacher behaviors lead to instructional gains and others do not (Shulman, 1990). Reflective practice wanes, and with it, potential opportunities to test and to build new knowledge. And the schism between theory learned in college courses and teaching in the “real world” only widens.

By establishing and maintaining ties between the university personnel who prepare pre-service teachers and the induction support leaders in schools, a mutual informing can occur. Pre-

service teaching experiences can be examined through the lens of classroom practice, and induction programs can serve to bridge theory and practice (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Reynolds, 1995). Graham, Hudson-Ross, Adkins, McWhorter, and Stewart (1999) have shown that building communities of teachers both within schools and between schools and universities can help to diminish teachers' feelings of isolation and foster collaborative groups for reflective discussion about teaching practices.

Bransford et al. (1999) best underscore this need to connect college and induction experiences by explaining that new information must make sense within the context where it is presented, as well as bridge existing knowledge. Shepherding novices through their induction experiences will help to seal the success of the pre-service teaching coursework by reminding candidates that they can safely rely upon their theoretical framework. It will also enhance their learning because they will have a context within which to situate their background knowledge. Lack of ongoing support ignores the critical years when new teachers are re-shaping their beliefs about teaching, improving and expanding their PCK, and needing assistance as they deal with unfamiliar persons and situations.

Additional Issues Related to Foreign Language Teacher Preparation

The National Standards Movement

Dedicated teachers are a valiant lot. In the face of public scrutiny and criticism, educators are striving to insure the quality of the profession. In collaboration with state licensing agencies and due in large part to teachers' efforts, there now exist several layers of professional standards by which the quality of teacher behaviors can be judged. These are professional accountability systems that range from NCATE (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) standards for new teacher certification, to INTASC (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and

Support Consortium) standards applied to teachers just finishing their induction years, to NBPTS (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards) used to identify experienced, master teachers (See Appendices A, B, & C, respectively). The development of the three groups of standards for foreign languages teachers was closely tied to the ACTFL Standards. The implications of these sets of benchmarks are far reaching. Individual states have either adopted the use of these national standards or similar sets of criteria. The purpose of Standards-based licensure is to attempt to guarantee, in a sense, that all certified teachers have indeed met a minimal criteria of classroom and subject area competencies. Since we believe that teaching will in some way have an impact on or result in learning, the profession is seeking ways to document, through standards, artifacts, and portfolios, that individual teachers indeed possess the ability to lead groups of students through the schools' curricula and onto success. The criteria set forth in the ACTFL/NCATE, INTASC, and NBPTS standards, created over the course of the past decade, provide evidence of a national movement towards making the connection between teacher behaviors and student learning.

The various sets of standards all address three larger areas: teacher knowledge of the subject and how it pertains to varied instructional delivery, teacher knowledge of students and the greater educational community, and ongoing teacher growth and professionalism. Allen (2002) surveyed foreign language teachers in three Midwestern states in order to uncover how familiar these teachers are with the National Standards and how consistent their beliefs are with the new trends in Standards-based instruction. The responses to the survey suggest that although teachers are aware of the standards and believe that foreign language instruction should take place in the target language using communicative approaches, foreign language instruction usually followed a coverage model (Chaffee, 1992), where the course content is determined by the textbook in use

and teaching is viewed as the transfer of information. The suggested implication for pre-service foreign language teacher education is that:

Because their language learning experiences were most likely guided by the coverage model, [pre-service teachers] need exposure to other models that are based on contextualized, meaningful language use . . . [they] may benefit from opportunities to experiment and to interpret standards based models in the context of their own . . . circumstances. (Allen, 2002, p. 525)

In other words, within the Standards lie important instructional components with which pre-service teachers must be familiar if the Standards are to achieve the desired instructional impact.

Guntermann (2000) discusses the National Standards as they relate to the ACTFL Performance Guidelines (See Appendix D), which describe what students should be able to do with their L2 skills. She advocates for an instructional emphasis on concrete, hands-on, personalized experiences and describes how Standards-based instruction looks very different from traditional methodologies. Guntermann also underscores the need for teachers to examine their assessment practices and to include more performance and authentic assessments, in keeping with the Standards. Pedagogical reform must encompass all aspects of instruction, and in L2 instruction, assessments should provide a language use experience (i.e., an opportunity to produce or to intake L2 in a meaningful way), as well as generate data about student performance.

Diversity and change are hallmarks of the post-modern age (Hargreaves, 1993, 1994), and NBPTS Standards number two and number five (See Appendix C) both address the issue of teachers' ability to adapt instructional delivery to a variety of learners using a wide range of strategies. The INTASC Standard number 3 (See Appendix B) also calls for teachers' ability to

relate to a diverse learner population. NCATE Standard 3b signals learner diversity as something a brand new teacher should be able to cope with. Yet, novice teachers may not have fully developed a broad repertoire, or may gravitate towards a singular teaching style based on his/her personal preferences. In fact, Cooper (2001) studied the relationship between FL teachers' personality styles and their own learning styles. Cooper's findings indicate that teachers will likely embrace an instructional style that aligns with their own learning style, and they also tend to mimic methods to which they were subjected as learners.

Cultural Competence

Yet another sign of our post-modernity, American FL education is somewhat driven by the nation's demands in the fields of international business, diplomacy, and more recently, defense. Foreign language teaching is still an emerging discipline. Instruction has migrated away from linguistic training as a means in and of itself to the use of language as a tool to unlock the cultures that it represents. Thus the profession draws upon other disciplines: sociology, anthropology, social psychology, political science, and economics, in order to better understand and appreciate the cultures of the target languages studied. This open-mindedness and appreciation of a target culture is termed "cultural competence." Cultural competence also includes a basic familiarity with the target culture's daily practices and products as well as with the values that shape them.

The ACTFL Guidelines for Foreign Language Teacher Education include culture as one of the "five C's" that are the integral components of language teaching (See Appendix D). Of primary importance regarding the "cultural C" is the need to show and understand relationships; first between language and culture and next between the target culture and our own. Consequently, culture has unlimited facets: personal interaction, art and history of the people

who speak the target language, and even current events. The teaching dilemma has been how to describe culture in such a way that it can be assessed as a competency. And, how much and which kind of cultural knowledge should teachers have? How should pre-service teachers acquire their cultural competency? Should it be accomplished through L2 courses or in education courses?

Nostrand (1989) urges individual agencies and local colleges of education to push forward with this need for intercultural education until the arrival at a nationwide consensus. One of the major impediments to the requirement of cultural competence in new teachers is that the need for other types of subject matter competencies tend to be more important to school administrators, especially when teacher candidates are scarce.

L2 Teacher Fluency

In addition to the aforementioned essential components of meaningful pre-service teacher preparation, foreign language teacher preparation is further complicated by the need for novices to develop a high level of fluency in the language they will teach. Schulz (2002) cites a failure of university programs to provide new foreign language teacher candidates with the necessary proficiency as one of the three major problems in language teacher education. Flannigan (2004, personal communication) underscores the fact that without adequate L2 proficiency, teachers cannot do the basics of their job: communicate effectively in the target language. Because of their lack of proficiency, novice teachers turn away from more communicative methodologies and rely on more traditional, grammar-focused teaching.

Cooper (2004) reports findings from surveying 437 novice foreign language teachers, currently teaching in Georgia, about their pre-service training. It appears that one of novices' greatest deficiencies is in the areas of L2 proficiency. The concept of teacher fluency is also

addressed in the newly formed National Standards for FL teaching. In a qualitative study of three student teachers, Clement (2003) notes that the candidates recognized their own L2 deficiency as detrimental to the complete success of their student teaching experience.

Lafayette (1993) takes L2 fluency one step further, recommending that prospective teachers need more than a knowledge of linguistic structures. He posits that they need a strong background in applied linguistics, SLA theories, and how language theory is applied to instruction. Liskin-Gasparro's explanation offers why novice teachers may lack the proficiency they need to perform in L2 at the prescribed ACTFL "advanced-low" level:

Language departments and teacher-preparation programs are both constrained by wider educational and social forces. That the linguistic proficiency of beginning teachers is a major topic of concern in FL professional circles is related to such realities as the limited place of foreign languages in K-12 curricula and the marginalized status generally of speakers of languages other than English in the United States. It is one of the great ironies of the late twentieth century that initiatives to improve the linguistic proficiency of beginning foreign language teachers exist side-by-side in state legislatures with language policy measures that discourage the development and maintenance of bilingualism. (1999, p. 285)

Novice teachers may not arrive at their university-level studies having already attained a working fluency in the second language. And, given their need to fulfill all of the undergraduate certification and general graduation requirements, they may not be able to pursue an adequate number of post-secondary classes in the L2 to achieve the prescribed levels of L2 performance, according to the Standards.

SLA and Best Practices

One of the central questions to foreign language education becomes how to best acquire a second language. It is a critical factor for the teacher who had to learn the language, and for the student who may be subjected to a plethora of methodologies, all promising to lead to L2 fluency. The FL profession has endured countless fads and methodological swings, each proposing content delivery strategies and claims to raise achievement for all students.

Hargreaves (1994) explains:

Today's solutions often become tomorrow's problems. Future exhibits in our museums of innovation might include whole-language, cooperative learning, or manipulative math. Singular models of expertise which rest on supposedly certain research bases are built on epistemological sand. (p. 60)

Because L2 acquisition is highly complicated and varies contextually, it is of the utmost importance that secondary FL teachers have an understanding of the multiple facets to the query and a solid epistemology on which to build their practices. Perhaps teacher education can undo this dependency framework by encouraging new teachers to rely on their own solid L2 fluency, theory, best practices, and reflective risk-taking.

Chapter Summary

There is a fundamental difference between the teaching of foreign languages and the teaching of other subject areas. That difference is that the medium is the message. Foreign language teachers are teaching the second language while operating in that language as a mode of instruction. Only L2 teachers have the added burden of creating activities for students in which both the content and the language to discuss the content together form instruction. This unique feature of language teaching creates special challenges and considerations in the

preparation of new foreign language teachers. From the work of Sullivan (2001), the following capture the challenges involved in foreign language teacher preparation:

1. Knowledge and fluency of the language being taught is essential, but only half of the picture.
2. Although native speakers may be fluent in the nuances of the language, they may also be very inadequate teachers due to their lack of experience with American culture, an incomplete understanding of educational goals, and little to no pedagogical content knowledge.
3. New foreign language teachers often work in isolation, and perhaps without the support from a well-articulated curriculum and same-subject peers.
4. Generic university methods courses (for all subjects) do not address the needs of foreign language instruction.
5. Foreign Language methods courses may be taught by individuals with little or no K-12 experience but rather with a background in second language acquisition theory, applied linguistics, and/or literary analysis.
6. Professional assessment of language teachers, such as portfolios, must be appropriately adjusted to reflect the uniqueness of foreign language teaching.
7. Novice teachers must learn to select authentic materials for instruction, and additionally know the techniques for making those materials cognitively accessible to their students.
8. Novice teachers must know how to personalize language tasks and give do-able assignments at the student level, and provide appropriate assessments of those tasks.

Past practices in foreign language education which required a strict knowledge of L2 grammar with literary analysis as an end goal of instruction no longer suffice in this century.

World language teaching has also spread to the middle and elementary grades, making past methodologies even more antiquated (Knight et al., 1998). Today, oral proficiency, communicative competence, and contextualized learning underscore acceptable practice. Sociolinguistic features, discourse, and strategic competencies have been added to the list of curricular goals. The need to deliver instruction in the target language places an additional burden on classroom teachers, confronted with their own need to enhance productive language skills. Novice foreign language teacher-learners have already developed their own set of strategies for SLA which may or may not be compatible with the learning and/or implementation of newer communicative methods (Schick & Nelson, 2001).

By recognizing that the teacher is the key element to school change and improvement, it is necessary to examine the process by which teaching and learning can be positively impacted. As the profession prepares to embrace the next, newest generation of teachers, it will be absolutely imperative that every teacher, regardless of the path taken to arrive in the classroom, understands the great complexities of all that it means to be a teacher. The recruiting, training, and retention of highly qualified professionals must be a national priority. And the pre-service methods course is a critical, foundational element in establishing professional habits that can lead to classroom success and job satisfaction.

The complex nature of teaching in the post-modern age combined with the challenges of competent foreign language teaching creates an almost impossible teacher preparation scenario. However, by focusing on outcomes based on the published teacher standards, and by espousing reflective practice, new foreign language teachers stand a chance of becoming vibrant, competent contributors to the profession.

Given our post-modern national agenda for school reform, accountability, and student achievement, it stands to reason that all teachers, regardless of how they arrive in the classroom, should be held to the same standards. Thus, the foreign language teaching profession must closely examine how foreign language teachers develop their pedagogical content knowledge and their general repertoire of teaching skills. Without such knowledge, their ability to impact instruction, to reflect on experience, and to learn from mistakes may be severely limited.

CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL INFLUENCES ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING PRACTICES

Researchers have identified many frameworks with which they propose to categorize, define, and describe SLA. This portion of the dissertation describes the most widely accepted SLA paradigms and identifies how each informs pedagogy as well as how each does not. After considering SLA theories, this section also addresses other important factors which impact foreign language instructional design such as: cognition, learner variables, and the affective domain.

Second Language Acquisition Theories

In the center of the professional debates about best foreign language pedagogical practices resides an array of theories which inform the SLA process. In other words, if one can grasp how languages are acquired, one can use that knowledge to create effective instructional practices, or to justify the sorts of pedagogy that one espouses. While there are many SLA theorists and several categories and sub-categories of SLA theory, the three primary theoretical camps are: nativism, psycholinguistics, and socio-cultural theory.

Nativism

Linguist, Noam Chomsky (1965, 1980), has proposed that language is not learned, but rather innate. His studies claim that the grammars of all languages can be described by a set of universal principles, and that the differences among languages can also be explained by a finite set of parameters that are equally innate. These claims led to the identification of universal principles of language hierarchy that Chomsky calls “Universal Grammar” (UG). Chomsky

suggests that there is an innate part of the brain called the Language Acquisition Device (LAD) through which UG is accessed. During a critical period, ages 2 to 10 years, children sort phonemes and grammar rules, discarding those that are not used in the child's first language. (In the literature, L1 is used to mean one's first, native language, and L2 signifies an individual's second, non-native language.) Chomsky refers to this language-specific parameter setting as the "structure dependency principle." All humans, according to Chomsky, are born with this "pre-wired" language system in the brain.

When considering bilingual persons, Chomsky's "interdependent hypothesis" posits that L2 learners have full access to the already developed UG in L1. Learners seek to cognitively develop mathematical-type formulas about L2 and to reset their UG parameters or to form new ones. This hypothesis proposes that L1 and L2 "cohabitate" in the same portion of the brain and that a bilingual person is using a single UG device and merely making unconscious parameter choices depending on the language being used. Hall (2001) explains this process as follows:

As we know, learners' first language is always present in their minds as they are learning a second language. Indeed, the two systems are so closely linked that what one does or learns to do in one has a significant impact on what one can do and learns to do in the other. (p. 95)

Based on L2 learners' struggles with L1 interference during L2 production as described above, it would seem that the cohabitation of parameters might only occur after the individual has developed a high level of fluency with L2, regardless of how the acquisition occurred.

Another consideration which is changing the nature of L2 instruction is that about 20% of students enrolled in U.S. public schools claim a language other than English as their first language (Toppo, 2003). Thus, we must ask the question about the potential benefits of making

some connections between English and the new foreign language for the purpose of fostering the development of students who can function appropriately in multiple languages. The ACTFL “Comparisons” standard states that “Students benefit from language learning by discovering different patterns among language systems . . .” (See Appendix D).

A proponent of UG would position that languages cannot be taught, and thus L2 learning is an innate linguistic process that is triggered by the input of grammatical features. Through interactional modifications and the noticing of syntactic features, L2 learners reset their UG parameters as a result of exposure to L2. In other words, UG scholars are primarily interested in the cerebral processes at a syntactical level that occur as a result of input (Cook 1993; Fowler 2002).

Because UG limits linguistic examination to the acquisition of grammatically acceptable speech caused by input, UG theory alone cannot account for every aspect of SLA. For example, severely isolated children do not learn grammatical language. Interaction therefore appears to be an essential component of language acquisition (Rymer, 1994). Nor does the nativist perspective account for the learning of socially appropriate language. UG does not address sociolinguistic issues such as register, tone, etc. Additionally, it *is* possible for people to learn a second language after the critical period. High school students who do not begin their L2 study until grade nine have often continued their foreign language studies to the point of demonstrated L2 fluency.

Psycholinguistic Theory

Building on Chomsky’s theories about the role of interactional modifications as related to SLA, Stephen Krashen’s Input Hypothesis claims that language is acquired by understanding what we hear or read, without conscious attention to language form (Krashen 1992, 1999).

Similar to UG proponents, he postures that SLA occurs as the result of exposure to linguistic opportunities. Unlike UG theorists who are more interested in what the end result looks like than the process, Krashen (1992) takes one more step by hypothesizing that L2 acquisition occurs only when the input is comprehensible. If the input is well beyond the learner's level of comprehension, the input remains "unavailable" to the learner. Thus, he created his "i + 1" hypothesis. The "i" represents the input which is generally assumed to be written or spoken language. The forms (grammar) in the input should only be just beyond the learner's current level of linguistic competence.

Krashen (1992) also argues that it is unlikely for SLA to occur due to conscious learning, and thus, it would seem that instruction is futile since language *teaching* assumes that L2 acquisition is a conscious process. Thus, many have assumed that since instruction cannot lead to acquisition, the role of pedagogy becomes one of providing an input-rich environment within which instruction strives to manipulate the input in such a way that it becomes comprehensible to the learner. How instruction makes input comprehensible can take a variety of shapes. For example, Total Physical Response Storytelling (TPRS) methodology provides gestures, pictures, and stories for the purpose of clarifying input to the learner (Ray & Seely, 2002).

In their treatment of grammar instruction, Ray and Seely (2002) claim that, "Emphasizing rules early forces students to slow down their speech and edit it more, meaning that they may always be editing when they speak. A byproduct of learning is hesitancy, which is the opposite of fluency" (p. 131). The first criticism of such a statement about fluency is that it assumes a very narrow definition of what constitutes fluency. Ray and Seely (2002) define fluency as a quick rate of speech. Psycholinguistics proponents may be imposing a stipulative definition for fluency which fits their argument but which conflicts with other definitions in the field. In fact,

fluency is defined by the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages on a broad variety of levels (1999). Native-like fluency is something that not even many language teachers achieve over a lifetime of use and study. However, a “working fluency,” or one’s ability to negotiate meaning and to make needs known is something that can be achieved regardless of the rate of speech. It is also noteworthy that a person’s lack of spoken accuracy can in fact lead to interference with the comprehension of the message by the listener. Thus for many, fluency is a combination of skills like vocabulary choices and syntactic control that, when properly orchestrated, create meaningful interactions.

Bragger and Rice (1999), in their article written to support content-based instruction, propose a new twist to Krashen’s Input Hypothesis (1992). They argue that when using authentic materials, it is necessary to choose content carefully, keeping in mind the level of the learner and the level of the input. The Bragger and Rice proposal expands Krashen’s theory to include both $C + 1$ and $L + 1$. $C + 1$ represents the content to be presented, and Bragger and Rice maintain that if the content is too far out of the students’ realm of experiences and contexts, it will not be effective. $L + 1$ symbolizes the language of the content.

Nonetheless, the value of Krashen’s $i + 1$ theory is of primary importance to the foreign language classroom. As teachers make every effort to deliver instruction in the target language, they must be equipped with ways to make L2 salient to the listeners. This is especially true for new native-speaker teachers. A decree to teach entirely in L2 does not mean a license to effervesce on a native-speaker level. Interactional modifications such as the rate of speech, repetitions, and appropriate vocabulary choices will greatly affect the learner’s ability to uptake the language to which he or she is exposed (Pica, 1992).

A weakness in the above-described psycholinguistic theory is that it downplays or minimizes the role of output in the SLA process. By engaging in output, students gain from recasting, an additional strategy which leads to SLA. Recasting is the act of reconsidering interpersonal or intrapersonal speech and reformulating it into more grammatically appropriate syntax. From a study of three and a half years of informal interactions, observations, and formal interviews of four Chinese immigrant high school students who were learning English, Harklau (1994) explains the value of language production in SLA this way: “Just as spoken output is hypothesized to be essential in developing L2 speaking proficiency, writing output-the process of composing and producing written texts-is viewed as necessary in order to develop proficiency in written mode” (p. 254).

In my own ongoing action research, graduating students answer a year-end exit survey asking them to identify the classroom activities or strategies which were the most beneficial to the development of their L2 fluency. In spite of the fact that instruction, readings, and other classroom activities are only conducted in L2, students rarely identify input as the most helpful component, perhaps because they take it for granted or because they consider their fluency as their own personal ability to produce the language. Students’ first answer to the inquiry is always the availability of a few valuable formulaic frameworks that they can rely on as a sort of safety net when they need to speak or write. Second, students identify frequent opportunities to *use* L2 as what causes them to perfect and to retain their skills. Peirce (1995) and Harklau (1994) also echo the value of language production in the L2 acquisition process.

Perhaps the reason that students perceive the importance of language production is explained by VanPatten (2002). He notes that “. . . how learners access their developing system to make output is also a distinct set of processes” (p. 762). Because speaking skills are so highly valued

and since students are publicly aware of their personal ability to produce meaningful speech, it is likely that more conscious effort is expended by students on output rather than on input.

VanPatten also awards a distinct value to learners' L2 output, explaining that, "Output may play a role as a focusing device that draws learners' attention to something in the input as mismatches are noted, and it may play a role in the development of fluency and accuracy" (p. 762). As students work consciously to create their output, they have cause to notice the tools that they are using to do so. Therefore, opportunities to speak or to write reinforce what students have taken in from the input provided.

Baum and Luna (2003) administered a survey in 2002 to students completing the Advanced Placement (AP) French, German, and Spanish Language Exams. The survey focused on students' experiences with SLA. In examining the results from more than 33,000 standard Spanish students, (i.e., true second language learners with no regular or familial contact with the language), their data show: "Regularly communicating in Spanish, either in the interpretive mode (i.e., reading, viewing/listening) or in the interpersonal mode (i.e., corresponding in writing and conversing), comprises behaviors strongly associated with superior performance" (p. 17). The Baum and Luna (2003) data indicate the need for both input and output as necessary to achieve superior levels of proficiency as demonstrated on the AP Exam.

Peirce (1995) claims that practicing L2 is an essential component of SLA. She states that this component is graded, "The more exposure and practice, the more proficient the learner will become" (p. 14). Exposure to L2 can be operationalized as opportunities to intake language while engaged in reading or auditory functions. Practice can be interpreted as either the output functions of speaking and writing or the opportunity to intake language.

While psycholinguistic theory offers sound arguments related to the importance of making input salient to the learner, it downplays the role of output in the SLA process. Furthermore, psycholinguistic theory studies the intrapersonal over the interpersonal; the latter of which is demonstrated (below) as important to acquisition.

Socio-cultural Theory

Lev Vygotsky (1978), the father of socio-cultural theory argues that language and cognition are intertwined, emphasizing, “. . . mental functioning has its origins in social activity” (in Belz & Kinginger, 2000, p. 28). Vygotsky believes that language is the vehicle through which other forms of cognition develop. He points out that there are relationships between “form” and “function” of language since learning the social meanings of linguistic structures are a vital part of the SLA process.

Vygotsky believed that learning occurs within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). He saw the ZPD as a dynamic social setting within which meaning is constantly changing and evolving. For teaching and learning, the ZPD is the ability zone within which each individual student can make progress. Teachers would say that they take students from where they are, and provide them with appropriate challenges to cause learning. In athletic terms, a trainer would find the athlete’s target heart rate, and then push that athlete to improve his or her heart rate to just a few beats more, just enough to cause improvement in the individual’s physical fitness level. If the trainer does not correctly determine the athlete’s capabilities, the athlete will either not improve his or her physical abilities or will be pushed to perform at levels that are dangerously unsafe. The ZPD is much the same. And, the ZPD undergoes perpetual change. As students learn more, they are capable of extending their zones to higher places, thereby resetting their baseline of abilities.

Socio-cultural theory supports the notion that language development is the result of collaborative interaction. Socio-cultural theory assumes that L2 learners are noticing language and syntax through pragmatic functions that arise as they attempt to communicate. Ohta (1999) examined the effects of recasts on auditors in a classroom setting. The study shows that recasts are noticed by more people than solely the student to whom the recast is directed by the teacher. Ohta states, "Learner responses to incidental recasts provide evidence of the salience of the contrasts. Results show that what functions as corrective feedback from the learner's perspective is quite different from what an analyst might identify. . ." (p. 57). In other words, students who are comparing their own private talk with recasts provided to a classmate notice gaps between the recast and their previously hypothesized notions about meaning and form. Thus, classroom interactions provide continual vicarious potential to notice linguistic contrasts. Learners use their private speech, ". . . to compare their production with that of others or of the teacher" (Ohta, 1999, p. 63). In this study, the noticing of contrasts within the interactive classroom setting leads to acquisition.

Of great importance in all of the versions of socio-cultural theories is the concept of scaffolding. Scaffolding can be defined as ". . . understood in cognitive psychology as progressive help provided by the more knowledgeable to the less knowledgeable" (Nassaji & Cumming, 2000, p. 98). Like recasts, scaffolding allows learners to make hypotheses about L2 meaning and form, thus promoting acquisition in an interactional way.

Nassaji and Cumming (2000) examined the scaffolding process for two years through the journal entries of a six-year-old speaker of Farsi and his English teacher during the course of grades one and two. They analyzed comments written back to the young student by his teacher and the ways that he used her scaffolding to improve his own output. These authors were able to

demonstrate that the teacher improved Ali's competence using scaffolding, which provided a sustained, dynamic, and interactive means of communication.

In a study of five dyads of adults enrolled in an intensive beginning Spanish class, Anton and DiCamilla (1999) transcribed audio recordings during three collaborative sessions to determine the use of L1 as a scaffolding tool leading to SLA. While the scaffolding is not asymmetrical, (the learners are at nearly the same level of competence), the act of partnered collaboration allowed the learners to scaffold each other, one providing information that the other perhaps lacked. This study also raises the question of the value of L1 in the process of L2 acquisition. Anton and DiCamilla state, “. . . L1 is deployed to provide scaffolded help in the ZPD. By means of L1 the students enlist and maintain each other's interest in the task throughout its performance, develop strategies for making the task manageable, . . .” (p. 237). In a critical review of collaborative interaction, Wells (1999) also supports the notion that dialogic, collaborative tasks are essential to SLA, explaining, “. . . students' use of L1 plays a strategic cognitive role in scaffolding, in establishing intersubjectivity and externalizing their inner speech as is necessary to perform the task, achieve their goals, and thus realize their levels of potential development” (p. 250).

Other Theoretical Influences on FL Teaching Practices

Each of the above-mentioned theoretical camps contributes to the greater SLA picture in different ways. From the universal grammarians, it is noted that the brain seeks to establish linguistic patterns based on exposure to input. And, we find that when learning L2, there is often interference from L1 because of these already established patterns. Good teaching guides students to work within the parameters of what they can produce, and steers them away from the constant translation of their thoughts in L1 to L2. From psycholinguistics, we know that the

input provided in the classroom must be comprehensible in order for the learner to access it. We are also reminded that if the level of difficulty of the material is more than $i + 1$, the level of frustration will be too great for learning to take place. From the socio-cultural perspective, teachers are reminded that teaching and learning are interactive processes that take place within an ever-changing context. There is one overarching concept that cuts across all of the SLA theories—input. VanPatten explains, “. . . in all elaborated theories of acquisition, input is fundamental for acquisition and is needed for the creation of an underlying mental representation of the linguistic system” (2002, p. 763). The theoretical and instructional debate remains as to what that input should look like or sound like in an instructionally mediated environment. Nevertheless, what pure SLA theory has neglected to examine is the science of cognition and the learning strategies that learners may implement to enhance acquisition, nor do these theories account for affective variables in the SLA process.

Cognition

The many and varied versions of SLA theories lead us up to the question of secondary foreign language pedagogical practices. Can languages be taught or are they learned from experiences and exposure, or a combination of both? If languages can be taught, what is the proper focus of instruction? In contrast to socio-cultural theory which always considers discourse within a context, information-processing theories work to uncover problem-solving models in asocial conditions. These cognition theories generally use computer analogies to refer to how the brain processes and stores information. Often, the long-term memory is described much like a hard drive and the short-term memory is like the desktop where students can choose to save or to discard temporarily stored information. Instructional design theories and cognitive psychology,

which examine the processes of learning, can be very beneficial to teachers who strive to identify techniques to assist their students with attention, retention, and recall.

The role of cognition in SLA gives rise to lengthy debates in the field, especially with regards to the direct instruction of grammar and linguistic forms. Krashen (1999) performed a detailed investigation of recent studies that took place in university settings among intermediate or advanced adult English as a Second Language (ESL) learners. The goal of the review was to debunk the role of grammar in L2 instruction. Krashen believes that regardless of whether grammar instruction is inductive or deductive, it is still considered form-focused.

In spite of the studies' findings that grammar instruction was beneficial to SLA, Krashen (1999) states that the adult learners involved, “. . . were used to direct teaching of grammar, expected it, and had survived it” (p. 245). And when considering the control groups for many of the studies, he states that the evaluated groups were indeed involved in meaning focused situations, but that the environments were contrived and that the comprehensible input provided was minimal and impoverished. Furthermore, Krashen considered the assessment tools from the studies to be questionable. The assessments consisted of fill-in-the-blank, cloze, or other grammatical judgment tasks. Some used pre- and post-essays and speeches, but the students had been made aware that form was the critical feature of the evaluation. Krashen (1999) argues that the students performed well on these assessments because they had learned to follow a pattern, not because they had acquired linguistic competence, and he states:

These studies, thus, do not compare direct instruction and comprehensible input. Rather, they compare the impact of more or less direct instruction on tests designed to measure conscious learning. No data are provided that hint that conscious learning has more than a peripheral effect; nothing has changed in the theory of language acquisition. (p. 251)

Because of these and other factors, Krashen (1999) maintains that conscious learning is done outside of the LAD and uses the same mechanisms as other areas of cognition. Thus, his conclusion is that there is no evidence to justify the teaching of metalinguistic knowledge as a means to improving students' linguistic proficiency.

Bradi (1995) takes an opposing view, claiming that when “. . . a learner's attention is drawn to a target structure by explicit . . . input (the result was) short-term positive effects for learning the targeted structures” (p. 161). Of interest to foreign language instructors is Bradi's claim that only positive input, rather than negative (error correction) has a relevant effect on SLA. From another perspective, task-based types of instruction can seek to design functional linguistic activities, which draw attention to specific aspects of L2 morphemes (Skehan 1998). Ellis (1997) also argues that languages can indeed be taught, or at the very least, L2 acquisition is facilitated by instruction and by providing students with specific learning strategies to enhance retention of new material. These three authors demonstrate that causing a purposeful attention to form can and does enhance learning.

More recent data show that both form and meaning are necessary for a successful SLA experience (Zephir, 2000). That is to say that form-focused instruction with corrective feedback within a context has demonstrated enhanced SLA in a classroom setting. Through survey, Zephir found that new teachers believe that grammar and linguistics are the most important part of teaching. He believes that new teachers are predisposed to the belief that form-focused instruction is the generally accepted means of SLA because of their own SLA classroom experiences. The challenge then becomes convincing new FL teachers of the need to provide an appropriate blend of both form and meaning.

Zephir (2000) also discusses the great debates about inductive versus explicit explanations with regards to grammar instruction. Since there are no guarantees that inductive learning will lead all students to correct concepts, and since analytical learners are frustrated by inductive learning, it is more common practice among those who shun grammar explanations to present structures in such a way that they are “favored” while used in meaningful input.

Processing Instruction (PI) provides an approach to L2 instructional delivery that favors both form and meaningful input (VanPatten, 2002). VanPatten proposes that language forms with less frequent communicative value may not be acquired by learners without assistance. L2 instructors can provide assistance by considering that input, spoken or written language, will likely differ from intake, the language that students focus on and eventually retain. PI is a three-step method whereby forms are explained to students at a syntactic level, learners are made aware of high-frequency interpretational pitfalls based on expected traditional paradigms, and finally meaningful interpretational exercises draw students’ attention to the content of the input so that it stands an increased chance of retention. We are reminded again of Chomsky’s theory of the LAD and paradigm setting (1965, 1980). VanPatten’s data show that students’ interpretive skills improve and are retained on post-tests. He maintains that acquisition is enhanced since learners engage in less trial and error to create L2 paradigms and instead, are more likely to understand structurally embedded meanings.

Further data suggest that instruction and exposure contribute to SLA in different and unique ways. Shresta (1998) studied the speech samples of two groups of ESL learners. The group that had learned English by exposure demonstrated greater fluency with the language. Fluency was defined by the study as a quick rate of speech. The group that learned English via formal classroom grammar-based instruction demonstrated greater accuracy in their speech. One might

conclude that both rate of speech and accuracy are desired outcomes of effective L2 instruction and therefore determine that inductive as well as explicit types of instruction can serve to enhance learning.

To help resolve the debate about favored SLA methodologies, studies on cognition and the science of learning can further inform foreign language teaching practices. Bruer (2001) states that theory for any instruction should address the ways in which knowledge can be structured so that it can be most easily grasped by the learner. Instructional theory should also consider how to effectively sequence the presentation of new material. Bruer outlines the logical steps of instructional presentation as: simplifying, generating new propositions, and increasing the manipulation of information. The idea of simplifying is especially pertinent to L2 instruction since language used for instruction must be salient to the learner.

Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (1999), cognitive psychologists, make a strong case in favor of teaching students specific strategies for problem solving and for the organization and storage of knowledge so that it can be accessed at a later time for the completion of a meaningful task. Bransford et al. (1999) cite studies which show that when students are taught how to transfer their previously acquired knowledge and to metacognitively monitor the effects of the transfer processes, they will be more likely to develop stronger problem-solving and critical thinking skills. Brown (1982) echoes the plea from Bransford et al. to teach students to systematically move a step beyond pure isolated cognition. Brown underscores the fact that teaching students to mediate their learning and to make appropriate revisions when errors are detected allows students to react to the material being learned rather than to their own ability (or lack of ability) to master new concepts. In this way, students are empowered to learn. Hall (2001) also argues in favor of embedding the teaching of learning strategies into classroom activities. Weinstein and

Mayer (1986) classify learning strategies into types such as: rehearsal, elaboration, organization, management strategies, comprehension monitoring, and anxiety reduction. They hypothesize that learning is greatly enhanced when students can combine domain-specific knowledge with generalized learning strategies. Weinstein and Mayer (1986) state that “. . . general techniques are part of the arsenal of knowledge that a learner needs for effective learning” (p. 325).

Successful FL teaching imparts both the content as well as how to master and apply the content.

Cognition theories remind us that there are strategies we can teach our students to help them organize and monitor their progress through the mastery of new knowledge. One final consideration before making instructional delivery choices related to new content is to engage in backward planning; rehearsing for and building on the tasks and performance assessments designed to cause students to think beyond mere recall. Since the testing instrument often drives the methodology, by examining the desired outcomes, and by knowing how students acquire their skills along the way, foreign language instruction will be in a better position to appropriately align a learner-centered curriculum. Once program goals have been set, the learning tasks become more relevant and instructors can direct L2 students to connect their learning in meaningful, communicative ways and design assessments that reflect the goals of each lesson. Bransford (2001) and Krashen (1999) also remind us that the testing instrument used will often determine students’ perception of their success or failure. For the student who does not know how to implement new knowledge for the sake of thinking, or as is the case in SLA, for the sake of communicating, new information remains useless. Teachers who consider what the end product of the lesson should look like and then guide students with lesson-appropriate strategies and rehearsal of skills may find that their students perceive themselves to be fairly successful.

Learner Variables

Language teachers have begun to accommodate individual learners in the classroom by attempting to meet the various linguistic, communicative, and sociocultural goals of their students, while at the same time adapting their instruction to meet students' differing language learning needs. In general, the philosophy of second language instruction is changing to one that is more interactive and communicative, and less static and teacher-centered (Cohen, 2000, p. 14).

Foreign language teaching is a complex process. The number of variables that affect each community of learners is infinite, providing an on-going challenge to instructors as they strive to promote successful learning. One must consider the involvement of the learner in the classroom process, and how the learner's level of interest as well as his abilities can affect the FL experience. Bailey, Daley, and Onwuegbuzie (1999) maintain that learning may be impeded as a result of incongruities between the teaching style of the instructor and the learning style of the student. And there is a strong correlation between particular learning styles and FL anxiety. Novice FL teachers need to be skilled in evaluating students' learning styles (the automatic or individual characteristics of the learner, or how s/he retains new information) and then to provide and to prescribe learning strategies (actions chosen by students that facilitate learning) which can optimize retention and reduce anxiety.

SLA theories alone fail to recognize the demands on the classroom teacher to individualize instruction in an effort to meet every learner's needs. Bragger and Rice (1999) claim, "The typical learning environment makes extraordinary demands on the teachers who deal with complex issues that go far beyond the teaching of their subject matter" (p. 377). In their design of multiple intelligences, Gardner and Walters (2001) ably identify this very concept of each learner as being the sum of different degrees of a variety of intelligences, and they report,

“Inasmuch as nearly every cultural role requires several intelligences, it becomes important to consider individuals as a collection of aptitudes rather than as having a singular problem-solving faculty . . .” (p. 318). By extension, if learners are not equipped with a singular problem-solving faculty, then to equip teachers with a singular pedagogy is contrary to what is known about learners.

For example, Hodge (1998) examined students with mild learning disabilities (such as dyslexia) and students with Attention Deficit Disorder (ADD) and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) in Spanish classes at a community college. She evaluated how students processed data as it passed through the sensory input, the short-term memory (STM) and the long-term memory (LTM). Hodge found that many students do not possess the ability to assign value to input as it passes into the sensory memory. In other words, students are unable to decide what is important enough to pass into the STM for storage in the LTM and what input is non-necessary and should be discarded. Therefore, at-risk learners can be easily tempted to discard knowledge that should in fact be passed to the LTM. Learners waste time and energy assimilating useless bits of instruction and cannot produce important parts of speech because their brains did not deem them important enough to remember. Hodge advocates the need for direct, implicit instruction in mixed-ability classes. She demonstrates and maintains that these students will achieve greater success with less frustration.

The Affective Domain

In addition to any particular LD's (learning disabilities) that affect SLA, learners' attitudes such as anxiety and motivation play a significant role in the total FL experience. Krathwohl (2002) suggests that motivation and cognition are not separate, but rather inextricably linked

features of the individual learner. Kim and Hall (2002) also discuss how students are more likely to attend to subject matter that is more pleasing to them on a personal level.

Inextricably connected to SLA is the importance of attention to the available classroom input. Without attention to the input, students disengage from the L2 processes shown above (scaffolding, noticing, etc.) that lead to acquisition. Using strategies that engage students' attention and motivate them to become active participants in their own learning helps to enhance SLA (Campbell, 1991). One of the benefits of providing students with pedagogy that leads them to feel successful is the creation of resultant motivation. Whereas language aptitude concerns the cognitive abilities that underlie successful L2 acquisition, motivation involves the attitudes and affective states that influence the degree of effort that learners make to learn an L2. Ellis (1997) explains:

An assumption of the research . . . is that motivation is the *cause* of L2 achievement.

However, it is also possible that motivation is the *result* of learning. That is, learners who experience success in learning may become more . . . motivated to learn. (p. 75, emphasis in the original)

Since success is a powerful motivator, foreign language teachers are truly obligated to strive to offer a classroom methodology that meets every student's needs. One singular pedagogical approach is not likely to reach each learner. Engaging in teaching practices that meet students' needs will be more likely to motivate students to continue their L2 studies. Achieving fluency requires the commitment of time (Baum & Luna, 2003). If foreign language students feel unsuccessful, they are not likely to continue their pursuit of the language over the full course of their secondary academic careers, given that it is an elective subject in most U.S. schools.

Implications for Novice Teacher Preparation

No single defined framework has yet taken into account all of the facets that foreign language teaching and learning can encompass. While each existing framework contains a piece or pieces of the interlocking puzzle, the tools and learning styles that each group of learners brings to the SLA arena provide key elements which must be united with SLA theory in order to complete the whole instructional methodology picture. Thus, gathering broad-based research is difficult because of the infinite number of learner variables that exist in each setting. Often, it is easy to embrace one body of data and forsake another group of research data that provides an antagonistic conclusion.

Because of this, the foreign language teaching profession has endured countless methodology trends. We have demonstrated our willingness to try new things for the benefit of our students. We must proceed enthusiastically with caution as we seek to apply all that research has to offer. There is great value for FL educators in understanding the mental processes as described by SLA theoretical researchers. However, it is critical that second language educators consider motivation, anxiety and other affective variables as well as individuals' learning preferences, in addition to SLA theories and information processing as we attempt to create a successful learning experience for our students.

Having pieced together the elements for effective instruction, the new teacher is better equipped to make informed decisions about issues such as textbooks, instructional practices, student placement, and assessment, as determined by sound theory. At the most basic level, novice FL instructors must:

1. seek instruction that helps students operate meaningfully in L2.
2. minimize the use of and interference from L1 during L2 instruction and usage.

3. use a variety of techniques to make L2 input meaningful and comprehensible to the learners.
4. teach strategies for problem solving and for the organization and management of information.
5. vary instruction to account for individual and collective learning styles.
6. provide a variety of meaningful performance assessments and authentic assessments which address all levels of cognition.

Chapter Summary

While SLA theories provide valuable insights into possible methods of optimizing instruction, best instructional practices must also be informed by knowledge in the areas of information processing, learner preferences, classroom management, and much more. Given the multi-faceted task of secondary L2 instruction, the demands placed on teacher preparation programs are great. Pre-service foreign language teachers, having acquired a theoretical basis for instructional design, can begin to implement sound pedagogy. And not only does a novice teacher's theoretical basis need to inform classroom instruction, but also curriculum design, materials selection, and curriculum assessments that align with the theoretical framework.

Being able to account for L2 acquisition because of multiple theoretical perspectives allows novice teachers the tools to explain L2 acquisition difficulties and to adjust instruction by using a multiplicity of potential solutions. As educators, we must guard against any tendency to make claims in favor of using one particular strategy for SLA based on one study. Donato and McCormick (1994) summed up this point well by stating: “. . . the emergence of strategies is a by-product of goal-directed situated activity in which mediation through artifacts, discourse, or others plays a central role in apprenticing novices into a community of practice” (p. 456). The

words “situated activity” best acknowledge the dilemma. Since each teaching situation or context is in its own way unique, the challenge becomes meeting the needs of individual situations.

Since L2 success is dependent on students’ ability to retain and to recall information over several years, further studies which target recall over time would shed greater light on the types of teaching and learning strategies that lead to the most permanent or deepest levels of learning. Longitudinal recall studies of secondary L2 learners would be difficult to conduct, yet valuable to the profession in that they would serve to demystify some of the claims about SLA instruction.

To wholly embrace one SLA theory is to ignore what the others have to offer to teaching. Moderation is the key element to prevent the foreign language profession from its historical “bandwagoneering,” by embracing one body of research and forsaking all other data. The over-application of SLA research studies to methodology and pedagogical practices also results because studies on one component of SLA are used to make claims about SLA on a broader level. For example, it is important to carefully consider SLA claims that are generated from studies on L1 (first language) acquisition or from studies on ESL (English as a Second Language) populations (Zephir, 2000). While Vélez-Rendón (2002) advocates for combining research efforts on SLA with ESL populations, I maintain that the learning experience for those populations is often quite different from traditional L2 classroom methods, and that immigrants’ motivation and necessity to learn English is far different from secondary U.S. students’ desire to achieve L2 fluency. For this reason, data collected on ESL populations may not necessarily apply to secondary L2 classroom pedagogy. An additional consideration when examining SLA data is the parts of language that are researched. Many studies examine just oral language production or only journal writing, for example. L2 oral production, literacy, auditory comprehension, writing

skills, and cultural competence are all important components of traditional secondary SLA pedagogy. Studies that may only examine one of these linguistic areas could lead to the over-application of the body of research in broader pedagogical terms. However, the collective application of a variety of bodies of research can lead to well-rounded pedagogies and varied methodologies which serve to create more successful teaching and learning environments.

CHAPTER 4

THE STUDY DESIGN: AN EXAMINATION OF POST-SECONDARY PRE-SERVICE FOREIGN LANGUAGE METHODOLOGY INSTRUCTION

Rationale for the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the instruction of novice secondary foreign language teachers during the pre-service methods course. There exist studies of pre-service training for the core content areas: mathematics, science, social sciences and language arts. For example, Smagorinsky and Whiting (1995) studied pre-service training for new secondary language arts teachers, as reported in *How English Teachers Get Taught*. Similar to this FL study, the aforementioned authors examined syllabi and instructor survey data as the means to discover the content of pre-service language arts methodology training. To date, no similar large-scale study has been conducted to examine foreign language methods courses. For these reasons, I hoped to establish a baseline of data by focusing a lens on how pre-service secondary foreign language teachers are being shaped.

Assumptions of the Study

I undertook this study with a number of assumptions based on a combination of personal experiences and the previously cited literature. Those assumptions were:

1. Depending on the size and type of the institution, foreign language pre-service methods courses exist in a variety of possible forms: a) in colleges of education with a generic focus for secondary teachers of all subjects, b) in colleges of education with a foreign-language specific focus, c) in foreign language departments with a focus across languages, or, d) in foreign

language departments and specific to one particular L2. This study hopes to determine any differences and/or benefits to one type of offering over another.

2. Instructors with little to no secondary experience may teach the secondary methods courses.

Or, the instructor's secondary experience may have taken place decades earlier, possibly making it difficult for the instructor to add relevance to the course. Through this study I hoped to determine any differences in course content based upon the instructor's background and experiences.

3. One of pre-service teachers' most common complaints is that pre-service training is too theoretical, and not connected to the "real classroom" (Cooper, 2004). I held the assumption that methodology instructors who have had significant experiences in a K-12 classroom will include course content of a more pragmatic nature than will instructors whose experiences are limited to the post-secondary arena. The latter will be more likely to deliver a course that is more theoretical. I hoped that the study would clearly prove or debunk this assumption. I also sought to determine if either of the previous two assumptions might be connected to this assumption or if there are other causes.

4. When considering the study within the larger context of pre-service teacher education, I assumed the secondary methods course to be part of a larger program of teacher preparation, and that pre-service teachers were likely to be exposed to knowledge about educational psychology, social foundations of education, and other such content during courses other than the foreign language methodology course. This study specifically examined the content germane to SLA and foreign language pedagogy, and which sorts of theories guide that content.

The Research Questions

To help inform the foreign language profession regarding the current state of novice teacher preparation, this study aimed to examine:

1. What is the current content of post-secondary foreign language methods courses as reflected in the course syllabi?
2. How do post-secondary FL methods instructors address the development of PCK in pre-service teachers?
3. How do post-secondary FL methodology instructors guide novices to make connections between theory and practice?

Based on the collected syllabi, survey, and questionnaire data, I was looking for the interconnectedness of beliefs, theory, and classroom practice during the methods course, and hoped to gain an understanding of how the methods courses studied fit into the larger picture of pre-service teacher preparation.

Data Gathering Methods

To examine the delivery of secondary foreign language methods instruction to pre-service teachers, this study gathered data from 32 post-secondary methods instructors across the U.S. In an attempt to obtain a broad spectrum sampling of programs, the size, location, and type of institution were not limited. Much like the Smagorinsky and Whiting study (1995), part of the solicited data was in the form of a survey accompanied by a letter of request, which was distributed and returned to me in electronic format via e-mail. Requests for data were sent electronically to as many public and private post-secondary institutions across the U.S. as possible. The request asked for a copy of the methods instructors' course syllabus and responses to a short survey (See Appendix E). Ten randomly selected participants completed a

questionnaire (instead of the aforementioned survey) designed to elicit additional data about the methodology instructors' beliefs (See Appendix F). The purpose of the survey or questionnaire was to gain a sense of the post-secondary methods instructors' backgrounds and experiences. One of the participants was unable to share a syllabus because of participation in a grant study program, but did complete and submit a questionnaire.

These data were collected between October 2004 and March 2005. I visited post-secondary web sites, identified potential methods instructors, and made the data requests as per the web site findings. Some participants recommended additional participants to me. One participant recommended a web site, *FLteach*, where several post-secondary syllabi are posted. Most syllabi were outdated, however, I contacted the instructors who had posted to that site and was successful in gaining some newer data. I also asked personal acquaintances in the field to recommend possible study participants. Therefore, data responses were obtained from both recommended and non-recommended sources. All syllabi and accompanying survey data included in this study represent methods courses taught during 2004-2005.

Survey Data Analysis Methods

Twenty-two of the responses consisted of a survey response plus a syllabus. This first data analysis consisted of an enumerative task to compile the survey data. I grouped the methodology instructors' survey responses on a blank survey grid in order to see the overall picture of their backgrounds. Some of the questionnaire responses also served to answer survey questions. For this reason, data from the 10 questionnaires of an enumerative nature were also included in the compilation (See Appendix G). Follow-up e-mails with the participating instructors served to clarify any omitted or ambiguous survey data.

Questionnaire Data Analysis Methods

I examined the questionnaire data from an inductive analysis research perspective using open coding; the initial step towards analysis. Miles and Huberman (1994) state, “Coding is analysis. To review a set of field notes, transcribed or synthesized, and to dissect them meaningfully, while keeping the relations between the parts intact, is the stuff of analysis” (p. 56). Open coding, also a generative exercise, is the process of developing the categories and the themes as they emerge from the data, rather than imposing a pre-determined set of codes based on prior researcher assumptions. Ryan and Bernard (2000) succinctly explain the steps of any coding process as follows: “The fundamental tasks associated with coding are sampling, identifying themes, building codebooks, marking texts, constructing models (relationships among codes), and testing these models against empirical data” (p. 780).

Using a multi-staged coding process (Patton, 2002), themes were lifted from the questionnaires and compared among the entire data set. The units of analysis were coded at the idea level, rather than at the word or line levels. The ideas presented were usually of a one-to-three sentence length. The first three questionnaires were read repeatedly in order to identify emergent themes. Two peer de-briefers also read and coded the data. Their codes and categories were used to compare with mine, and because of their input, codes and categories were adjusted to better reflect the whole of the data. Having established the codes and categories on three pieces of questionnaire data, those same codes were applied to the seven subsequent questionnaires, allowing for modifications and newly emerging codes based on differences in the data.

Once the codes were established, then they were clustered together in sets of items with commonalities and pertinent to the research questions (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lecompte, 2000).

LeCompte (2000) identifies some possible lenses for grouping codes, which apply to these data: by similarity and by hypothesized reasonableness. Spradley (1979) would identify the types of analysis as theme analysis, or finding the relationships between larger categories and their connections to the data as a whole, and componential analysis or targeting the characteristics of a domain that make it unique. I defined categories (domains) and revised them several times as a result of this emergent analysis process. I noted memos regarding potential connections within the data and initial hypotheses that began to take shape (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). During and after the act of coding, I began theorizing and developing hypotheses about the connections and relationships between the various categories identified in the data (LeCompte and Priessle, 1993).

Syllabi Data Analysis Methods

LeCompte (2000) describes examining and interpreting data as follows:

The task of analysis, which makes interpretation possible, requires researchers first to determine how to organize their data and use it to construct an intact portrait of the original phenomenon under study and second, to tell readers what that portrait means.
(p. 147)

My goal was to engage in archival data analysis on the syllabi texts. Silverman (2001) refers to text as “data consisting of words or images which have become recorded without the intervention of a researcher” (p. 119). The challenge to qualitative researchers in the examination of these texts is that they can appear to be disjointed from the social constructions and contextual phenomena which the researcher hopes to examine. Therefore, there is the risk of misinterpretation of the intended meaning (Hodder 1994).

Nevertheless, Silverman (2001) outlines several ways that texts can represent reality. Based on Saussure's science of semiotics—the science of systematically studying language (Innis, 1984), Silverman argues that texts can be treated in ways similar to the treatment of an organized narrative, and he proposes that content analysis is the most accepted means of gathering conclusions from texts. Silverman describes the process as first establishing a set of categories, and then counting the number of instances that fit into a particular category. It is this systematic manner of analysis that will allow different coders to arrive at the same analysis of any given document. If the categories can be used in such a way so that any researcher would be able to establish this inter-rater reliability, then it can be concluded that the categories fit the data.

Ryan and Bernard (2000) as well as Miles and Huberman (1994) propose that one of the best sources for establishing categories can be the published literature and literature reviews in the related field. By extracting the primary themes from the literature, those can serve as the pre-established categories assigned to the textual analysis and which will then be enumerated at the end of the process. Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest approaching the data with a fixed set of categories in mind, but also allowing for new categories, as necessary, so that critical data is not left out of the textual analysis because it “doesn't fit.” In fact, another danger in conducting this sort of analysis is that the categorical grid can be too rigid, and cause certain data to remain uncategorized, or to escape inclusion in such a study. LeCompte and Preissle (1993) directly contradict Miles and Huberman (1994), “As is the case with all enumerative techniques, units of analysis are clearly specified in advance of data collection” (p. 261).

Perhaps Silverman (2000) suggests an acceptable compromise. He establishes that researchers need to follow clear guidelines and employ systematic data description and analysis methods. Silverman proposes a summary of critical questions to guide the process:

1. Are the methods appropriate for the nature of the question being asked?
 2. Is the connection to an existing body of knowledge and theory clear?
 3. Are there clear accounts of the criteria used for the selection of the cases for study and of the data collection and analysis?
 4. Was the data collection and record-keeping systematic?
 5. Is reference made to accepted procedures for analysis?
 6. How systematic is the analysis?
 7. Is there adequate discussion of how themes, concepts, and categories were derived from the data?
 8. Is there adequate discussion of the evidence for and against the researcher's arguments?
- (p. 222)

Similarly, Moustakas (1994) states:

A method offers a systematic way of accomplishing something orderly and disciplined, with care and rigor. Procedures or techniques make up a method, provide a direction and steps to be followed, and move a study into action. [. . .] There are no definitive or exclusive requirements. Each research project holds its own integrity and establishes its own methods and procedures to facilitate the flow of the investigation and the collection of data. (p. 104)

In other words, it is of the utmost importance during the collection, analysis, and interpretation of qualitative data to follow organized, systematic procedures that are supported by the type of data and the scope of the research question.

Finally, the enumeration component of this analysis method may appear to serve more of a quantitative approach than qualitative. It is in the interpretation of the data that the enumerative

process can help to lend sense-making after analysis. The enumerations are able to show how strongly a category exists in cross-case studies. Wolcott (1994) explains:

When we analyze, we carefully select a few factors for scrutiny; we rely on the weight of evidence and the systematic nature of our procedures to be convincing. But when we interpret, [. . .] our interpretive ‘*rightness*’ is judged within traditions, not in the correspondence between our accounts and truth or a strict adherence to procedures.

(p. 258, emphasis in the original)

In order to interpret that which has been analyzed, I believe that the enumerating process in this method helps to provide the “weight of evidence” during the analysis phase that lends itself to plausible, warranted interpretations.

Applying the Syllabi Data Analysis Methods

I developed analytical themes that appeared to be important to novice foreign language teacher development based on the previously cited literature in this field. The categories were:

- Beliefs – How are methodology courses dealing with novices’ pre-existing beliefs about what FL teaching should look like based on their apprenticeship of observation and any other pre-existing influences?
- Theory – What theories are promoted and how are they connected to practice? Are pre-service teachers encouraged to favor one SLA theory over another in their practice?
- Standards – ACTFL/NCATE, INTASC, NBPTS (See Appendices A, B, and C). Do they inform the methods course?
- L2 – To what extent are novices encouraged to use L2 exclusively in the classroom and are they trained on how to do so? Do they learn to make L2 salient to their learners?

- Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) – How are novices developing their repertoire of teaching strategies for specific types of content delivery?
- Strategies – Are pre-service teachers encouraged to teach learning strategies as well as L2, and are they being equipped with a repertoire of strategies to share?
- Diversity – To what extent are novices learning to differentiate instruction for diverse types of learners?
- Affective – Do pre-service teachers learn to consider affective elements in the L2 classroom?
- Assessment – What sorts of assessments are novices learning to use to evaluate their students' progress?
- Reflective Practice – Are novices being trained in action research and other reflective exercises?
- Voice – Does the methodology course content help to build novices voice and identity as a classroom teacher?

Having verified the categories against the literature, I began the systematic analysis of all of the syllabi. I created tables of data based on a combination of the aforementioned themes, and of data groupings created with any remaining data, clustering them according to patterns of similarity as described by LeCompte (2000). Two peer-debriefers verified the syllabi data sorting categories on a subset of syllabi. The additional sorting categories, not defined by the literature which emerged during the systematic analysis, will be described in detail in Chapter 5.

Each syllabus was identified by a letter or number (A, B, C, etc.), entered in the tables to represent the origin of the data. By using the letter codes to signify when the course content was

evident in a specific syllabus, an enumerative process was established as well. Additionally, this data sorting method allowed me to see how the data were distributed across the syllabi.

I read each syllabus with care, placing descriptions of all syllabi content within the above-named categories, indicating the syllabus of origin. Since some methodology courses were designed to include Foreign Language in Elementary Schools (FLES) or English as a Second Language (ESOL) training, for the sake of consistency, content very specifically aimed at either of those certifications was not included in the data analysis report. Twenty-eight of the 31 syllabi were received electronically; three instructors mailed hard copies of the syllabus to me. In order to verify that all necessary content was included in the reporting tables, I used the edit/find feature of Microsoft Word, seeking keywords related to each data sorting category in the electronic files. I chose the keywords based on frequent usages of common terminology in the syllabi themselves related to the sorting area. The data identified by the keyword searches were verified against the manually collected data. The data sorting tables and the lists of keywords for each category can be found in Appendix I. The three syllabi received only in hard copy were verified manually.

The required texts for each course were listed in Table 5, Appendix I. Several syllabi offered supplemental reading lists and related bibliographies. All of the additional readings, web sites, and references have been listed thematically in Appendix H.

Validity

I used a combination of “data triangulation” and “methodological triangulation” as defined by Denzin (in Mathison, 1988, p. 14). Data triangulation uses multiple data sources. In this study, data were gathered in three forms: survey, questionnaire, and syllabi. Methodological triangulation involves the implementation of more than one method to study the same aspects of

a given research question. In this study, open coding, thematic analysis, and quantitative methods generated the final data. As discussed in Chapter 5, the questionnaire and syllabi data corroborate each other on several points.

I acknowledge possible subjectivity and bias with regards to the survey questions and the questionnaire topics as well as the themes that were lifted from the literature. The study design could certainly reflect my own interests and views. However, in the data analysis, care was taken to be systematic as described. Additionally, two peer debriefers shared in the creation of the initial list of questionnaire codes, and they each applied the literature-based thematic codes to two different syllabi.

Limitations of the Study

The data gathered by this study are limited by the fact that they only represent the post-secondary institutions that chose to participate. Because participation was voluntary, the data are perhaps further limited by only representing those instructors who are most passionate about new teacher training. The data cannot be indicative of foreign language pre-service education in every part of the U.S., nor can they completely reflect how the methods course is situated within the larger context of the pre-service teacher education programs in the schools represented. The study merely examined the methods courses themselves by looking through the lens of the course syllabi. And just because certain course components may or may not have been listed on the syllabi themselves does not completely guarantee if or how those topics were presented by the instructors or moreover, perceived by the student participants.

As is the case with any archival data analysis, there is the risk of misinterpretation of the intended meaning. Hodder (1994) states, “. . . different types of texts have to be understood in the contexts of their conditions of production and reading” (p. 204). Because the syllabi were

interpreted without personal commentary from their authors (except for the 10 instructor questionnaires), there is the risk that my outsider perspective may not have appropriately interpreted the intended meaning. While the survey data represent an attempt to contextualize the syllabi data, they can not completely capture the methods instructors' beliefs or potential context-specific data within the documents themselves. Smagorinsky and Whiting (1995) received some refusals to participate in their study for this very reason. Potential contributors expressed discomfort with having their intentions interpreted based on a printed document, and denied the researchers access to their syllabi data because of potential mis-interpretation of the data generated by that study.

This study is also limited to the study of secondary methods courses. Although some states require K-12 foreign language certification, it is more the norm in the U.S. to have separate certifications for grades K-6 and 7-12. Additionally, the requirements for novice teacher competency can be somewhat different for teachers preparing to deliver foreign language instruction to the two different age groups. Since states' financial constraints typically limit foreign language instruction to the secondary grades in U.S. schools, I made the decision to limit the scope of this study to secondary methodological training only.

CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The Participants

Of the 32 participating post-secondary instructors, 29 were from public institutions and 3 from private, representative of 16 different states. Based on the participating instructors' names, 22 were female and 10 were male. The sizes of their institutions were as follows:

Table 1

Size of Participating Institutions

Number of Undergraduates in Thousands	Number of Participating Institutions
1-9	9
10-19	9
20-29	9
30-39	5

The majority represented Division I schools; five were Division II schools; one was a Division III school.

Instructor Survey Results

The following description reflects a compilation of the instructor surveys. The compiled raw data can be found in Appendix G. The majority of the methods instructors had at least five years teaching experience in a secondary setting. The time elapse since those classroom experiences was divided. Table 2 below provides the range of the instructors' secondary experience combined with the number of years that have passed since those experiences occurred.

Table 2

Methods Instructors' Secondary Classroom Experience

Years of Experience	Time Elapse Since Secondary Classroom Experience				
	No experience	0-5 years ago	6-10 years ago	11-15 years ago	>15 years ago
No experience	4				
1-5 years			1	4	2
5-10 years		1		1	6
More than 10 years		5	3	2	3

About a third reported that their secondary teaching occurred within the past 10 years. Nearly two-thirds of the instructors' experiences happened over 10 years ago. Two instructors noted that although they could not claim recent secondary classroom teaching experience, they remained closely connected to the secondary teaching arena via collaborative work with secondary FL faculty. Four of the methods instructors included in this study had no secondary classroom experience.

Instructors' Professional Assignments

Twenty-one of the methods instructors were full-time post-secondary personnel; tenure-track faculty at the assistant, associate, or full professor level. The remaining instructors were either graduate teaching assistants, or adjunct faculty. More than two-thirds of the instructors wanted to teach the course, adding comments that they enjoyed this work. In the words of one instructor, "It is my chosen and prepared professional field." The remaining instructors were either

assigned to teach the methods course or taught it for reasons not listed in this survey. Twenty-one instructors worked within the institution's foreign language department, Nine were members of the School of Education or related department, and two instructors were members of both foreign language and education departments. While examining the syllabi data with regards to the instructors' departmental affiliations, no significant differences in methodology course content were noted based on the professional assignment.

Instructor L2 Fluency

The instructors' language backgrounds included European languages traditionally represented in U.S. schools: Spanish, French, and German. One polyglot claimed fluency in five languages including Italian and Portuguese. One additional instructor had Portuguese language skills as well. A total of eleven instructors noted fluency in two or more foreign languages.

Since none of the methodology instructors claimed fluency in some of the less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) such as Chinese, Russian, or Arabic, there may be cause to wonder how our current post-secondary system will adequately prepare new teachers to meet the growing demands in these areas. And while issues related to SLA theories and to learner diversity are somewhat universal to secondary FL pedagogy, it is likely that some teaching strategies are language-specific, raising the question of how we will equip new LCTL teachers with adequate PCK.

Program Size

The program size ranged from 2 to 25 students. Based on the number of pre-service teachers involved, the program sizes appeared to be relatively small, with twelve programs serving five or fewer students. Most programs fell into a mid-range with numbers of enrolled pre-service teachers in the teens. Because of low enrollment, two of the programs included in this study

intended to close at the end of the 2005 academic year. A third instructor noted on the survey a great shortage of certified FL teachers in the local area and called for more efforts by post-secondary FL departments to recruit future teachers.

Course Format

The courses generally served undergraduate students. Some of the programs permitted both graduate and undergraduate students in the same course. Four methods courses consisted of a combination of two semesters of study. All other programs offered the methodological training within the confines of a one-semester class. One of the programs consisted of a single semester 15 credit block devoted completely to methodology and in-school observation and practicum experiences.

Findings from the Instructor Questionnaires

To gain a deeper sense of the instructors' backgrounds and beliefs that may have shaped the delivery of the methods courses, I collected additional questionnaires from 10 of the instructors (See Appendix F). The ten instructors who responded to the questionnaires portrayed a wide array of experiences and beliefs.

These instructors have been delivering pre-service methodology training from between 3 and 28 years. Their degrees varied from doctoral degrees in education or curriculum and instruction, to a Ph.D. in a specific FL, to an Ed.S. in a similar field. Three cited their doctoral coursework or research in education as key components to the framework of their beliefs about methodology training. The questionnaire participants represented full-time university professors, adjunct faculty, and graduate assistants.

The Influence of Secondary Teaching Experience

All 10 of the instructors who responded to the questionnaire had secondary teaching experience, again with a great variety in the length of experience from 2 to 24 years. One of the instructors continues to teach high school French on a part-time basis. They underscored the connection between secondary classroom experience and successful methods instruction with statements like, “I feel the time I spent in the classroom has given me invaluable expertise that I can share with beginning and experienced teachers,” and “I think it is imperative that a FL methods instructor have been a classroom teacher for several years. Otherwise, they cannot possibly have the credibility, requisite experience, and background to relate theory to practice.” The instructors explained how their classroom experience influenced the delivery of the methods course, wanting it to be very “hands-on and learner-centered.”

Instructors' Experiences and Beliefs

When asked to describe their background experiences and how those influence their delivery of the pre-service methods course, two instructors indicated that they began teaching language without any formal training about how to do so. These same two had been deeply impacted by their own frustrated attempts to communicate in the target cultures after formal language study in U.S. classrooms. They created their pedagogy as they went along, basing their instruction on their personal experiences of what worked and what didn't. Thus, it became paramount to them that students develop strong fluency especially in the areas of speaking and listening, in an effort to help their pre-service teachers avoid the discomfort that they themselves had experienced because of their own historical inabilities in face-to-face settings. According to both of these instructors, L2 fluency is best accomplished by teaching with a very communicative approach; one that is rich in verbal interaction.

A different instructor felt that her experiences attending conferences and related professional development events had shaped her career and her methodology teaching. For this reason, she has required that her pre-service teachers participate in similar functions. Two other questionnaire participants also noted the influence of learning due to conference attendance and from the professional relationships that develop as the result of personal involvement in teaching-related organizations. The syllabi data also show a strong correlation to attendance at state and local conferences, likely as a reflection of the ACTFL/NCATE Standard Six related to professionalism (See Appendix A). One of the questionnaire participants was in fact involved in the writing of the ACTFL/NCATE Standards for pre-service teacher program accreditation.

One faculty participant stated that methodology instructors should make an effort to teach their students to reflect, since as a result of her own reflective experiences she has grown in her capacity to be an effective instructor. She models reflective behavior by considering the needs of novice teachers in order to inform how she directs the education of pre-service teachers. She reflects on what skills novices will need, and then engages in backwards planning to equip pre-service teachers with those tools for the future. Over half of the respondents noted that they also reflect on their own language learning experiences to guide their personal beliefs about SLA and classroom best practices. Their personal experiences in the military, the Peace Corps, travel, work, and study abroad have further informed their opinions regarding language acquisition.

Key Concepts for FL Methods Courses

When responding about the most important concepts to convey to pre-service FL teachers during the methods course, one instructor acknowledges that there are “a zillion things!” At the heart of the matter resides second language fluency—how it is not currently being achieved in secondary classrooms and how a lack of teacher fluency affects the methods selected for

classroom instruction. Pre-service teacher candidates' L2 fluency was a very common topic among the instructors. Instructor A felt, in fact, that one of the greatest impediments to a novice teacher's success was a lack of strong language skills. He expressed that teaching in the target language was essential, and if one couldn't speak the L2 to begin with, the fall-back method for the teacher would be to analyze grammar. Another instructor wrote:

I think what has made our student teachers good is not only their pedagogical competence, but also their subject matter competence. For the past 10 years, our FL students have had to pass a five-part proficiency test before being allowed to enter my methods course. I strongly believe we need to have more than a good GPA for our pre-service teachers. If they can't speak [the target language] well, they will not use the language as much in their own classrooms nor can they raise the level of their students above their own level.

And yet another instructor wrote that the language acquisition process was "so complex, intertwined, and complicated." These comments are in keeping with the aforementioned literature on the same subject. (Vélez-Rendón, 2002). Attaining L2 fluency is complicated, and imparting it to learners is equally complicated. But without L2 fluency, the ability to provide an input rich teaching and learning environment is severely limited. In summary, improved novice teacher fluency can lead to improved student fluency, and the cycle then becomes a positive, upward spiral.

The instructors specifically identified three impediments to pre-service teacher fluency. The first impediment was the methods by which novice teachers learned L2 in high school or in college. Depending on the instructional delivery strategies used in beginning and intermediate level language courses, students can emerge with a wide variety of competencies. Some might

conjugate verbs well and can't speak a sentence. Others may only be able to speak with coined phrases but not understand when spoken to by a native speaker. Long-term retention of vocabulary and other lexical items may be missing. Next, pre-service teachers have majored in the foreign language. The traditional college major curriculum includes a great deal of literature studies beyond the first four semesters of "language acquisition" courses, and often less spoken language. Instead of engaging in lively discussions in L2, language majors are more likely to listen to lecture, take notes, consider literary analysis, and possibly even discuss the literature in English. Tesser and Long (2000) discuss the great divide between the language and literature departments in traditional programs, citing these same difficulties.

The third impediment to L2 fluency as identified by the questionnaire participants was novices' own personal desire to improve fluency, as well as their beliefs about how to best achieve it. Because of their apprenticeship of observation, inseparable from the methods under which they learned the FL, they may believe that they already have enough language competency to teach well, when in fact they can only perform in set paradigms and do not possess the overall linguistic skills to lead their own students to fluency. Phillips, Levy, and Glisan (2005) also cite antiquated, traditional L2 instruction at the post-secondary level as problematic to SLA and the perceptions about teaching gained by pre-service teachers during their foreign language courses. Phillips et al. (2005) also stated that the new ACTFL/NCATE program certification guidelines require that pre-service FL students who will graduate as secondary teachers receive a minimum score of an "Advanced-low" (from the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines) on the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) in order to be certified. Yet only nine of the methods course syllabi recognized the need for teacher fluency in L2.

As personal examples of the effects of limited fluency, two of the instructors cited personal frustrations upon their first communicative experiences abroad. One struggled to make sense of why he lacked fluency, remembering that he “had gotten an ‘A’ on that stuff in school.” The point this instructor hoped to make was that content delivery is very limited by the teacher’s acquired level of fluency. If a teacher lacks the necessary L2 fluency to teach in the target language, then s/he will rely on more traditional textbook and grammar driven approaches which are not as likely to lead students to fluency. Even though he had gotten excellent grades in his high school French class, the methods used to teach him did not lead to his attaining a sufficient, functional level of L2 fluency for effective communication with native speakers. In describing ideal pedagogy, another instructor discussed teaching 100% of the time in L2 by stating, “If it is done well it can be *so* successful and students have *such* a sense of pride” (emphasis in the original). In spite of these many efforts to underscore the need for novice teacher fluency, based on the syllabi data, fewer than one-third of the courses recommend any levels of pre-service teacher fluency as an important step towards becoming a secondary FL teacher (See Table 10). The syllabi findings would seem to support claims that pre-service teachers are not being equipped with the fluency they need to succeed as beginning teachers (Clement, 2003; Cooper, 2004; Schulz, 2002). However, post-secondary institutions may be considering candidates’ L2 fluency outside of the realm of the methods course itself. In either case, there does seem to be a lack of attention in the methods courses themselves about how to make L2 available to students in a secondary classroom setting.

Several questionnaire participants listed a solid foundation in SLA theory as one of the most important concepts presented in the methodology course. Another listed the need to be able to make connections between SLA theory and novices’ PCK as essential. And the instructors

also believe that pre-service FL teachers should have an awareness of the Standards as well as an understanding of “pedagogical directions in the field.” In the area of teaching practices, proficiency-based instruction (teaching with very communicative, authentic tasks designed to foster L2 fluency) is highly important to these instructors and is commonly noted across the syllabi data as well. The instructors listed assessment and authentic performance assessments as critical topics tied to proficiency-based instruction. In other words, both instruction and assessment need to be aligned with the national proficiency movement in keeping with the National Standards.

To explain the assessment component further, I noted that the instructors recognized the need to familiarize pre-service teacher candidates with authentic performance assessments. One instructor qualified his comment on this topic by explaining that schools may espouse a curriculum that relies heavily on written testing to formulate grades, and that traditional written assessments don’t necessarily reflect current pedagogies nor do they necessarily lead to student fluency. He wrote:

Schools are determined to follow a more traditional path to grades and they are highly recognized for having brilliant students and high test scores, so the local community is unwilling to espouse change. But the kids know they don’t understand anything and they can’t say anything.

Another instructor expressed that if assessments are too grammar-driven they will be in conflict with more communicative proficiency-based methods.

Also connected to theory and the Standards, a group of the questionnaire instructors identified Standards-embedded instructional planning among the essential concepts for the methods course. Planning included both unit and lesson planning, as well as curricular alignment. One instructor

defined curricular alignment as “vertical and horizontal teaming.” Embedded in the idea of teaming is the notion of working with other professionals in the same department to insure a smoothly articulated learning sequence for students.

Within the questionnaires, the instructors listed a wide variety of topics related to classroom strategies and PCK as important concepts to convey to pre-service teachers. There was some duplication of those comments by more than one instructor, but for the most part, the responses resembled a collection of unique perspectives. For example, two instructors wanted their students to be able to incorporate technology into FL classroom instruction. One instructor had written her dissertation around a computer program she had developed for teaching French. Another instructor noted strategies for teaching the four skill areas and how to incorporate grammar into instruction as important concepts for developing teachers. This same instructor listed knowing how to “prime” students for learning, or teaching new teachers how to “hook” students’ interest in instruction. Like “hooks,” knowing how to motivate students is related to affective issues. Understanding how students develop cognitively, linguistically, emotionally, and physically also showed up on the list of important concepts. Two classroom concepts that surfaced from more than one instructor were the need for pre-service teachers to be able to address student diversity and the ability to deliver meaningful instruction to heritage learners, given the unique speaking and listening skills that they may already bring to the learning experience.

Some interconnectedness does exist among these latest concepts. Student motivation, cognitive development, and diversity should all contribute to teacher decisions about instructional delivery within specific contexts. What motivates learners will be related to their ages, their cultural backgrounds, how they prefer to learn, and how well the teacher will actively

engage them in their development. And finally, as the ideal means for developing classroom skills, the instructors felt that good internship experiences could provide critical insights about secondary students as learners and provide the necessary opportunities to practice instructional delivery skills on a variety of topics. So, while the questionnaire data showed a variety of sub-topics in the area of instructional expertise, ultimately the instructors converged on student-focused in-classroom issues.

I noted two more concepts in the questionnaires which did not directly relate to the other areas mentioned thus far. The first was the idea of inspiring new FL teachers to be professionals and life-long learners. The syllabi data in Table 17 corroborate this notion. Many other instructors hope that their pre-service teachers will understand the importance of becoming life-long learners as reflected in the larger collection of syllabi. And the remaining important concept that one instructor wanted to be sure to convey to her students was, “enthusiasm!” In the face of a new and challenging career, I highly agree that without enthusiasm—a love for teaching, for students, and for foreign languages—a novice teacher will be doomed.

Theory and Practice

The last item on the instructor questionnaire asked the instructors to describe the relationship between theory and practice as it existed in the methodology course. I believe that due to the fact that most of the questionnaire participants had a significant amount of secondary classroom experience, they emphasized practice as the means to comprehend SLA theories. One instructor expressed it this way, “As developing teachers, students need multiple strategies that are successful for a learner-centered class.” For this reason, the instructors seemed to favor equipping pre-service teachers with classroom strategies and undergirding the rationale for those strategies with theory. One instructor had even developed evaluation charts for classroom

activities to help pre-service teachers evaluate time spent on meaningful communication, as defined by the professional literature. Her teachers-in-training analyzed all of their lesson objectives based in great part on research findings.

Reflecting on teaching practices was one of the primary ways that methodology students made the theory-practice connection. Mentioned in the questionnaires and visible in the syllabi data was the fact that pre-service teachers planned and carried out many demonstration lessons in the methods courses for a variety of grade levels and for different purposes: literacy, writing, grammar, Whole Language Approach, Standards-based lessons, and performance-based tasks. They wrote reflection papers on their lesson demonstrations that included questions about the integration of the National Standards, the ACTFL K-12 Learner Performance Guidelines, learning theories, $i + 1$, the affective filter, methods, assessment, and diverse learner needs. Students also reflected on the teaching they observed as they participated in their respective field experiences. They completed assignments for the methods course that aligned with their observations of the master teachers, providing the opportunity to reflect on the relationship between theory and practice as it was seen in action in the classroom. These assignments took the form of reflective journals, papers, and class discussions.

A final teaching portfolio was a common element in nearly half of the courses. As was mentioned in the questionnaires and further evidenced in the syllabi data, during the methods course pre-service teachers began to collect artifacts from their teaching, e.g., digital video clips of their micro-teaches, teacher and student sample products, unit and lesson plans, assessment instruments, classroom management strategies, etc. As an end of semester project, they reflected in writing about their portfolio and made class presentations (sometimes multimedia

presentations). This final assignment was designed to be a reflection on how theory and practice go together in the teaching and learning process, often based on INTASC and NBPTS standards.

In summary, it can be said that based on the instructor questionnaires, pre-service teachers were taught to critique different methods and approaches to foreign language teaching. The instructors hoped to guide students to understand that there is no “one right way” to teach, but rather to synthesize the positive aspects of various approaches and methods into their practice. And, the instructors wanted their students to be able to articulate *why* they plan, deliver, and assess student learning in whatever ways they choose with theory-based rationales. Additionally, teacher fluency constituted the extra ingredient blended into the framework for sound L2 pedagogy.

Syllabi Data Findings

The complete contents of the 31 methods courses as per the respective syllabi can be found in Appendix I, p. 157. The syllabi data were sorted according to the analysis categories established in Chapter 4 which were taken from the professional literature. Additional data categories emerged in the areas of: broader education topics, technology, planning for learning, and classroom management. The syllabi data also included: listings of the primary texts used in each course, the supplementary required readings, recommended readings (See Appendix H), assessment of pre-service students’ competencies, and some other data which did not fit into any other category. The criteria and content of each of the 19 data categories are described subsequently.

Beliefs

The first data category deals with beliefs about teaching. In Chapter 2 of this dissertation, the literature strongly suggested that apprenticeship of observation and the beliefs that pre-service

teachers bring to the methodology experience have a lasting effect on the teacher's assimilation of newer pedagogies. In fact, pre-service teachers were shown to embrace methods similar to those used in the classrooms where they themselves learned the second language (Britzman, 1991; Grossman, 1990; Lortie, 1975; Vélez-Rendón, 2002; Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998). And since beliefs are what future teachers bring to the methodological experience, beliefs become the starting point. For this reason, the syllabi data related to teacher beliefs were listed as the first category.

By examining Table 4, the sorts of syllabi content that fit into the area of beliefs can be noted: a professional attitude, a reflection on one's own SLA experience, and beliefs about the value of L2 education. Just under half of the courses contained content which expressly addressed the assumptions and beliefs that reside in the minds of pre-service teachers. However, only one program addressed multiple facets of teacher beliefs, citing course content in five of the demonstrated belief sub-categories. Out of all of the data related to teacher beliefs, the most common feature consisted of pre-service teachers' development of a personal philosophy about FL teaching and learning. In one single course, Syllabus M, the instructor asked pre-service teachers to reflect on their beliefs and assumptions about FL teaching at the onset of the semester. At the end of the same semester, Instructor M asked the course participants to re-reflect on their beliefs and how those beliefs might have been re-shaped because of knowledge gained throughout the course.

Education Topics

The second data clustering involved a small number of syllabi listing the consideration of educational issues outside of WL methodology and pedagogy per se. For example, we find "problems in education," "social and historical contexts of L2 instruction," and the most

common topic, a “history of FL methods” in Table 5. These sorts of foundational socio-historical topics likely serve to situate other content included in the methods course. The most frequent sub-category, the history of FL methods, must certainly relate to the previously cited changes in FL teaching during the past 50 years (Schultz, 2000; Vélez-Rendón, 2002). As we have seen, pre-service teacher beliefs are so strongly influenced by how they themselves were taught, that it is possible the methods instructors we are attempting to explain why the learning contexts within which pre-service teachers may have learned L2 were in fact outdated. Examining where the profession has been might help to bridge in-class discussions about the current and future direction of FL pedagogy.

Texts

For the third data category, primary course texts, I have made an assumption that the primary texts used in the methods courses act as a guide or a backdrop to the other course content (See Table 6, Appendix I). Indeed the calendarized weekly class discussion topics as listed in the syllabi generally referenced topics from the text and/or the supplemental readings list. (The supplemental readings lists have been compiled in Appendix H.) The three most commonly used books in pre-service methods courses were: *ACTFL’s Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (1999), *Teacher’s Handbook: Contextualized Language Instruction* by Shrum and Glisan (2000), and *Teaching Language in Context* by Omaggio Hadley (2001). In order to render a more thorough analysis of the methods course content, I examined the three above-mentioned resources and have included below the content and focus of each.

The most widely used text, the ACTFL Standards book, acts as an overarching guide to FL teaching. It outlines the development of the National Standards, their implications, and provides program models for grades K-16. The standards are organized around the “five C’s,” which are

described in detail within this text. Readers can also find suggestions for instructional approaches for Standards-based teaching. A large portion of this resource is divided into appendices which outline the K-16 Standards for teaching: Chinese, classical languages, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish. Each language-specific chapter contains Sample Progress Indicators for grades 4, 8, 12, and 16 correlated to each of the Standards. Also included are sample learning scenarios and suggestions for performance assessments related to the scenarios. Most of the subject-specific chapters were written in conjunction with the related national teachers' organizations such as the Association of Teachers of Japanese, the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese, the American Council of Teachers of Russian, etc.

After the National Standards text, the Shrum and Glisan (2000) book was the most frequently required resource. The guiding principles on which these authors base their approach are contextualized and integrated language instruction, grounded in the Standards. Chapter 1 provides a brief theoretical overview on SLA perspectives, explaining the role that each plays in learners' interaction in an L2 classroom. Topics such as those covered in Chapter 3 of this dissertation are offered to pre-service teachers, including concepts like: socio-cultural theory and the ZPD, the role of input and output, motivation, and cognition.

Next, the authors present the Standards couched in the need to contextualize L2 instruction. They contrast skill-based approaches with thematic and task-based approaches. Following a presentation of the Standards, state and local curricular goals are examined side by side with lesson and unit planning. Using this approach, the FL textbook is considered a tool rather than the primary material, as is the case with coverage-models of instruction. Commonly, teachers plan their courses based on the number of chapters that can be "covered" during a given semester

or academic year. In Standards-based approaches, the curriculum is organized around the claims and evidence of what students can do, using the text and other materials to guide students to achieving the skills described in the curricular claims.

The National Standards are prevalent throughout the text. There is a chapter on developing interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational modes, a focus on oral and written skills, and grammar instruction through stories. Learner diversity is also addressed, including instruction for heritage learners and strategies for students with physical disabilities. In the assessment chapter, the reader gains information related to performance-based tests, authentic tasks, rubrics use, and student portfolios. These are compared to more traditional assessments (grammar paradigms, fill-in the blank, etc.). Finally, a chapter on the integration of technology serves to present pre-service teachers with ideas for using multi-media to deliver instruction and to incorporate culture into the classroom.

Readers also encounter separate chapters specifically geared towards L2 instruction in the elementary and middle schools. Learner characteristics based on age and cognitive development are considered as related to instructional delivery. Sample lesson ideas serve to reinforce the chapter underpinnings, and the Standards continue to shape the overarching concepts.

The book's content is reinforced with the use of case studies included in each chapter. The learning scenarios presented in the case studies are accompanied by opportunities to reflect through teaching as well as through discussion, in an effort to provide realistic contexts for situating the concepts and guidelines. The appendices offer several templates for sample activities, questionnaires, mental organizers, checklists, holistic scoring guidelines, and portfolio evaluations.

As another of the most widely used foreign language methods texts, the Omaggio Hadley (2001) book serves to help those interested in classroom language learning to clarify their own beliefs about language learning and to understand SLA theory. It reflects on the past trends of L2 instruction, presents new developments in the field, and is intended to be a resource that encompasses all aspects of L2 classrooms from proficiency to culture to technology with adult learners in mind. It does not deal with elementary foreign language teaching or L2 acquisition in a natural setting.

Omaggio Hadley (2001) provides a thorough overview of the ACTFL proficiency guidelines, an explanation of the many definitions of proficiency, and gives consideration to the Standards for L2 learning. She then presents a basic review of second language acquisition theory. Then, based on the ACTFL guidelines and SLA theory, she has created a set of hypothesized principles for classroom teaching. The theoretical assumptions intended to guide practice are presented.

Next Omaggio Hadley (2001) outlines the role of context in the comprehension and production of discourse. There are guidelines for situational practice with speaking and writing as well as interactive and small-group activities to practice listening and reading. The integration of video and computer technology to teach these skills is introduced. There are also suggestions for assisting students who struggle with certain facets of L2 acquisition.

In this new third edition, an extra chapter addresses many types of assessments. Included is discussion about which types of assessment are appropriate for the skill in question. The ACTFL proficiency guidelines are revisited with regards to assessment. There are additionally ideas for using authentic materials, computer adaptations, and portfolios to assess student progress. Finally, readers receive instruction on how to synthesize materials for the creation of lesson plans and curriculum articulation.

The text is very thorough with theory, and several concepts like SLA and the ACTFL guidelines are often revisited as a reminder that theory drives practice. It is a terribly dense book with far more details than the beginning teacher can really absorb. It does provide a substantial theoretical foundation for pedagogical content knowledge, but the brand new teacher needs somewhat of a more pragmatic approach to the application of theory with far more examples, situations, and suggestions for practice and reflection. It might therefore be said that in pre-service methodology courses where the Omaggio Hadley (2001) text is the primary content, that the course could have tendencies towards a more theoretical approach. However, I will further consider this aspect of the methods courses within the larger context of the additional course content later in this findings section.

One more resource to count along with the three most widely used texts in the methods courses, is the *FLTeach* web site. *FLTeach* is a listserv established by Jean LeLoup and Robert Ponterio, FL professors at SUNY-Cortland. The site includes information on FL teaching methods, training student teachers, and curriculum articulation. It is an active forum for FL teachers everywhere to post questions and suggestions. There is also an archive for seeking information on a wide variety of topics, as well as a listing of web resources for FL teachers. Ten courses require that pre-service teachers subscribe to the site's discussion groups, complete methodological models, consider described classroom technological implementation, and/or post reflections to the discussion boards. Requiring that methodology students make active use of this web site provides them with multiple opportunities to interact electronically with practicing FL teachers.

Theory

For the fourth set of data gathered, the categorical identifier was theory. I placed all syllabi content that appeared to present ways of understanding SLA and discussions of particular or specific methodologies. While there is a risk of some cross-over with PCK, this category focuses on the what vs. the how, or in other words, on pre-service teachers' learning about methodologies rather than their engaging in discussions or practice with regards to the application of the methods. The syllabi indicated that the methodology courses promoted communicative, social, and situational approaches to language teaching. In other words, the theories presented by the methods instructors in their courses sought to make the learning meaningful to the students within a social context. The overarching theories in many syllabi (as can be seen in Table 7), were generally related to SLA, to the big picture of methodology, and to the grounding of best practices in SLA theory.

After those three larger groupings of data, no remaining data categories appeared prolifically across the syllabi. But rather, individual courses seemed to present highly specific types of theories such as socio-cultural theory, pragmatics, and a variety of methodological models. Krashen's Input Hypothesis, Total Physical Response Storytelling (TPRS), and communicative language teaching were the most repeated course topics after the three primary sub-classifications. There appeared to be a wide range of opinions and choices about the best manner to deliver second language instruction, as evidenced by the long list of singular methodologies often listed by just one program.

Interestingly, one of the syllabi, Syllabus R, stood out as being particularly focused on theory more than on any practical applications of those theories. Students in Course R read many professional journals, wrote reflection papers about journal articles, took exams based on theory,

and made class presentations on one theoretical perspective of the student's choice. In a similar way, Syllabus A contained a heavy emphasis on the use of TPRS as a methodology, devoting six entire class meetings to this topic. In what could be perceived as opposing objectives, Instructor A stressed in the questionnaire that the problem with current FL methodologies is that students can't speak; they can't say anything. Yet, some would argue that the TPRS methodology emphasized in this same course relies primarily on visual and auditory receptive skills, providing less opportunity for output than other methodologies.

Also noteworthy is that Syllabi H, N, and S had no theoretical mentions, while Syllabi A, O, V, and Z have the most prevalent theoretical course content, based on the number of instances that theory is mentioned in the syllabi. Obviously there was great diversity in the treatment of SLA theory and in the connections between theory and practice across the methodology courses. I examined the instructors' backgrounds to determine if any correlation existed between the amount of secondary classroom experience and the treatment of theory in the methods course. The instructors' backgrounds compared to the amount of theoretical instruction as evident in their corresponding syllabi are contrasted in Table 3 below.

Table 3

Correlations Between Instructor's Background and Theoretical Course Content

“Heavy” Theory Syllabus		“Light” Theory Syllabus	
A	Current part-time secondary teaching experience, Assistant Professor in a FL department	H	Over 20 years of secondary experience 5 years ago, instructor in a FL department
O	5-10 years secondary experience 6-10 years ago, Lecturer in a FL department	N	6-10 years experience over 10 years ago, Adjunct Faculty in a School of Education
V	More than 10 years secondary experience over 15 years ago, Associate Professor in a School of Education	S	Over 10 years of experience 6-10 years ago, Instructor in a FL department
Z	3 years secondary experience, doctoral student in a curriculum department		

The two groups have Ph.D. and non-Ph.D. faculty, located in both schools of education/curriculum and FL departments, and their secondary experiences range from current to several years prior. Clearly, no correlation can be made between the emphasis (or lack of emphasis) on theoretical learning and the instructor's secondary teaching background. It is also interesting to note that for the seven courses listed above, the Omaggio Hadley (2001) text, considered more theoretical than others, is only used in course Z above.

One commonality is that the three instructors of “light theory” courses are not full-time faculty, however, when contrasted with instructors O and Z on the “heavy theory” side, they are not full-time post-secondary faculty either. So, the commonality still does not serve to provide a contrast between the two groups. This finding serves as an example of the overall diversity of methodology instruction. The profession has not yet adopted a common ground sense of the most effective balance between theory and remaining course content. And while much of the syllabi content appears to be influenced by the instructors’ backgrounds and beliefs, again, there is no common thread that indicates that certain types of instructor backgrounds will translate into parallel instructor behaviors.

Standards

Next, I will address the role of the National Standards (as developed by ACTFL, often referred to as “the Standards”), and how they inform the methods courses. The Standards are similar to theory in two ways. First, they serve to inform and to undergird teaching practices. Second, one can have knowledge about and an understanding of the Standards without fully understanding how to practically integrate them into curriculum planning, instructional delivery, and assessment. Nineteen of the 31 courses identified an understanding of Standards-based instruction, planning, and assessment in the syllabus. However, fewer than half of the courses, based on the language in their syllabi, indicated the discussion of practical ways to achieve application of the Standards to a variety of instructional areas. Only ten syllabi noted discussions about integrating the Standards into assessment, and eight provided for the creation of Standards-based lessons (See Table 8). The point to be made here is that while there appears to be a movement towards incorporating the standards into instruction, how to achieve that integration does not have a prominent, widespread place in the syllabi examined.

Two syllabi stood out as being heavily based on the Standards. Syllabus J favored using “integrated standards-based instructional approaches” versus a traditional four-skills approach. Integrated instruction calls for a more realistic usage model of language skills. Instead of practicing or assessing listening or writing, for example, in isolation, the skills are “integrated.” Students read for meaning and then discuss what they learned. Or they listen to a radio broadcast followed by conveying some necessary piece of information to an interested friend. The three modes as described in the Standards—interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational—appeared to dominate the content of Syllabus Q. This instructor was clearly determined to immerse pre-service teachers into each and every aspect of Standards implementation.

Five of the courses included pre-service teachers’ reflecting on their own attained level of fluency based on the ACTFL proficiency guidelines. This reflective exercise may have helped to illustrate how teaching methods, learning styles, and other factors can influence the potential of achieving at a specific level. By comparing their own attained L2 skills with the ACTFL guidelines, pre-service teachers may become more familiar with those guidelines and how to apply them to their own students. They might also be able to connect their own L2 strengths and weaknesses to how they were themselves taught, and to extend that thinking to their developing classroom practices. Nine courses required that pre-service teachers attain an “advanced-low” level of proficiency on the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) in order to continue to pursue a degree in FL teaching. The pre-service teachers’ attained level of proficiency can have an impact on the type of methodologies one can possibly use for instructional delivery, as discussed earlier in the study findings.

NCATE, INTASC, and NBPTS standards were all evident in numerous forms throughout the syllabi. Many of the courses listed one or more of these sets of teacher competencies as the

course goals or objectives. State-adapted versions of similar standards were present as well. A discussion of what types of evidence instructors required in order to ascertain that their students had indeed accomplished the standards will be discussed later in these findings.

Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Shulman (1990) proposed pedagogical content knowledge as a theoretical construct for pre-service teacher educators to think about how teachers learn to engage in teaching practices. Based on the professional literature related to this topic for foreign language education, the current constructs for content delivery could be described as communicative, Standards-based, and proficiency-oriented instruction using authentic materials. For the purposes of sorting the data found in the syllabi, I included any reference to teaching skills, specific classroom strategies or named methods, “how to” topics, and any other techniques related to instructional delivery. In more pragmatic terms, this section could be called “for the classroom.” As one of the largest data categories, it encompasses all of the bits and pieces of teaching tips and strategies intended to enhance content delivery (See Table 9).

The first and most striking finding is that while 26 of the 31 syllabi acknowledge the National Standards, 20 of the syllabi continue to approach instructional delivery in a “four-skills” manner: teaching reading, teaching writing, teaching speaking, and teaching listening. Only one course, Syllabus Q, fully organized all of the course content within the constructs of the three modes: interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational. Fourteen of the syllabi specifically targeted the teaching of grammar as a class discussion topic. However, that topic appeared to be diversely addressed; some instructors couched the teaching of grammar within more proficiency-based models while others did not.

Nine of the syllabi listed ten or more topics related to instructional delivery: G, H, O, Q, T, V, Y, Z, and 4. It was most interesting to discover that definite patterns existed across these “PCK heavy” syllabi. Upon closer examination, it could be noted that the nine above-referenced syllabi shared much common course content in the area of classroom strategies. The following topical areas shared by at least two of these courses were: speaking, oral interpersonal and presentational skills, listening, writing, the writing process, reading, pre- and post-reading, culture, cultural awareness, the use of authentic materials, teaching culture through literature, grammar, the role of grammar in communicative teaching, error correction, incorporating vocabulary, making instruction comprehensible, varying teaching strategies to meet the needs of diverse learners, the integration of L2 skills, the integration of other content areas, the integration of SLA theories into instructional design, interactive and student-centered learning, contextualized instruction, textbook selection and use, teaching heritage learners, pair/group/cooperative activities, information-gap activities, and teaching pronunciation. It seems that these “commonalities” may indeed reflect a degree of SLA and Standards-based teaching in interactive and communicative environments.

This list of common course content might represent a baseline of “ideal” teaching skills for pre-service teachers. It is appropriate that the list of basic teaching skills is lengthy. Cooper (2001) advocates for enough variety of instructional strategies to meet the needs of individual teaching styles and personalities. And since the socio-cultural variables in any given classroom are too numerous to count, it stands to reason that equipping teachers with only one or two approaches could be fatal to their students’ progress. The larger question becomes, how much PCK is enough for the beginning teacher and how much should the profession rely on continued inservice training to complete a teacher’s repertoire? The truth is, for the best teachers, the tool

belt of teaching strategies is never full enough. Highly successful teachers never stop learning and continue to try on new techniques, all for the sake of their students. It therefore stands to reason that the best teacher preparation programs will provide pre-service teachers with plenty of classroom strategies *and* foster an attitude of life-long learning. The gamut of instructional strategies presented across the syllabi included in this study was truly vast, but more tools of the trade are better, I would say. Of greater concern, I believe, are the courses which spend very little time on pragmatic classroom strategies. Feiman-Nemser and Parker (1995) cited the lack of a sufficient teaching repertoire as one of the greatest challenges facing brand new teachers. According to the instructor questionnaires included in this study, equipping pre-service teachers with “multiple strategies” for the classroom is crucial.

The role of practice in learning to teach, to hone PCK, and to fully understand theory was cited as necessary in the professional literature (Smagorinsky et al., 2003; Vygotsky, 1987). Practice teaching is evidenced by a large number of micro-teaching assignments across the syllabi, seen in Table 22. The micro-teaches appeared to be how the instructors measured their students’ ability to engage in effective instructional delivery. By examining the combination of instances of micro-teaching combined with instances of mentions in the syllabi on the topic of teaching skills, it can safely be concluded that Syllabi P, R, S, and 1 contain little to no pragmatic course content related to the development of pre-service teachers’ PCK.

Technology

Technology constituted an additional tool for L2 instructional delivery. Technology was not established by the literature as a data category. However, since it appeared as a very common course topic, it became an emergent category (See Table 11). While four syllabi did not show any required technology skills as part of the methodology course, the majority encouraged some

sort of multi-media, PowerPoint, Internet, or web familiarity (See Table 11). Ten of the instructors required that their students make a technology presentation or present a technology project as an assessment for the methodology course (See Table 22). And several of the courses required that pre-service teachers develop a “portfolio” to showcase their teacher preparation experiences. Many of these portfolios were electronic compilations or had an electronic component.

Learner Diversity

Next, the instructional focus turns to the student. Providing instruction for diverse groups of learners weighed in as pedagogically important, and having a sufficient array of teaching strategies to account for learner diversity is very much related to PCK—instructional delivery with diversity (Bailey et al., 1999; Bragger & Rice, 1999; Cooper, 2001; Gardner & Walters, 2001, Hodge, 1998). All of the syllabi except six included the consideration of learner diversity either as a goal or a class discussion topic (See Table 12). The primary interest was in being familiar with a variety of instructional strategies so that new material could be salient to the learners. Diversity had several faces; students’ age, learning styles, cultural backgrounds, physical challenges, and emotional wellness could be found among the topics under the student diversity umbrella. Some of the courses cited involving knowledge about learner diversity while planning lessons and creating assessments. Three instructors required that their pre-service teachers include modifications or accommodations for learners with special needs in their lesson delivery. And Instructor E required her students to prepare three separate lessons with modifications for learner diversity in each one. These lessons were videotaped and peer evaluated. Syllabus E was very heavily steeped in learner diversity and the pre-service teachers’

ability to make instructional modifications as needed. Learner diversity was a non-issue in six of the courses.

Learning Strategies

However, in spite of the widespread acknowledgement of the importance of individual learning styles, the inclusion of class discussions about teaching learning strategies, was only evident in a third of the syllabi (See Table 13). The professional literature about cognition reminds us that in addition to teaching to a variety of learning types, helping students learn metacognitive skills and specific tips that can accelerate their own learning and increase long-term retention prove to be invaluable skills (Bransford et al., 1999; Brown, 1982; Ellis, 1997; Weinstein & Mayer, 1986). Unless pre-service teachers are aware of the need to teach learning strategies to their students, and if they are not familiar with as great a variety of learning strategies as teaching strategies, that knowledge may not find its way to students. And, since most pre-service language teachers have developed a love of and a talent for foreign languages, they may have a difficult time helping students to whom second language learning is more challenging. Equipping pre-service teachers with various learning strategies should go hand in hand with the development of teaching strategies.

Planning for Instruction

One data category which did not result from the professional literature, but rather emerged from the syllabi, was that of planning for learning. This category represented the gamut of considerations related to instructional planning. At the highest levels, the course goal was that students would have the ability to engage in curricular planning appropriate for the local community, the students, and the content. “Outcome assessments, curricular goals, student performance, and mastery” were all listed as part of the planning process. While the larger topic

of assessment will be discussed later in these findings, it is evident that considering assessment as important to planning can lead teachers to making more informed decisions about instruction. With the goal in mind, backwards planning at the curricular and unit or lesson level is better achieved.

From there, unit and lesson planning were noted as crucial. At the most spontaneous level, it was hoped that teachers would have the ability to make on-the-spot judgments and adjustments about their lesson delivery based on their students' performance. Related to the ability to make quick decisions about instruction were two other time-sensitive issues: lesson pacing and time-on-task. Lesson pacing included the allocation of time for individual lesson activities and components, as well as considering how teachers adjust their plans based on students' progress through those lessons. And, just as teachers must attend to minutes spent during one class period, they must also consider how much time each semester or quarter is spent developing a particular L2 competency. Although time-on-task is more related to student behaviors and classroom management, much of that management can be accomplished with appropriate instructional planning. While some would argue that classroom management is separate from PCK and lesson planning, I would argue that lessons succeed because the teacher is prepared and ready to direct the instructional group. Activities that are informative, engaging, and success-building serve to keep students focused and on task. Horizontal planning was also noted for consideration in just a few syllabi. Providing activities that enrich students' depth of knowledge on a particular topic or which allow more interested and/or able students to work on their individual interests is an effective way to engage them and to provide a diversity of learning experiences.

Some of the courses listed instructional planning as related to some very specific issues like Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) courses. And although the “pros and cons of block scheduling” were listed as a discussion topic, there was insufficient evidence in the syllabus to know if those discussions included strategies for adapting instruction to varying class lengths. And finally, four courses listed no pre-service content related to planning for instruction (See Table 14).

Behavior and Motivation

Another of the data categories established by the professional literature was that of affective considerations (Campbell, 1991; Ellis, 1997; Kim & Hall, 2002). Affective elements are given to mean student behaviors and attitudes which teacher behaviors potentially influence. The emotional classroom atmosphere, how teachers manage student behaviors, and motivation are all included in this realm. Pre-service teachers’ knowing how to create an optimum, supportive classroom environment was noted in ten of the syllabi (See Table 15).

Group dynamics seemed to be an important factor for the creation of a positive classroom setting. The syllabi made references to appropriate use of partner/pair and group activities, valuing the power of peer-relationships, and realizing how classmates can influence each others’ learning. On the individual side, topics such as student responsibility for learning and intrinsic motivation were also evident in a few courses. Motivation and motivational strategies appeared as discussion topics in eight of the syllabi. Only one instructor listed anxiety as a discussion topic.

Behavior management was placed in this affective category, considering the effects of behavior management on the overall classroom atmosphere. Talking with colleagues and watching the Harry Wong *First Days of School* videos were included as ways to learn more

about appropriate classroom management. Seven of the syllabi listed that pre-service teachers would demonstrate an understanding of good classroom management as a course goal. In my experience, classroom management can and should include instructional management, as described above in relation to planning for learning. It may also include behavior management or discipline, as specifically identified in six other syllabi. One third of the syllabi do not address affective issues such as classroom environment or motivation as class discussion topics or as course goals. And lastly, one syllabus, from Instructor P, couched nearly all of the methods course content in terms of behavioral and classroom management.

Assessment

This data category represents all of the syllabi information related to assessing secondary students' progress with SLA in the classroom setting. The types of assessments described included: formal, informal, ongoing, proficiency, aptitude, diagnostic, oral, pre-test/post-test, placement, achievement, performance-based, authentic, holistic, rubrics-based, and portfolios (See Table 16). I assume formal assessment to mean a traditional testing environment where students complete a written test, as contrasted with informal or ongoing assessments, (i.e., the constant gauging teachers do during classroom activities to verify that students have indeed understood what they think they understand). The "questioning strategies" found in Syllabus P came from a direct reference to comprehension monitoring. Pre-tests and post-tests are simply assessments used before and after instruction as a way to measure instructional effectiveness and the amount of progress students have made between learning points. Aptitude, diagnostic, and achievement tests can be clustered as similar, formal assessments. They each serve to measure students' levels of attained knowledge, ability, strengths, and/or weaknesses. Standardized testing would fall into this group. Proficiency, authentic, and performance-based tests share their

roots in the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (1999). These assessments ask that students demonstrate their L2 competencies in authentic settings which simulate real-life language-use situations. An oral assessment could be proficiency-based or used somehow to provide additional knowledge about students' speaking abilities. Holistic assessments focus not on error counting or exactly correct performances, but rather seek to evaluate an overall ability to demonstrate competencies and accomplishments. The use of rubrics is one way to achieve a holistic evaluation. Guidelines are set to direct students' work based on established expectations and then applied to the final product. Portfolios allow students to create a sort of "scrap book" of products that demonstrate knowledge on a specific subject or overall linguistic competency. Portfolios can be electronic or hard cover documents. Either form allows students to demonstrate their knowledge, to highlight exemplary experiences, and to reflect on the overall impact of their learning.

The range of assessment-related topics in the syllabi was as varied as the assessments themselves. As course goals, it was hoped that pre-service teachers would understand how to align assessments with the curriculum, how to assess all of the L2 skills, and how to use ongoing comprehension monitoring. As class discussion topics, some courses included evaluating specific language skills, aligning testing with teaching, testing culture, portfolios, and general test construction. Although possibly implied in some courses, the skill of interpreting students' scores or assessment outcomes was only explicitly mentioned in one syllabus. In fact, Instructor 4 expressed nearly all of the content in his syllabus in terms of the links between instruction and assessment.

Looking once again at Standards-based teaching, we are reminded that 19 of the courses devoted class time or course goals to some sort of standards-based teaching. However, only 12

of the syllabi listed any course content related to proficiency-based or authentic assessments. This may be attributed to the fact that the profession is still evolving into Standards-based teaching. However, we really should be considering the claims we want to make about what students can do and then identifying the sources of evidence needed to support those claims. In other words, step one is determining what the goals for students should be. Step two is deciding how to measure if students have accomplished what has been set forth for them, and step three is designing instruction to lead students to the goal. Traditional curricular planning may not always begin with the end product in mind, as demonstrated in these syllabi, with more attention paid to the Standards in the teaching portion of the syllabi rather than in the assessment section.

There was a small amount of data in the syllabi which related assessments to student diversity. Two courses held as a goal, “Demonstrate effective techniques for evaluating FL students of differing abilities.” Just as instruction might require modifications for diverse learners, assessment modifications can be just as important. Syllabus 3 included the following goal: “Use assessment to identify student strengths and to promote student growth rather than to deny students access to learning opportunities.” It would appear that Instructor 3 truly understands the importance of building up students’ confidence in their L2 abilities, in keeping with Ellis’ concept of resultative motivation (1997). Tests and grades often act as silent barriers, denying students access to advanced courses, even though they might be motivated enough to meet such challenges. Instructor 3 had more data listings (six) in the learner diversity category than any other instructor. It is notable that Instructor 3 recognizes the importance of learner diversity issues and goes so far as to follow-up with the same topic from instruction all the way through to assessment. I believe that diverse, student-centered learning will result in the greatest classroom success, based on the discussion from the professional literature found in Chapter 3.

Reflection

According to the literature, reflective practices are essential to the development of effective teaching skills (Cochran-Smith & Fries 2001; Hargreaves, 1994; Vélez-Rendón, 2002; Zephir, 2000). Within this data category, I have included all pre-service course content related to the consideration of why teachers teach as they do, how they reshape their practices based on experience, and what tools they use to examine their practices. Some type of ongoing evaluation of teaching practices was evident in 21 of the 31 syllabi (See Table 17).

For starters, six courses included reflective exercises on foundational teacher beliefs. The assumption was that if teachers reflected on their own personalities, learning styles, and their L2 learning experiences, they would better understand their own concepts of what a FL teacher should be and do. Additionally, pre-service teachers were asked to reflect on their classroom observation experiences and perhaps keep a journal about those reflections. Other courses included topics of how to self-assess teaching effectiveness; one course included content about conducting action research. The most common course goal related to reflection, found in almost half of the syllabi was, “Use reflective practices to improve over time; understand the importance of reflection and self-assessment.”

Data about being a life-long learner was also included in this category. I assumed that reflection would lead to change and growth, in much the same ways that having an attitude of life-long learning would accomplish a similar goal. They both reflect an attitude of wanting to continually improve and evolve as a FL educator. Three courses included suggestions that ongoing involvement in methodology-related listservs and developing the habit of reading professional journals would be effective means of enhancing life-long learning. Two syllabi noted the value of seeking constructive feedback as an additional way to improve teaching

practices. One instructor included stress management as a class discussion topic, which I also included in this category, as an essential, life-long, teacher survival skill. Learning how to cope with the constant and changing demands placed on a teacher can only help the teacher gain a healthy perspective for the duration of his or her career.

Voice and Identity

Closely related to developing a spirit of life-long reflective practice is the larger picture of developing pre-service teachers' sense of professional identity. The most common means to the development of professional identity as encouraged in 13 of the syllabi was active membership in professional organizations. Instructor K even required that students present a topic of interest at the local FL conference. Organizational membership could also relate back to the concept of life-long learning as noted in the previous section.

Many of the syllabi topics revolved around relationships with colleagues, administrators, parents, and the local community, using effective communication skills. Pre-service teachers were reminded to, “demonstrate ethical conduct and professionalism.” As a course goal, pre-service teachers were to become clear, pleasant, accurate, and caring role models.” Pre-service teachers were directed to consider cultural norms in the local community, and to act as agents of good will between the variety of cultures that might comprise that community. And in keeping with one of ACTFL’s five C’s—Community— pre-service teachers were encouraged by one instructor to help students make connections with their language learning experiences and their community.

There was also an element of FL advocacy in the syllabi. The implied expectation was that FL teachers should use their voices to promote the study of their subject area. Examples of advocacy issues as noted in the syllabi were: “Understand and communicate the value of

language learning;” and “Participate in local organizations for FL advocacy.” Syllabus D had the heaviest emphasis on advocacy, with a requirement to join the state FL organization, to perform a public-service act promoting FL learning, and to create a web page for FL advocacy. Perhaps because FL study resides outside of the “core curriculum” in most states, this is a skill that would not likely be evident in pre-service teacher instruction for new social studies or math teachers.

In summary, through their methods courses, pre-service teachers were asked to consider how they would see themselves as professionals and how others would perceive them based on their actions and professional demeanor. Cooperation with peers, students and other local entities as well as professional involvement for sharing, growing, and advocacy appeared to be the most commonly cited topics. Seven syllabi evidenced no course content related to the development of pre-service teachers’ voice and identity (See Table 18).

Other

There were three pieces of pre-service methodology course content that did not belong in any other data sorting category (See Table 19). First, three of the courses required that pre-service teachers demonstrate proficiency in *English* and L2 at an intermediate-high level in writing and speaking, and an advanced level in reading and listening. While the importance for FL teachers to possess solid L2 production skills was discussed earlier in these findings, a requirement to demonstrate adequate English skills was a rare finding. I assume that teacher professionals would need solid skills in English in order to intervene effectively in problematic classroom management situations as well as in emergencies, to communicate clearly with parents and colleagues, and to complete necessary written reports in a professional way. Possible FL teacher shortages in critical needs areas may be resulting in the hiring of native speakers to deliver L2

instruction. If native or heritage speakers have insufficient English abilities, their opportunities to build a professional voice in the greater learning community can be lessened.

Next, one of the course goals was to “understand the necessary university-school collaboration.” While the professional literature indeed discusses the need for seamless teacher preparation experiences, it does not note the idea as a cognitive concept to be taught within the context of the methodology course. But rather, the collaboration is recommended as a way to shepherd novices through their pre-service teaching preparation and to support them during their induction years. I can only speculate that this might be included as a methodology course topic in the spirit of impressing upon pre-service teachers the need to continue their learning to teach throughout their induction years.

The last piece of syllabi content that did not fit exactly into any other category was, “An awareness of local, state, national, and embassy resources.” This course content is loosely related to the PCK issues of culture and materials selection. Embassies, local businesses, etc. can be helpful allies and may be able to provide authentic materials as well as contact with native or heritage speakers. This content also relates somewhat to the teacher voice category, where teachers were encouraged to make connections with the local community.

Classroom Experience

I was able to establish which programs offered field experiences or any type of classroom observations from a combination of the instructor surveys and from the syllabi themselves. Table 21 lists the amounts and the types of practicum experiences offered in conjunction with all but five of the pre-service methods courses. Most of the observations took place in secondary school settings, although one class completed their observations in post-secondary FL courses

and another group was required to observe an immersion class. There was wide variety in the number of hours of observation required, ranging from 2 to 50 plus.

In the syllabi, exercises to connect the practicum experience with the theories from the readings were evident. The exercises came most often in the form of reflection journals and papers. These sorts of “on the job” training experiences may in fact be the solution to the concerns that surfaced in the Cooper survey (2004) about the need to connect theory to practice. And, given that connections to past learning appear to be the key to successful new learning of all sorts (Bransford et al, 1999), those “real” classroom connections must be made in order for the pre-service teachers to be able to synthesize what they have learned in the methods course.

Course Grading

How pre-service teachers were evaluated in the methods courses ranged from mid-term and final exams to project presentations and portfolio assessments. Many courses required theoretical papers and reflection pieces. Some courses emphasized more “participatory learning,” as evidenced in the syllabi that appeared to dedicate a greater proportion of the course grade based on process-product sorts of projects like lesson plan creation and portfolio presentations. And nearly all the courses included attendance and class participation as a portion of pre-service teachers’ grades.

Eleven syllabi provided no evidence of the use of a mid-term or final exam as instruments to evaluate pre-service teachers. In those courses, the instructors relied on papers, projects, and presentations as the means to provide adequate and appropriate evaluations of their pre-service teachers. Eight relied on periodic quizzes, tests, and even pop quizzes over the course readings as part of students’ grades. Because I personally believe that pop quizzes serve to create an adversarial relationship between teacher and students, I would not advocate for the modeling of

that practice in a pre-service methods course. Pop quizzing can imply messages that students are too unmotivated to work without external forces because they are inherently lazy, and that the power differential between teacher and students needs to be a negative one. Rather than trying to catch students off guard, by communicating to them up front what the expectations are and what the checkpoints will be, students sense that the instructor is for them and not against, thereby creating a greater attitude of mutual respect and trust; a concept that was reinforced in the Table 15 findings. “Recognizing the value of intrinsic motivation” and other similar data that addressed the importance of creating a positive classroom climate were concepts that some of the methodology instructors had included in their syllabi.

Evidence or demonstration of teaching skills was apparent in the grading for all but five courses in the form of micro-teaches or similar class presentations intended to imitate content delivery in a FL classroom. Pre-service teachers were often required to submit a unit or lesson plan, either in conjunction with the micro-teaching or as a stand-alone exercise. Four courses allowed for video taping of lesson presentations for reflection. Also related to classroom teaching was the submission of a behavior management plan in five courses. Another five required the creation of a lesson assessment. Eleven of the courses required some type of technology, multi-media presentation, or web project. And the teaching portfolios varied greatly; some were scrapbook-style and others were created electronically. Finally, eleven courses tied a portion of the pre-service teachers’ grades in the methods course to the observation and field experiences.

Another cluster of assignments used to grade pre-service teachers was on their collections of teaching materials. Eight instructors asked their students to create resource files, boxes containing realia, or other sorts of props intended for implementation in the classroom. (Realia is considered to be any object that is an authentic, direct artifact from the target culture.) Based on

Krashen's (1992) $i + 1$ Theory, effective teachers make the input comprehensible to the learners. One of the ways to make language more salient is to use objects, pictures, and other types of concrete examples to help convey meaning. Realia often serves a dual purpose—making language accessible while bringing culture into language instruction at the same time.

As mentioned earlier, some instructors urged their students to become involved in FL professional organizations. In fact, six instructors tied that requirement to their students' grades. Four of the courses showed the requirement of creating a personal professional development plan. This course requirement appeared to be linked to the notion of ongoing, life-long learning. Three courses asked for the creation of a resumé or job search plan.

It would seem that one of the greatest challenges to the post-secondary FL methods instructor is the modeling of FL assessments within the methods course itself. As evidenced time and time again, the array of topics and skills that need to be covered within the scope of one class is almost limitless. And since methodology courses are situated within the larger context of teacher certification programs regulated by state licensure agencies, instructors are obligated to design assessments which clearly demonstrate to accreditation agencies that teachers who graduate from local programs are indeed highly qualified teachers. The pre-service teacher portfolio seems to be one such solution to providing the mandated evidence. So if the portfolio model is appropriate for demonstrating pre-service teacher competencies, why is it that teachers rely on more traditional, pencil-paper models to assess their own students' competencies? I would argue that the assessment tools used in the methodology course should, to some degree, serve as a model for secondary classroom assessments, perhaps through the use of rubrics, performance assessments, presentations, technology, and the like.

Chapter Summary

While I began this study with some specific assumptions, the data bears out that they were mostly untrue. I had assumed that the methods instructors' secondary background (or lack of) would prove to be a strong factor in the delivery of the methods course. There was no strong correlation. Neither was there a correlation between methods courses situated in FL departments vs. courses housed in schools of education with relation to specific types of course content.

The single most striking feature of the findings from this study was the incredible variety it uncovered. From the wide variances in the instructors' backgrounds, to the inconsistencies across the syllabi findings, to the many ways that instructors evaluated the pre-service teacher candidates, the range was indeed vast. And yet, the standards which have been set forth by national, state and local agencies are fairly specific. Thus it would seem likely that the wide array of topics, texts, and course assessments are a reflection of the individual instructors' beliefs and preferences. Just as pre-service teachers' practices are influenced by their beliefs and past experiences, it is likely that the methods instructors' beliefs about concepts to emphasize in their courses are partly the result of their own experiences.

We are reminded that just as all secondary FL classrooms are impacted by an array of socio-cultural variables and therefore cannot be identical by nature, the same is true for post-secondary classrooms. Hence the question remains: how much of the variety that exists in pre-service FL teacher training is due to contextual variables and how much is due to instructor preferences and beliefs? And in allowing for local variations of the methods course content, have all courses in some way addressed the essential features outlined in Chapters 1 and 2 of this study? The enumerative quality of the data as described in Chapter 5 and available in Appendix I demonstrate where the courses appear to be in keeping with the recommendations from the

literature and where they do not. The data have been examined thus far in keeping with the professional literature; it was in fact that literature which shaped the categories for classifying the raw data.

As a final consideration, ACTFL, the leading national FL association, has partnered with NCATE for the purpose of outlining what competencies pre-service FL teachers should obtain. Given these novice teacher standards, Chapter 6 examines the methods course findings with the lens of the ACTFL/NCATE Standards in order to provide answers to the questions above.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS AND QUESTIONS

Considering the Findings in the Context of the ACTFL/NCATE Standards

Since the ACTFL/NCATE Standards (See Appendix A) represent the benchmark most closely and sequentially related to the time frame of the methodology course for secondary foreign language teachers (i.e., one semester prior to graduation and state licensure), let us consider these findings in the context of those standards. The ACTFL/NCATE Standards are comprised of two components, Program Standards (PS) and Content and Supporting Standards (CSS). The first set outline the recommended components of successful pre-service teacher programs, and the latter outline the evidence that pre-service teachers should be able to demonstrate as proof of attained competencies.

PS 1, PS 2, and CSS 1: L2 Fluency

These standards all address the development of pre-service teacher's L2 fluency. In the instructor questionnaires, there was considerable mention of how a teacher's fluency, or lack there of, influenced methodology selection. And yet, the methodology course content only briefly considered this aspect of instructional delivery in nine instances (See Table 10). It is possible that methodology instructors consider or assume that L2 proficiency is developed elsewhere in the undergraduate curriculum. However, in the context of PCK, more emphasis could be given on how to deliver instruction effectively in the target language, how to make language salient to the learners, the use of scaffolding, paraphrasing, etc. PS 8 calls for study abroad experiences in the pre-service teachers' repertoire. Those experiences clearly reside

outside of the methods courses, but are likely cited as essential due to their power to impact growth in L2 fluency and to equip the teacher candidate with first-hand cultural knowledge.

PS 3: Language, Linguistics, Culture, and Literature

The third standard lists the essential components to the overall pre-service teacher preparation experience. I assume that the language and linguistics background serve to foster the development of candidates' L2 fluency. Culture is intended to cut across the language teaching experience and to be woven into the basic fabric of FL teaching. The syllabi did evidence a significant number of elements related to the teaching of culture. Twenty-two of the courses included the teaching of culture as evidenced in the PCK syllabi data. The syllabi also addressed the teacher's role in mediating culture within the social context of the classroom and the local community. However, when examining the course evaluation components of the methodology classes, culture appeared to be a sideline experience. Either it's not important enough to be evaluated, or perhaps methodology instructors are unsure how to evaluate it, and it is possible that it is implicitly vs. explicitly evaluated within the larger scheme of SLA assessment. While some of the micro-teaches and class presentations were required to be on a cultural topic, for the most part, practice teaching was performed on "language" topics (i.e., how to teach a particular grammatical feature, how to teach listening, etc.).

Literature, the final component of the standard, is likely there because of the rich opportunities for pre-service teachers to acquire language and cultural appreciation through the study of authentic literature. Those same experiences can be extended to the secondary classroom at lower levels of comprehension. And while teaching reading appears in the PCK section of 21 syllabi, teaching language through literature is only evident in two. It would appear that either an assumption exists that pre-service teachers will know how to teach literature based

on their observations as students of literature, or that the use of literature in the secondary classroom is minimized in the methodology course. A common historical assumption is that students must learn the “language” before they have the tools to unpack the literature, or said another way, that authentic literature is too difficult for secondary students. While this may be true of many pieces of very dense literature, there are many authentic selections available for secondary classroom use. And by incorporating reading and authentic literature in beginning and intermediate language acquisition courses, learners can gain language skills via the literature and take in authentic cultural perspectives in the process.

The challenge to secondary L2 methodology is helping teachers know how to make the literature accessible to students. So until teachers adopt a belief that reading authentic pieces is beneficial to students, they may side step this skill in favor of interpersonal modes of communication. And because reading, as an intake skill, can be more challenging to students, it is easy for secondary students to become frustrated with the reading process. For all these reasons, methodology courses need to consider equipping pre-service teachers with strategies to make reading accessible to students and to take them beyond a mere comprehension of the printed text and into critical thinking and reflecting on reading in the target language.

PS 4: Methodology Instruction

This standard addresses the need for a methods course taught by a FL specialist “whose expertise is foreign language education and who is knowledgeable about current instructional approaches and issues.” Only one of the syllabi received was representative of a “general” methods course designed to serve across content areas. While it is possible that more such programs exist, I believe that since many of the instructors were recommended by other FL methods instructors, this study does not likely represent the gamut of possible methodological

experiences for FL teachers, but rather provides a cross-section sampling of what FL-specific methods course content might look like. And, it appears that all of the instructors in the study, except four, have some secondary teaching experience upon which to base their assumptions. The fact that 18 of the instructors had secondary experiences over a decade ago also creates an obligation on the part of the methods instructors to insure that their own beliefs and pedagogical practices remain current. As discussed earlier in the literature, the field of FL teaching has changed considerably in recent years. Therefore, it behooves methods instructors to work hard to attend conferences, to dialog with contemporary secondary FL teachers, and to create opportunities to work collaboratively with them; all in an effort to thwart the cyclical spread of outdated methodologies (Schultz, 2000; Vélez-Rendón, 2000).

PS 4 as well as CSS 3 do suggest that the instructors need be aware of current methodological trends and provide pre-service teachers with sufficient second language acquisition theory to justify and to frame instructional practices. Since the data in this study cannot measure the instructors' knowledge, I can only speculate, based on the course content presented, that the instructors espoused a vastly wide array of theories and methodologies as presented to their pre-service teacher candidates. The profession is obviously still struggling with the identification of "best practices." The answer lies somewhere between sufficient diversity to meet the learning needs of all students and the plethora of methodologies that have been devised as a response to the profession's quest to identify best instructional practices as determined by SLA research.

In my experience, the most significant shift in FL instruction over the past decade is the creation and adoption of the *21st Century Standards for Foreign Language Learning* (1999). CSS 4 calls for the integration of the National Standards in planning, materials selection and design, and instructional delivery. As discussed earlier in the findings, while some Standards-

based methodology course content is evident in all but two of the syllabi, translating the Standards into practice as seen in the PCK findings and in the low number of courses that address standards-based assessments is not yet happening in-depth in all programs. Currently, we are talking the talk but not yet walking the walk. One syllabus listed the class discussion in this way, “The evolution of methods into Standards-based.” Because the instructional practices of most current secondary and post-secondary FL instructors pre-date the birth of the National Standards, teacher candidates are not yet experiencing a wide-spread application of them in their own language learning settings, during their field experiences, or in the methods courses themselves. But the evolution is somewhat evident. The most commonly used methodology texts all provide deep knowledge about the Standards. It therefore becomes a matter of translating knowledge about the Standards into more Standards-based instructional and assessment practices.

The larger question remains, will the evolution be fast enough? In a recent presentation, data indicated that very few programs which have submitted reports to the ACTFL/NCATE accreditation review process have met the program requirements (Glisan et al., 2005). The primary downfall resides in the artifacts that the teacher candidates submit as evidence that they are meeting the standards. While the teacher preparation programs and methods course syllabi may indeed reflect Standards-based practices, that course content is not necessarily resulting in Standards-based teaching as reflected in the artifacts submitted to NCATE. Thus, it would appear that teacher preparation programs must take additional steps to insure that teaching practices, not just the supporting theory and jargon, are demonstrably Standards-based.

CSS 5: Assessment of Languages and Cultures

Here we consider the integration of the Standards into assessments. CSS 5 calls for a knowledge and application of assessment models as well as reflection upon them. As already discussed, the syllabi have demonstrated that Standards-based instruction is currently more evident in the methodology courses than Standards-based assessments, planning, or materials selection.

PS 5 and PS 6: Field Experiences

The importance of field experiences supervised by qualified and knowledgeable faculty is set forth here. Again, it is not within the scope of this study to determine the qualified nature of field supervisors. The Standards do call for field experience during the methods course, prior to the student teaching experience in FL classrooms. Five of the courses included in this study offered no concurrent practicum experience, and some of the field experiences were limited to a very small number of hours or observations. While the syllabi did not generally specify that the observations took place in FL classrooms, related course content (e.g. classroom discussions on the methodologies used), lead me to believe that most of the experiences took place in FL settings.

CSS 6: Professionalism

Teacher candidates are expected to engage in professional development. While not defined, the spirit of this Standard is to move teachers beyond the methods course and field experiences so as to continue to learn and grow as FL professionals. In the Voice and Identity section of the syllabi findings (Table 18), nearly one half of the instructors have included involvement in professional organizations as a goal. What about the other half? In the course evaluation section of the findings (Table 22) attendance at professional conferences, creating a personal

professional development plan, and making conference presentations are only factored into a handful of courses. Because this standard represents a belief, a behavior, and an attitude of willingness to seek ongoing change, it is likely difficult to assess. Will requiring membership in local professional organizations translate into active involvement for inservice teachers?

The other aspect of professionalism seen in the syllabi was related to teacher behaviors and conduct in the school setting: relationships with students, colleagues, and the greater school community. In a few courses, pre-service teachers were asked to consider the effect of their listening, communicating, and role modeling. These course topics are not, however, widespread across the syllabi. It may be that because these behaviors are so closely tied to personal relationships and experiences, methodology instructors consider this topic best left to student teaching and similar experiences. I would argue that raising an awareness through discussions and role-playing is valuable in the quest to raise the bar for teacher professionalism. Many studies cite a lack of respect for teaching as why teaching remains an unattractive career or why new teachers leave the profession (Gold, 1996; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; Wilkerson 2000). Two of the FL teacher preparation programs in this study will not exist starting in the fall of 2005, due to lack of enrollment. This finding supports the greater concern that for a variety of reasons, fewer post-secondary students are attracted to a career in L2 teaching in the face of a growing shortage of highly qualified FL teachers. By increasing new teachers' professionalism, they may be better equipped to gain respect in the local education community. Respect is earned, so let's give beginning teachers the tools to cultivate respected and respectful interactions.

Conclusions

Returning to where this study began, it does appear that pre-service teacher methodological training may not be keeping pace with the social and professional forces that depend on it. The lack of clear and complete shifting to Standards-based instruction and assessment is the most profound piece of evidence to support this claim. Vélez-Rendón (2002) called for a “wider array of competencies” in order to effectively actualize L2 instruction in this century. Yet the findings in this study do not convince me that pre-service teachers are leaving the experience equipped with the tools to meet the needs of diverse learners. While there does appear to be a great diversity of available methodologies, the methodological diversity appears to be linked to diverse instructor beliefs about teaching practices rather than linked specifically to students’ learning differences. The profession must somehow demystify foreign language teaching practices and identify a more systematic means of unveiling those practices for new teacher candidates.

Strengthening Programs through the Methodology Course

By identifying effective instructional practices through the lens of what best enhances student learning, a call for knowledge about how to use L2 in salient ways so as to foster the use of L2 in instruction which leads to student comprehension and retention would seem to be in order. Equipping pre-service teachers with both teaching and learning strategies so as to affect deep learning would also need to be thoroughly addressed. And finally, planning for assessment and instruction within the framework of proficiency-based objectives (i.e., claims, evidence, and instruction) will keep the student rather than the subject matter in the forefront of teaching practices. These are great challenges for methodology instructors.

Strengthening Programs at the Institutional Level

Goodlad (1990) called for greater support of teacher trainers in the post-secondary arena, stating that if schools of education wish to improve teacher training, that more time and resources must be allocated to this worthy endeavor. Publication and research demands may not allow teacher preparation faculty the time they need to best foster and oversee new teacher preparation along the continuum. Time constraints may also impede the necessary cooperation between language and literature faculty within foreign language departments, the actualization of the co-development of new FL teachers as a shared responsibility between FL and education faculty, and the collaboration of schools and universities as they seek to extend the teacher preparation process into teachers early induction years.

From my position as a secondary teacher, Goodlad makes a hugely important claim: that reform efforts in teacher education must be joined with those who work in the schools. Because of a general lack in this area, criticism of teacher training programs is generously fueled. One often hears that university courses are only theory and irrelevant to the “real world.” I believe that only by making those connections between theory and “real world” will teacher education programs be truly effective. The FL profession is in fact striving to make L2 instruction more reflective of the society around us by advocating for authentic, communicative instruction. It will take a combined “real world” awakening of teacher preparation programs *and* of FL methodologies to arrive at the most effective teacher preparation paradigms. But once again, pulling the contributing secondary and post-secondary faculties together requires leadership, time, and an immense amount of effort. Of these three, time is usually the missing element, because of the demands on teachers and teacher trainers in our current traditional teacher preparation configurations.

Another paramount concern about teacher preparation programs is the data that illustrate a lack of perceived quality in schools of education. Colleagues in the arts and sciences see education professors at the bottom of the prestige ladder; not true scholars. In order to qualify as scholars and to earn tenure, university professors are expected to produce research. Goodlad (1990) wrote:

In the large research-oriented schools of education, teacher candidates perceived themselves as on the fringes. They knew which education faculty members had national reputations, but they had little or no association with these well-known figures. Further, they knew that the school of education ranked rather far down on the scale of professional school prestige. Thus, they found themselves in a second-class enterprise in a second-class unit of the campus. (p. 207)

Goodlad proposed that in order to achieve change and renewal of teacher education programs, faculty members' time and energies must be allowed to be allocated to a "first-rate teacher education program" (p. 195). Lawmakers and university policy makers must deem teacher preparation central to the mission of the schools and ensure the resources required to support such programs.

Much to the credit of the instructors in this study who lead methodology training, I did sense that they genuinely strived to set their teacher candidates on the path to success. All of the instructors who participated in this study did so voluntarily, and they indicated in the instructor survey, for the most part, that they teach the methods course by choice. Those who participated in the instructor questionnaire wrote with passion about best practices and expressed their frustrations with regards to the shortfalls they perceived. It is with gratitude to these instructor

participants that I conclude this study, hoping to have established some baseline data about the state of pre-service FL methodological content and training.

Recommendation for Further Research

Readers are reminded that this study represents but a sample of pre-service methodology training across the U.S. And because the study was comprised primarily of an archival analysis of the course syllabi, it cannot completely account for all of the classroom interactions during methodological training, nor can it assume the experiences within each teacher preparation program designed to compliment or to enhance the methods course.

In order to better understand the complete formation of new FL teachers, further longitudinal studies should be conducted at two or three teacher preparation sites. These studies would follow pre-service teachers through all of their education coursework, their methods course(s), intern teaching, and the first two years of induction teaching. It appears that certain facets of novice teacher preparation develop over time and with experience, such as PCK. Closely following small groups of pre-service teachers over the course of their preparation might serve to identify where program strengths and weaknesses lie, as well as further explain the types of experiences that most positively impact a novices' development. Vélez-Rendón (2002) calls for research on partnerships between local schools and FL teacher preparation programs. Longitudinal studies could include how the secondary/post-secondary relationships impact new teacher development.

Data could be collected in the form of classroom videos, interviews with pre-service teachers, their university instructors, supervising teachers, school administrators, and students of these novice teachers. Shadowing teacher candidates in their university L2 classes could provide insights into the content delivery methods to which they are exposed before becoming teachers

themselves. The institutions' methodology course syllabi could again be examined and study participants might answer survey questions from time to time as necessary. In other words, an in-depth study over four to five years at some interesting teacher preparation sites could generate substantial data.

A smaller, related study might gather qualitative data about pre-service teachers' FL teaching and learning beliefs. Since belief shifting must precede change and adaptation, a future study which examines how effective the pre-service FL methods course is in changing students' beliefs could be useful. Just as one of the methodology instructors asked her students to reflect on how their beliefs had transformed over the duration of the course, a research study could collect interview data about what the pre-existing and post-methods course beliefs are, and what factors lead to the most changes and/or improvements to the teacher belief paradigm.

In Closing

In order to advance pre-service FL methodology instruction, keeping learner diversity in mind while considering SLA theories and how those theories translate into best practices will likely keep the profession moving in a positive direction. Vélez-Rendón states:

There is consensus that the main goal in second language learning is the development of language proficiency and cultural awareness. To achieve this goal, language teachers must be able to implement a number of interactive relationships that place the learner at the center. These include opportunities for learners to interact with the target language, with the other actors in the classroom, and with the instructional environment in which learning occurs.

(p.462)

Right now, it appears that a lack of consensus exists in the field about the *how* rather than the *what*. Methodology instructors seem to all be working towards the development of competent

new foreign language teachers. However, across the syllabi, inconsistencies continue to exist especially in the areas of the appropriate use of L2 in the classroom and how to address learner diversity with a sufficient variety of instructional strategies.

REFERENCES

- Allen, L. (2002). Teachers' pedagogical beliefs and the standards for world language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 3(5), 518-528.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (1999). *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century*. Lawrence, KS: Allen Press, Inc.
- Anton, M., & DiCamilla, F. (1999). Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 83(2), 233-247.
- Bailey, P., Daley, C., & Onwuegbuzie, A. (1999). Foreign language anxiety and learning style. *Foreign Language Annals*, 32(1), 63-73.
- Baum, D., & Luna, C. (2003, July). *Beyond the classroom: How Advanced Placement (AP) students are learning Spanish language*. Paper presented at the annual HACU International Conference, Guadalajara, Mexico.
- Belz, J., & Kinginger, C. (2002). The cross-linguistic development of address form use in telecollaborative language learning: Two case studies. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 59(2), 186-212.
- Bradi, S. (1995). Reconsidering the role of interaction and input in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 45(1), 141-175.
- Braggar, J., & Rice, D. (1999). The message is the medium: A new paradigm for content-oriented instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 32(3), 373-392.
- Bransford, J., (2001). Teaching thinking and problem solving. In F. Schultz, (Ed.), *Sources: Notable selections in education*, (pp. 301-307). Guilford, CN: Dushkin Publishing Group.
- Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (1999). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school*. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Britzman, D. (1991). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Brown, A. (1982). *Learning, remembering, and understanding*. Cambridge, MA: Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc.

- Brown, K. (2001). Mentoring and the retention of newly qualified language teachers *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 31(1), 69-89.
- Bruer, J. (2001). Education and the brain: A bridge too far. In F. Schultz (Ed.), *Sources: Notable selections in education* (pp. 319-329). Guilford, CN: Dushkin Publishing Group.
- Campbell, C. (1991). Motivating unenthusiastic foreign language students: meeting the challenge. In W. Hatfield (Ed.), *Creative approaches in foreign language teaching* (pp. 79-91). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Chaffee, J. (1992). Teaching critical thinking across the curriculum. In D. Barnes (Ed.), *Critical thinking: Educational imperative* (pp.25-35). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of a theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1980). *Rules and representations*, Columbia University Press.
- Clark, R. (1988). School-university relationships: An interpretive review. In K Sirotnik & J. Goodlad (Eds.), *School-university partnerships in action: concepts, cases, and concerns*, (pp. 23-48). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Clement, M. (2003). Insights gained from following foreign language methods students through the student teaching semester. *FLAG Journal* 4(1): 22-29.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, M. (2001). Stick, stones, and ideology: The discourse reform in teacher education. *Educational Researcher* 30(8), 3-15.
- Cohen, A. (2000). Strategies-based instruction for learners of a second language. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 84(612), 10-18.
- College Board. (2004). *AP participation report*. New York, NY: Author.
- Cook, V. (1993). *Linguistics and second language acquisition*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Cooper, T. (2001). Foreign language teaching style and personality. *Foreign Language Annals* 34(4), 301-317.
- Cooper, T. (2004) How foreign language teachers in Georgia evaluate their professional preparation: A call for action. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(1), 37-48.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2001). The challenge of staffing our schools. *Educational Leadership*, 58(8), 12-17.

- Dasenbrock, R. (1999) Changing teacher preparation for a changing student body. In P. Franklin, D. Lawrence, & E. Wells (Eds.), *Preparing a nation's teachers* (pp. 319-331). New York: The Modern Language Association of America.
- Donato, R., & McCormick, D. (1994). A sociocultural perspective on language learning strategies: The role of mediation. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(4), 453-464.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1013-1056.
- Feiman-Nemser, S., & Parker, M. (1995). Making subject matter part of the conversation in learning to teach. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(3), 32-43.
- Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 78-93
- Freiberg, H. (2002). Essential skills for new teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 59(6), 56-60.
- Fowler, B. (2002). Expert says he discerns "hard-wired" grammar rules. *New York Times*. New York: D6.
- Gardner, H., & Walters, J. (2001). A rounded version. In F. Schultz, (Ed.), *Sources: Notable selections in education*, (pp. 308-318). Guilford, CN: Dushkin Publishing Group.
- Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Glisan, S., Levy, S., & Phillips, J. (2005, March). The ACTFL/NCATE teacher accreditation process. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, New York, NY.
- Gold, Y. (1996). Beginning teacher support: Attrition, mentoring, and induction. In J. P. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, E. Guyton & A.o.T. Educators (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: a project of the Association of Teacher Educators* (pp. 548-594). New York: Macmillan Library Reference, USA.
- Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Graham, P., Hudson-Ross, S., Adkins, C., McWhorter, P., & Stewart, J. (1999). *Teacher mentor: A dialogue for collaborative learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Grossman, P. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education*. New York Teachers College: Columbia University.
- Grossman, P., & Stodolsky, S. (1995). Content as context: The role of school subjects in secondary school teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 24(8), 3-11.
- Guntermann, G. (Ed.). (1993). *Developing language teachers for a changing world*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Guntermann, G. (2000). *Teaching Spanish with the five C's: A blueprint for success*. Orlando: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Hall, J. (2001). *Methods for teaching foreign languages*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hargreaves, A. (1993). Teacher development in the postmodern age: Dead certainties, safe simulation, and the boundless self. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 9(2), 95-113.
- Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age*. London: Cassell.
- Harklau, L. (1994). ESL versus mainstream classes: Contrasting L2 learning environments. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 241-272.
- Hodder, I. (1994). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 393-402). London: Sage.
- Hodge, M. (1998). Teaching foreign language to at-risk learners. *Inquiry*, 2(1), 68-78.
- Hodgkinson, H. (2001). Educational demographics: What teachers should know. *Educational Leadership*, 58(4), 6-11.
- Hower, K. (1996). Designing coherent and effective teacher education programs. In J. P. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, E. Guyton & A.o. T. Educators (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: a project of the Association of Teacher Educators* (pp. 231-226). New York: Macmillan Library Reference, USA.
- Imig, D., & Switzer, T. (1996). Changing teacher education programs: restructuring collegiate-based teacher education. In J. P. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, E. Guyton & A.o. T. Educators (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: a project of The Association of Teacher Educators* (pp. 213-226). New York: Macmillan Library Reference, USA.

- Ingersoll, R., & Smith, T. (2004). Do teacher induction and mentoring matter? *NAASP Bulletin*, 88(638), 28-41.
- Innis, R. (1985). *Semiotics: An introductory anthology*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Jorgenson, O. (2001). Supporting a diverse teacher corps. *Educational Leadership*, 58(8), 64-67.
- Kagan, D. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 62(2), 129-169.
- Kauffman, D., Johnson, S., Kardos, S., Liu, E., & Peske, H. (2002). Lost at sea: New teachers' experiences with curriculum and assessment. *Teachers College Record*, 104(2), 273-300.
- Kim, D., & Hall, J.K. (2002). The role of an interactive book reading program in the development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Modern Language Journal*, 86(3), 332-349.
- Knight, S., Palka, K., & Richardson, N. (1998). Positive transfer: how an elementary perspective can transform the secondary foreign language classroom. *Action in Teacher Education*, 20, 24-34.
- Krashen, S. (1992). *Fundamentals of language education*. Lincolnwood, IL: Laredo Publishing.
- Krashen, S. (1999). Seeking a role for grammar: A review of some recent studies. *Foreign language Annals*, 32(2), 245-258.
- Krathwohl, D. (2002). A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: an overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(4), 217-219.
- Kwo, O. (1996). Learning to teach English in Hong Kong classrooms: Patterns on reflection. In D. Freeman & J. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp. 295-319). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lafayette, R. (1993). Subject-matter content: What every foreign language teacher needs to know. In G. Guntermann (Ed.), *Developing language teachers for a changing world* (pp. 125-157). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- LeCompte, M. (2000). Analyzing qualitative data. *Theory Into Practice*, 39(3), 146-154.
- LeCompte, M., Preissle, J., & Tesch, R. (1993). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. San Diego: Academic Press.

- Liskin-Gasparro, J. (1999). Issues for foreign language departments and prospective teachers. In P. Franklin, D. Lawrence, and E. Welles (Eds.), *Preparing a nation's teachers* (pp. 284-316). New York: The Modern Language Association of America.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? *Educational Researcher*, March, pp. 13-17.
- Mellgren, M. & Caye, L. (1989). School-university collaboration in second language teacher education: Building a successful partnership. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22(6), 553-560.
- Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mok, W. (1994). Reflecting on reflections: A case study of experienced and inexperienced teachers. *System*, 22, 99-111.
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nassaji, H., & Cumming, A. (2000). What's in a ZPD? A case study of a young ESL student and teacher interacting through dialogue journals. *Language Teaching Research*, 4(2), 95-121.
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).
- Nostrand, H. (1989). The beginning teacher's cultural competence: Goal and strategy. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22(2), 189-193.
- Ohta, A. (2000). Re-thinking recasts: A learner-centered examination of corrective feedback in the Japanese language classroom. In J.K. Hall & L. Verplaatse (Eds.), *The development of second and foreign language learning through classroom interaction* (pp. 47-71). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Omaggio Hadley, A. (2001). *Teaching language in context*. Stamford, CT: Heinle & Heinle.
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 9-31.

- Pica, T. (1992). The textual outcomes of native speaker-non-native speaker negotiation: What do they reveal about second language learning? In C. J. Kramsch & S. McConnell-Ginet (Eds.), *Text and context. Cross-disciplinary perspectives on language study* (pp. 115-132). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Ray, B., & Seely, C. (2002). *Fluency through TPR storytelling*. Berkeley, CA: Command Performance Language Institute.
- Reynolds, A. (1995). The knowledge base for beginning teachers: Education professionals' expectations versus research. *Elementary School Journal*, 95(3), 199-222.
- Richards, J. (1998). *Beyond training*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ryan, G., & Bernard, H. (1998). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K., Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 769-802). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Rymer, R. (1994). *Genie: a scientific tragedy*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial.
- Schick, J., & Nelson, P. (2001). Language teacher education: The challenge for the twenty-first century. *Clearing House*, 74(6), 301-304.
- Schulz, R. (2000). Foreign language teacher development; MLJ perspectives 1916-1999. *Modern Language Journal*, 84(3), 496-522.
- Seabold, C., & Wallinger, L. (2000). An update on the status of foreign language education in the United States. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 84(612), 1-9.
- Shresta, T. (1998). Instruction and exposure: How to they contribute to second language acquisition? *Foreign Language Annals*, 31(2), 231-242.
- Shocker-von Dittfurth, M., & Legutke, M. (2002). Visions of what is possible in teacher education—or lost in complexity? *ELT Journal*, 56(2), 162-171.
- Shrum, J. & Glisan, S. (2000). *Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction*. Heinle & Heinle.
- Shulman, L. (1990). *Research in teaching and learning : A project of the American Educational Research Association*. New York: MacMillan.
- Silverman, D. (2000). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text, and interaction*. London: Sage Publications.
- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data*. London: Sage Publications.

- Skehan, P. (1998). Task-based instruction. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18(1), 268-286.
- Smagorinsky, P., Cook, L., & Johnson, T. (2003). The twisting path of concept development in learning to teach. *Teachers College Record*, 105(8), 1399-1437.
- Smagorinsky, P., & Whiting, E. (1995). *How English teachers get taught: Methods of teaching the methods class*. Urbana, Illinois: National Council on the Teaching of English.
- Smith, T., & Ingersoll, R. (2003). *Reducing teacher turnover: What are the components of effective induction?* University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA.
- Spradley, J. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury park, CA: Sage.
- Sullivan, J. (2001). The challenge of foreign language teacher preparation: Addressing state teacher standards. *Clearing House*, 74(6), 305-308.
- Tedick, D., & Walker, C. (1995). From theory to practice: How do we prepare teachers for second language classrooms? *Foreign Language Annals*, 28(4), 499-517.
- Tesser, C., & Long, D. (2000). The teaching of Spanish literature: A necessary partnership between the language and literature sections of traditional departments. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(6), 605-613.
- Toppo, G. (2003). The American teacher. *USA Today*: July 3, 1D-2D.
- VanPatten, B. (2002). Processing instruction: An update. *Language Learning*, 52(4), 755-803.
- Vélez-Rendón, G. (2002). Second language teacher education: A review of the literature. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35(4), 457-467.
- Voght, G. (2000). New paradigms for U.S. higher education in the twenty-first century. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(3), 269-277.
- Vygotsky, L. (1987). Thinking and speech. In R. Rieber & A. Carton (Eds.), *L.S. Vygotsky, collected works* (pp. 39-285). New York: Plenum.
- Vygotsky, L., & Cole, M. (1978). *Mind in society : the development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press.

- Weinstein, C., & Mayer, R. (1986). The teaching of learning strategies. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 315-327). New York, Macmillan Publishing Co.
- Wells, G. (1999). Using L1 to master L2: A response to Anton and DiCamilla's sociocognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 83(2), 248-254.
- Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, J., & Moon, B. (1998). A critical analysis of the research on learning to teach: Making the case for an ecological perspective on inquiry. *Review of Educational Research*, 68(2), 130-178.
- Wilkerson, C. (2000). Attrition of foreign language teachers: Workplace realities. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(1), 31-34.
- Wolcott, H. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zephir, F. (2000). Focus on form and meaning: Perspectives of developing teachers and action-based research. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35(1), 305-319.

Appendix A

ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards For The Preparation of World Language Teachers

I. Requirements for Programs of World Language Teacher Preparation

The preparation of foreign language teachers is the joint responsibility of the faculty in foreign languages and education. In order for foreign language teacher candidates to attain the knowledge, skills, and dispositions described in the ACTFL Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers, programs of foreign language teacher preparation must demonstrate that they include the components and characteristics described below.

1. The development of candidates' foreign language proficiency in all areas of communication, with special emphasis on developing oral proficiency, in all language courses. Upper-level courses should be taught in the foreign language.
2. An ongoing assessment of candidates' oral proficiency and provision of diagnostic feedback to candidates concerning their progress in meeting required levels of proficiency.
3. Language, linguistics, culture, and literature components.
4. A methods course that deals specifically with the teaching of foreign languages, and that is taught by a qualified faculty member whose expertise is foreign language education and who is knowledgeable about current instructional approaches and issues.
5. Field experiences prior to student teaching that include experiences in foreign language classrooms.
6. Field experiences, including student teaching, that are supervised by a qualified foreign language educator who is knowledgeable about current instructional approaches and issues in the field of foreign language education.
7. Opportunities for candidates to experience technology-enhanced instruction and to use technology in their own teaching.
8. Opportunities for candidates to participate in a structured study abroad program and/or intensive immersion experience in a target language community.

II. Content and Supporting Standards

Standard 1: Language, Linguistics, Comparisons

- a. Demonstrating Language Proficiency
- b. Understanding Linguistics
- c. Identifying Language Comparisons

Standard 2: Cultures, Literatures, Cross-Disciplinary Concepts

- a. Demonstrating Cultural Understandings
- b. Demonstrating Understanding of Literary and Cultural Texts and Traditions
- c. Integrating Other Disciplines in Instruction

Standard 3: Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practices

- a. Understanding Language Acquisition and Creating a Supportive Classroom
- b. Developing Instructional Practices That Reflect Language Outcomes and Learner Diversity

Standard 4: Integration of Standards into Curriculum and Instruction

- a. Understanding and Integrating Standards in Planning
- b. Integrating Standards in Instruction
- c. Selecting and Designing Instructional Materials

Standard 5: Assessment of Languages and Cultures

- a. Knowing Assessment Models and Using Them Appropriately
- b. Reflecting on assessment

Standard 6: Professionalism

- a. Engaging in Professional Development
- b. Knowing the Value of Foreign Language Learning

Appendix B

INTASC Applicable Standards of Effective Practice

Standard 1: Content Knowledge. Language teachers are proficient in the language they teach. They understand language as a system, how students learn a language, and how language and culture are linked. They are knowledgeable about the cultures of the people who speak the language. Using this knowledge, they create learning experiences that help students develop language proficiency and build cultural understanding.

Standard 2: Learner Development. Language teachers understand how students learn and develop and can relate this to their development of language proficiency and cultural understanding. They provide learning experiences that are appropriate to and support learners' development.

Standard 3: Diversity of Learners. Language teachers understand how learners differ in their knowledge, experiences, abilities, needs, and approaches to language learning, and create instructional opportunities and environments that are appropriate for the learner And that reflect learner diversity.

Standard 4: Instructional Strategies. Language teachers understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to help learners develop language proficiency, build cultural understanding, and foster critical thinking skills.

Standard 5: Learning environment. Language teachers create an interactive, engaging, and supportive learning environment that encourages student self-motivation and promotes their language learning and cultural understanding.

Standard 6: Communication. Language teachers use effective verbal and non-verbal communication, and multimedia resources, to foster language development and cultural understanding.

Standard 7: Planning for Instruction. Language teachers plan instruction based on their knowledge of the target language and cultures, learners, standards-based curriculum, and the learning context.

Standard 8: Assessment. Language teachers understand and use a variety of assessment strategies to monitor student learning, to inform language and culture instruction, and to report student progress.

Standard 9: Reflective Practice and Professional Development: Language teachers are reflective practitioners who continually evaluate the effects of their choices and actions on others and who actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally.

Standard 10: Community. Language teachers foster relationships with schools, colleagues, families, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well being.

Appendix C

NBPTS World Languages Other than English STANDARDS OVERVIEW (for teachers of students ages 3-18+)

The requirements for National Board Certification in the field of World Languages other than English are organized in the following 14 standards. The standards have been ordered as they are to facilitate understanding, not to assign priorities. They are each an important facet of the art and science of teaching; they often occur concurrently because of the seamless quality of accomplished teaching.

Preparing for Student Learning

- I. *Knowledge of Students* – Accomplished teachers of world languages other than English draw on their understanding of child and adolescent development, value their students as individuals, and actively acquire knowledge of their students to foster their students’ competencies and interests as individual language learners.
- II. *Fairness* – Accomplished teachers of world languages other than English demonstrate through their practices toward all students their commitment to the principles of equity, strength through diversity, and fairness. Teachers welcome diverse learners who represent our multiracial, multilingual, and multiethnic society, and they set the highest goals for each student.
- III. *Knowledge of Language* - Accomplished teachers of world languages other than English have the ability to function with a high degree of proficiency in the language they teach, know how the languages work, and draw on this knowledge to set attainable and worthwhile learning goals for their students
- IV. *Knowledge of Culture* – As an integral part of effective instruction in world languages other than English, accomplished teachers know and understand the target cultures and target languages and know how these are intimately linked with one another.
- V. *Knowledge of Language Acquisition* – Accomplished teachers of world languages other than English are familiar with how students acquire competence in another language, understand varied methodologies and approaches used in the teaching and learning of languages, and draw on this knowledge to design instructional strategies appropriate to their instructional goals.

Advancing Student Learning

- VI. *Multiple Paths to Learning* – Accomplished teachers of world languages other than English actively and effectively engage their students in language learning and cultural studies; they use a variety of teaching strategies to help develop students’

- proficiency, increase their knowledge, strengthen their understanding and foster their critical and creative thinking.
- VII. *Articulation of Curriculum and Instruction* – Accomplished teachers of world languages other than English work to ensure that the experiences students have from one level to the next are sequential, long-range, and continuous, with the goal that over a period of years students will move from simple to sophisticated use of languages.
 - VIII. *Learning Environment* – Accomplished teachers of world languages other than English create an inclusive, caring, challenging, and stimulating classroom environment in which meaningful communication in the target languages occurs and in which students learn actively.
 - IX. *Instructional Resources* – Accomplished teachers of world languages other than English select, adapt, create, and use appropriate resources to help meet the instructional and linguistic needs of all their students and foster critical and creative thinking among them.
 - X. *Assessment* – Accomplished teachers of world languages other than English employ a variety of assessment strategies appropriate to the curriculum and to the learner and use assessment results to monitor student learning, to assist students in reflecting on their own progress, to report student progress, and to shape instruction.

Supporting Student Learning

- XI. *Reflection as Personal Growth* – Accomplished teachers of world languages other than English continually analyze and evaluate the quality of their teaching in order to strengthen its effectiveness and enhance student learning.
- XII. *Schools, Families, and Communities* – Accomplished teachers of world languages other than English work with colleagues in other disciplines, with families, with members of the school community, and with the community at large to serve the best interests of students.
- XIII. *Professional Community* – Accomplished teachers of world languages other than English contribute to the improvement of instructional programs, to the advancement of knowledge, and to the practice of colleagues in language instruction.
- XIV. *Advocacy for Education in World Languages Other than English* – Accomplished teachers of world languages other than English advocate both within and beyond the school for the inclusion of all students in long-range, sequential programs that also offer opportunities to study multiple languages.

Appendix D

The ACTFL K-16 Standards

The Standards feature a description of what *students* should know and be able to do with an emphasis on learning content while acquiring language, and demonstrating what they know through their performance. Moving from the previous focus on language and culture to one on communication and culture, the standards are organized around the following five goals of language learning:

1. Communication: *Communicate in Language Other Than English*

Communication is characterized by three “communicative modes” that place primary emphasis on the context and purpose of the communication:

- The *interpersonal* mode is characterized by two-way communication and active negotiation of meaning among individuals in written or spoken form.
- The *interpretive* mode focuses on the understanding and interpretation of oral and printed texts, in which no active negotiation of meaning is possible.
- The *presentational* mode refers to the oral and written presentation of information, concepts, and ideas to an audience of listeners or readers.

2. Cultures: *Gain Knowledge and Understanding of Other Cultures*

Woven inextricably into language is the “world view” of those who live in a culture. This anthropological view of culture features three interrelated components:

- Perspectives: meanings, attitudes, values, ideas;
- Practices: pattern of social interactions; and
- Products: books, tools, foods, laws, music, and games.

3. Connections: *Connect with Other Disciplines and Acquire Information*

Making connections to other disciplines expands the educational experiences of all students beyond the traditional “canon,” allowing them to acquire information through the second language by means of content-based learning experiences at all levels of instruction.

4. Comparisons: *Develop Insight into the Nature of Language and Culture*

Students benefit from language learning by discovering different patterns among language systems and cultures and gaining insights into both the target and native languages and cultures.

5. Communities: *Participate in Multilingual Communities at Home and Around the World*

Knowledge of other languages and cultures not only enables students to acquire job skills in multilingual communities but also encourages them to develop a life-long interest in languages and cultures for personal enjoyment and personal enrichment.

Appendix E

Letter of Request for Study Participation with Survey

October 10, 2004

Dear colleague,

In an effort to gain further insights into pre-service foreign language teacher preparation, I am currently conducting a study specifically into the foreign language methods courses offered in colleges and universities in United States.

As a professional, I respect how very busy you are, and yet without your information, the results of this inquiry will be shallow. I would very much appreciate receiving the following two pieces of data:

1. a copy of your current syllabus for the foreign language methods course.
2. your responses to the following short questionnaire.

You may return the above two items to me electronically at:

If you prefer, I would be happy to receive a printed copy of your information, mailed to: [doctoral student's home address]. The entire process should take no more than 10 minutes of your time!

Please be advised that your response to this request indicates your voluntary permission for the inclusion of the data collected in this dissertation study and in any potential future publications. The goal of this study is to illuminate the process of pre-service teacher preparation, not to scrutinize any particular program. No schools or instructors will be identified by name as related to the data analysis report. If you are interested in the final report of this study, please contact me as such and I will be happy to share the results with you. Please contact me now or in the future should you have any questions pertaining to this study.

I would like to offer my sincerest appreciation for your time and careful consideration of this request. And, if you know colleagues who might also be appropriate data contributors to this study, please feel free to share this request with them.

Note: It is important to realize that Internet communications are insecure and there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. However, once the completed survey (or email) is received by the investigator standard confidentiality procedures will be employed. You may withdraw your data submission at any time by notifying the investigator in writing and you may skip any survey questions with which you are not comfortable. Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential except as required by law.

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D., Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

Respectfully,

Marcia Wilbur
Language & Literacy Doctoral Student
125 Aderhold, UGA
Athens, GA 30602

Faculty Advisor
Dr. Peg Graham
Language & Literacy Department
125 Aderhold, UGA
Athens, GA 30602

Survey of Post-Secondary Foreign Language Instructors

(You may indicate your responses directly on the document below and return it to me via e-mail with your syllabus.)

1. I have taught Foreign Language courses in a secondary school for: (choose one)

_____ 0 years

_____ 1-5 years

_____ 5-10 years

_____ over 10 years

2. I most recently taught Foreign Language courses in a secondary school:
(Choose one or leave blank if no secondary experience.)

_____ 0 – 5 years ago

_____ 6-10 years ago

_____ 11-15 years ago

_____ over 15 years ago

3. I teach the Foreign Language Methods course:

_____ because I want to.

_____ because I am assigned to.

_____ other:

4. My rank at the university is:

_____ teaching assistant or instructor

_____ adjunct professor

_____ assistant professor

_____ associate professor

_____ full professor

5. My appointment is in the following department:

_____ Foreign Language

_____ School of Education (Curriculum & Instruction or similar department)

_____ Humanities

_____ other:

6. Please list the languages, besides English, in which you are fluent.

7. Is the Foreign Language Methods course taught at your institution in conjunction with some sort of concurrent practicum experience in a secondary school?

8. How many new secondary foreign language teachers will your institution likely graduate between January and August 2005?

Thank you!

Appendix F

Letter of Request for Study Participation with Questionnaire

October 10, 2004

Dear colleague,

In an effort to gain further insights into pre-service foreign language teacher preparation, I am currently conducting a study specifically into the foreign language methods courses offered in colleges and universities in United States.

As a professional, I respect how very busy you are, and yet without your information, the results of this inquiry will be shallow. I would very much appreciate receiving the following two pieces of data:

1. a copy of your current syllabus for the foreign language methods course.
2. your responses to the following short questionnaire.

You may return the above two items to me electronically at:

If you prefer, I would be happy to receive a printed copy of your information, mailed to: [doctoral student's home address]. The entire process should take no more than 10 minutes of your time!

Please be advised that your response to this request indicates your voluntary permission for the inclusion of the data collected in this dissertation study and in any potential future publications. The goal of this study is to illuminate the process of pre-service teacher preparation, not to scrutinize any one particular program. No schools or instructors will be identified by name as related to the data analysis report. If you are interested in the final report of this study, please contact me as such and I will be happy to share the results with you. Please contact me now or in the future should you have any questions pertaining to this study.

I would like to offer my sincerest appreciation for your time and careful consideration of this request. And, if you know colleagues who might also be appropriate data contributors to this study, please feel free to share this request with them.

Note: It is important to realize that Internet communications are insecure and there is a limit to the confidentiality that can be guaranteed due to the technology itself. However, once the completed survey (or email) is received by the investigator standard confidentiality procedures will be employed. You may withdraw your data submission at any time by notifying the investigator in writing and you may skip any survey questions with which you are not comfortable. Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential except as required by law.

Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D., Human Subjects Office, University of Georgia, 612 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-7411; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu.

Respectfully,

Marcia Wilbur
Language & Literacy Doctoral Student
125 Aderhold, UGA
Watkinsville, GA 30677

Faculty Advisor
Dr. Peg Graham
Language & Literacy Department
125 Aderhold, UGA
Athens, GA 30602

Post-Secondary Methodology Instructor Survey questions:

(You may respond below using as much space as necessary.)

1. How long have you been teaching the foreign language methods course?
2. What is your position at the college or university where you teach? In which department?
3. Describe your professional background and experiences.
4. In what way(s) do your background and experiences influence your delivery of the pre-service foreign language methods course?
5. In your opinion, what are the most important concepts to convey to pre-service foreign language teachers during the methods course?
6. Describe the relationship between “theory” and “practice” in your methods course.

Appendix G
Post-Secondary Methods Instructor Survey Responses

1. I have taught Foreign Language courses in a secondary school for: (choose one)

___(4)___ 0 years

___(7)___ 1-5 years

___(8)___ 5-10 years

___(13)___ over 10 years

2. I most recently taught Foreign Language courses in a secondary school:
(Choose one or leave blank if no secondary experience.)

___(4)___ no secondary experience

___(6)___ 0 – 5 years ago

___(4)___ 6-10 years ago

___(7)___ 11-15 years ago

___(11)___ over 15 years ago

3. I teach the Foreign Language Methods course:

___(23)___ because I want to.

___(5)___ because I am assigned to.

___(4)___ other:

G: "It is my chosen and prepared professional field."

Z: "I am assigned to teach it on a rotating schedule, but I love it and volunteered to do it more as necessary if my colleagues don't want to anymore."

4. My rank at the university is:

___(9)___ teaching assistant or instructor

___(2)___ adjunct professor

___(7)___ assistant professor

___(10)___ associate professor

___(4)___ full professor

5. My appointment is in the following department:

___(21)___ Foreign Language

___(9)___ School of Education (Curriculum & Instruction or similar department)

___(2)___ Both

_____ Humanities

_____ other:

6. Please list the languages, besides English, in which you are fluent.

6 = Spanish & French 14=Spanish 1=Spanish & German
4=French 1=French & German 2=Spanish, French, Portuguese
1-German, Spanish, French, Italian, & some Portuguese

7. Is the Foreign Language Methods course taught in conjunction with some sort of concurrent practicum experience in a secondary school?

All methods courses except 3 are taught with a concurrent practicum or observation experience. See Table 18, Appendix I for the types and amounts of time spent in FL classrooms.

8. How many new secondary foreign language teachers will your institution likely graduate between January and August 2005?

0-5 graduates: 12

6-10 graduates: 5

11-19 graduates: 10

20-25 graduates: 1

Information not available/provided: 4

Appendix H

Topical Supplementary Readings List from the Syllabi

The following reference list represents a compilation of the supplemental course readings from the pre-service foreign language methodology syllabi, arranged by topic. The citation information provided came directly from those sources. Every effort was made to provide missing citation information. However, some of the citations below may be incomplete.

Action Research

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (1982). *The action research planner*. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Nunan, D. (1990). Action research in the language classroom. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 62-81). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Advocacy

Minnesota Council on Teaching Languages and Cultures – www.mctlc.org. See especially the advocacy materials under New Visions: <http://www.mctlc.org/newvisions/advocating.html>

Assessment

---. (2001). *A collection of performance tasks and rubrics: Foreign languages*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Bachman, L. (1991). What does language testing have to offer? *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(4), 671-699.

Cohen, A. (1994). *Assessing language ability in the classroom*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Delett, J., Barnhardt, S., & Kevorkian, J. (2001). A framework for portfolio assessment in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34(6), 559-568.

Genesee, F., & Upshur, J. (1996). *Classroom-based evaluation in second language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Glisan, E., & Foltz, D. (1997). Assessing students' oral proficiency in an outcome-based curriculum: Student performance and teacher intuitions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 82, 1-18.

- Hancock, C. (Ed.). (1994). *Teaching, testing, and assessment: Making the connection*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Liskin-Gasparro, J. (1996). Assessment: From content standards to student performance. In R.C. Lafayette (Ed.), *National standards: A catalyst for reform* (pp. 169-196). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Shohamy, E. (1998). Evaluation of learning outcomes in second language acquisition: A Multiplism perspective. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Learning foreign and second languages* (pp. 238-261). New York: MLA.
- Szostek, C. (1994). Assessing the effects of cooperative learning in an honors foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 27(2), 252-260.
- Thompson, L. (2000-2001). *Foreign language assessment: 30 years of evolution and change*. Retrieved August 28, 2004, from:
<http://www.cal.org/resources/News/200012/assessment.html>
- Underhill, N. (1987). *Testing spoken language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wajnryb, R. (1996). *Classroom observation tasks*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Beliefs

- Scalera, D. (2000). Teacher beliefs and the heritage language learner: What will you teach your students? In J.B. Webb & B.L. Miller (Eds.), *Teaching heritage language learners: Voices from the language classroom* (pp. 71-85). Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Classroom Management

- Landsman, J. (1994). *Tips for creating a manageable classroom*. Minneapolis: Milkweed Press.

Culture

- Chaika, E. (1994). *Language: The social mirror*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Heusinkveld, P.R. (1997). *Pathways to culture: Readings on teaching culture in the foreign language class*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. NY: Oxford University Press.

Peterson, E., & Coltrane, B. (2003). Culture in second language teaching. *ERIC Digest* (EDO-FL-03-09). Retrieved August 1, 2004, from:
<http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/0309peterson.html>

FL Teacher Education

American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese. (1990). AATSP program guidelines for the education and training of teachers of Spanish and Portuguese. *Hispania*, 73, 785-794. Author.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (1989). ACTFL provisional program guidelines for foreign language teacher education. *Foreign Language Annals*, 21, 71-82. Author.

Baratz-Snowden, J. (1993). Assessment of teachers: A view from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. *Theory Into Practice*, 32(2), 82-85.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. (1997). *Beyond methods: Components of second language teacher education*. NY: McGraw-Hill, 1997.

Bartlett, L. (1990). Teacher development through reflective thinking. In J. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education*. (pp. 202-204). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bueno, K. (2001). Envisioning a Standards-based methods course: Preparing second language educators for the 21st century. *Texas Papers in Foreign Language Education*, fall, 23-37.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1991). Are our teachers ready to teach? *NCATE Quality Teaching Newsletter*, 1(1), 6-7, 10-11.

Dvorak, T.(Ed.). (1995). *Voices from the field: Experiences and beliefs of our constituents*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Earley, P. (1993). The teacher-education agenda: Policies, policy arenas, and implications for the profession. In G. Guntermann (Ed.), *Developing language teachers for a changing world* (pp. 7-22). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Glisan, E. W., & Phillips, J.K. (1989). Immersion experiences for teachers: A vehicle for strengthening language teaching. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 45(3), 478-484.

Goodlad, J. (1991). Why we need a complete redesign of teacher education. *Educational Leadership*, 49, 4-10.

- Guntermann, G. (Ed.). (1993). *Developing language teachers for a changing world*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Hancock, C.R., & Scebold, C.E. (2000). Defining moments in foreign and second-language education during the last half of the twentieth century. In D. Birckbichler & R. Terry (Eds.), *Reflecting on the past to shape the future* (pp. 1-17). New York: MLA.
- Holmes Group. (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools*. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group.
- Jarvis, G., & Taylor, S. (1991). Reforming teacher education. In D. Birckbichler (Ed.), *New perspectives and directions in foreign language teacher education* (pp. 159-182). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Lafayette, R. C. (1993). Subject-matter content: What every foreign language teacher needs to know. In G. Guntermann (Ed.), *Developing language teachers for a changing world* (pp. 124-158). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Moore, Z. (Ed.). (1996). *Foreign language teacher education: Multiple perspectives*. New York: University Press of America.
- Schrier, L. (1993). Prospects for the professionalization of foreign language teaching. In G. Guntermann (Ed.), *Developing language teachers for a changing world* (pp. 105-123). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Tedick, D., & Walker, C. (1995). From theory to practice: How do we prepare teachers for second language classrooms? *Foreign Language Annals*, 28(4), 499-517.

Grammar

- Aljaafreh, A. & Lantolf, J. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *The Modern Language Journal*. 78(4), 465-483.
- Heusinkveld, P. (1987). The subjunctive with spirit. *Hispania*, 70, 189-192.
- Terrell, T. (1980). A natural approach to the teaching of verb forms and functions in Spanish. *Foreign Language Annals*. 13(2), 129-135.
- VanPatten, B. (1996). *Input processing and grammar instruction*. Greenwich, CT: Ablex.

Learner Diversity

- Barnett, H., & Jarvis-Sladky, K. (1995). Learning disabilities: Teaching and reaching all learners. *Hispania*, 78(1), 163-166.
- Nieto, S. (2004). Culture, identity and learning. In S. Nieto (Ed.), *Affirming diversity: The sociocultural context of multicultural education* (pp. 144-206). Boston: Pearson.
- Oxford, R. (1994). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle.
- Sparks, R.L., & Javorsky, J. (2000). Section 504 and the Americans with Disabilities Act: Accommodating the learning disabled student in the foreign language curriculum (an update). *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(6), 645-654.

Methodology

- American Association of Teachers of French. (1989). The teaching of French: A syllabus of competence. *AATF National Bulletin*, 15, Special issue. Author.
- Abersold, J. (1997). *From reader to reading teacher: Issues and strategies for second language classrooms*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Allen, E., & Valette, R. (1994). *Classroom techniques: Foreign language and English as a second language*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Asher, J. (1982). *Learning another language through actions: The complete teacher's guidebook*. Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions.
- Bacon, S. (1989). Listening for real in the foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 22(6), 543-551.
- Brooks, F. B. (1992). Can we talk? *Foreign Language Annals*, 25, 59-71.
- Chamot, A. & O'Malley, M. (1994). How to teach content. In *The CALLA Handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach* (pp. 33-37). Boston: Addison-Wesley.
- Garfinkel, A. (Ed.). (1983). *The foreign language classroom: New techniques*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Grabe, W. (1991). Current developments in second language reading research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 5(3), 375-397.

- Gaudiani, C. (1981). *Teaching writing in the foreign language curriculum*. Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Kellerman, S. (1992). "I see what you mean." The role of kinesthetic behavior in listening and implications for foreign and second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 13(3), 239-253.
- Kinsella, Kate. (1997). Moving from comprehensible input to "learning to learn" in content-based instruction. In M. Snow & D. Brinton (Eds.), *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language and content*. New York: Longman
- Krashen, S. (1984). A theoretical basis for teaching the receptive skills. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17(4), 261-273.
- Lee, J., & VanPatten, B. (1995). *Making communicative language teaching happen*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Liebowitz, D.G. (1983). *Basic vocabulary builder*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An Introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McDonal, M., & Rogers-Gordon, S. (1984). *Action plans: 80 student-centered language activities*. Boston: Newbury House.
- Met, M. (1991). Learning language through content: Learning content through language. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(4), 281-295.
- Oller, J. (1993). *Methods that work*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Oxford, R. (1996). *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Manoa, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Pattison, P. (1987). *Developing communication skills*. Cambridge.
- Rivers, W. (1987) *Interactive language teaching*. Cambridge.
- Rivers, W. M. (1988). *Teaching French: A practical guide*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

- Rivers, W., Azevedo, M., & Heflin, W. (1998). *Teaching Spanish: A practical guide*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Rivers, W., Dell'Orto, K., & Dell'Orto, V. (1988). *Teaching German: A practical guide*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Rollman, M. (1994). The communicative language teaching revolution tested: A comparison of two classroom studies: 1976 and 1993. *Foreign Language Annals*, 27(2), 221-239.
- Sadow, S (1982). *Idea bank: Creative ideas for the language class*. Newbury House.
- Sánchez, A. (1997). *Los métodos en la enseñanza de idiomas*. Madrid: Sociedad General Española de Librería.
- Schaffer, C. (1989). A comparison of inductive and deductive approaches to teaching second languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(4), 395-401.
- Schwarzer, D. (2003). A qualitative assessment of a foreign language whole language class. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36, 77-85.
- Scott, V. (1996). *Rethinking foreign language writing*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Seelye, H. (1994). *Teaching culture*. Skokie, IL: National Textbook Co.
- Snow, Met, & Genesee. (1992). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content instruction. In Richard-Amato, P. & Snow, M. (Eds.), *The multicultural classroom: Readings for content-area teachers* (pp. 27-38). Longman.
- Tedick, D. J. (Ed.). (1997). *Proficiency-oriented language instruction and assessment: A curriculum handbook for teachers*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
- Tschiner, E. (1992). From input to output: Communication-based teaching techniques. *Foreign Language Annals*, 25(6), 507-517.
- Walleringer, L.M. (2000). The role of homework in foreign language learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33(5), 483-496.
- Walvoord, B. (1982). *Helping students write well*. Modern Language Association of America.
- Whitley, M. (1993). Communicative language teaching. *Foreign Language Annals*, 26(2), 137-154.

Motivation

Crookes, G., & Schmidt, R. (1991). Motivation: Reopening the research agenda. *Language Learning*, 41(4), p. 469-512.

Standards

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (1989). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines*. (1989). Yonkers, NY: Author.

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (1999). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines--speaking*. (1999). Yonkers, NY: Author.

American Association of Teachers of German. (1992). *Professional standards for teachers of German*. Cherry Hill, NJ: Author.

Bragger, J., & Rice, D. (1998). Connections: The Standards and a new paradigm for content-oriented materials and instruction. In J. Harper, M. Lively, & M. Williams (Eds.), *The coming age of the profession* (pp. 191-217). Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Blaz, D. (2002). *Bringing the Standards for foreign language learning to life*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Heining-Boynton, A. *Selecting a textbook based on the ACTFL Standards*. Evanston, IL: McDougal Littell.

Met, M. (1999). Making connections. In J. K. Phillips & R. M. Terry (Eds.), *Foreign language standards: Linking research, theories, and practices*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

National Foreign Language Resource Center. (1997). *Bringing the Standards into the classroom: A teacher's guide*. Ames: Iowa State University.

Phillips, J., & Draper, J. (1999). *The Standards for foreign language learning worktext*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Phillips, J., & Terry, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Foreign language standards: Linking research theories, and practices*. The ACTFL Foreign Language Education Series. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Smith, A. (1999). Designing a Standards-based thematic unit using the learning scenario as an organizing framework. *ACTFL Newsletter*, spring, 9-11.

Teacher Beliefs

Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher cognition in foreign language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Technology

Blake, R. (1998). The role of technology in second language learning. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Learning foreign and second languages* (pp. 209-237). New York: MLA.

Bush, M.. (Ed.). (1997). *Technology-enhanced language learning*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Fawkes, S. (1998). *Switched on? Video resources in modern language settings*. University of Southampton: Modern Languages in Practice Series 10.

Warschauer, M. (1996). *Telecollaboration in foreign language learning*. Manoa, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Theory

Barasch, R. (1993). Beyond the monitor model: *Comments on current theory and practice in second language acquisition*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Berko Gleason, J. (Ed.). (1989). *The development of language*. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Co.

Bernhart, E. (1991). *Reading development in a second language: Theoretical, empirical, and classroom perspectives*. Greenwich, CT: Ablex.

Brooks, F., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign learner discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispania*, 77, 262-74.

Brooks, F., Donato, R., & McGlone, J. (1997). When are they going to say "it" right?: Understanding learner talk during pair-work activity. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30 (4), 524-541.

Brown, G., Malmkjaer, K., Pollit, A., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (1994). *Language and understanding*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Chastain, K. (1999). *Toward a philosophy of second language learning and teaching*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Coady, J. (1997). *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Cook, V. (1996). *Second language learning and language teaching*. St. Martin's Press.
- Cummins, J. (1992). Language proficiency, bilingualism, and academic achievement. In P. Richard-Amato & M. Snow (Eds.), *The multicultural classroom: Readings for content-area teachers* (pp. 16-16). Longman.
- Kohl, H. (2002). Topsy-turves: Teacher talk and student talk. In L. Delpit and J. Dowdy, (Eds.), *The skin that we speak* (pp. 147-161). New York: The New Press.
- Donato, R., & Terry R.M. (1995). *Foreign language learning: The journey of a lifetime*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA research and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Freeman, D. (1996). Redefining the relationship between research and what teachers know. In K. Bailey & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Voices from the language classroom*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Genesee, F. (1994). *Integrating language and content: Lessons from immersion educational practice reports*. No 11. National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. Available at <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/ncrcdsl/epr11.htm>
- Hall, J.K. (1995). 'Aw, man, where we going?': Classroom interaction and the development of L2 interactional competence. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 37-62.
- Harper, J., Lively, M., & Williams, M. (1998). *The Coming of age of the profession: issues and emerging ideas for the teaching of foreign languages*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Hatch, E.M. (1983). *Psycholinguistics: A second language perspective*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Heath, S.B. (1992). Sociocultural contexts of language development: Implications for the classroom. In P. Richard-Amato & M. Snow (Eds.), *The multicultural classroom: Readings for content-area teacher* (pp. 102-125). Longman.
- Kinginger, C. (2001). ZPD \neq i + 1. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(5), 417-425.
- Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. San Francisco: Alemany Press.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

- Krashen, S. (1993). *The power of reading: Insights from the research*. Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1994). *Introducción al estudio de la adquisición de segundas lenguas*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Layfayette, R. (1996). *National Standards: A catalyst for reform*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Met, M. (1991). Learning language through content: Learning content through language. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(4), 281-295.
- Montgomery, M. (1986). *An introduction to language and society*.
- Musumeci, D. (1997). *Breaking tradition: An exploration of the historical relationship between theory and practice in second language teaching*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Omaggio-Hadley, A. (Ed.). (1993). *Research in language learning: Principles, processes, and prospects*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Richard-Amato, P. (1998). *Making it happen: Interaction in the second language classroom, From theory to practice*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Routman, R. (1991). Components of whole language. In R. Routman (Ed.), *Invitations: Changing as teachers and learners K-12* (pp. 31-69). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1984). *The ethnography of communication: An introduction*. Basil Blackwell.
- Savignon, S. (1997). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice; Texts and contexts in second language learning*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Sandrock, P. (2002). *Planning curriculum for learning world languages*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.
- Scarcella, R., & Oxford, R. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning: The individual in the communicative classroom*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Schwarzer, D. (2001). Whole language in a foreign language class: From theory to practice. *Foreign Language Annals*, 34(1), 52-59.

Snow, Met, & Genesee. (1992). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content instruction. In P. Richard-Amato & M. Snow (Eds.), *The multicultural classroom: Readings for content-area teacher* (pp. 27-38). Longman.

Taeschner, T. (1991). *A developmental psycholinguistic approach to second language teaching*. Greenwich, CT: Ablex.

Tharp, & Gallimore. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wing, B. (Ed.). (1992). *Foreign languages for all: Challenges and choices*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Web Sites

AATF: <http://www.frenchteachers.org>

AATSP: <http://www.aatsp.org>

ACL: <http://www.aclclassics.org/>

ACTFL: <http://www.actfl.org>

FLTEACH: <http://www.cortland.edu/flteach>

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium:
[http://www.ccsso.org/Projects/Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium/](http://www.ccsso.org/Projects/Interstate%20New%20Teacher%20Assessment%20and%20Support%20Consortium/)

National Capital Language Resource Center (NCLRC): <http://www.nclrc.org/>

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: <http://www.nbpts.org>

National Educational Technology Standards: <http://cnets.iste.org/>

New Jersey World Language Frameworks:
<http://www.state.nj.us/njded/frameworks/worldlanguages/>

Promoting Cultural Understanding in the Classroom:
<http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/library/tolerance.htm>

Teaching Foreign Languages K-12: A Library of Classroom Practices (Annenberg/CPB videos)
<http://www.learner.org/resources/series185.html>

TESOL: <http://www.tesol.org/index.html>

Appendix I

Syllabi Findings Tables

The abbreviations below indicate where in the syllabi the course content was located.

G = course goal or objective; CDT = class discussion topic; A = assessment (i.e., Methodology instructors graded pre-service teachers on the activity).

Table 4

Beliefs About Teaching

keywords: belief, attitude, philosophy

<i>Description of Course Content</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Q</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	
G/A: Develop a personal philosophy of FL teaching and learning.	x		x			x						x	x			x		x				x			x					x	x	x
G: Examine attitudes and beliefs related to L2 instruction.												x	x									x					x			x		
G: Understand the role of the teacher: teaching as a profession.													x			x											x					
CDT: Identify teacher biases and prejudices.															x																	
G: Affirm that second language learning is appropriate for <i>all</i> students regardless of ability, language background, race, ethnicity, gender, religion, and other cultural factors.																										x				x		
G: Have enthusiasm for the discipline(s) taught and see connections to everyday life.																														x		
G: Recognize the power of language for fostering self-expression, identity development, and learning.																														x		
CDT: Examine beliefs about teaching heritage learners																							x									

Table 5

An Educational Framework for FL Instruction

keywords: history

<i>Description of Course Content</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Q</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
CDT: Problems in education	x																														
G/CDT: History of FL methods	x			x		x			x		x				x		x	x		x				x				x			
CDT: FL teacher education	x																x														
CDT: Social and historical contexts for L2 instruction																														x	

Table 6

Primary Texts in the Pre-Service Methods Courses

The citation information below was taken directly from the syllabi included in this study. Every effort was made to provide missing citation information. However, some citations may be incomplete.

Description of Course Content	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	4	5
(2002). <i>ACTFL Performance Guidelines for K-12 Learners</i> . American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Yonkers, NY. Author.																										x					
Blaz, D. (2002). <i>Bringing the standards for foreign language learning to life</i> . Eye on Education.			x																												
Blaz, D. (1999). <i>Foreign language teacher's guide to active learning</i> . Eye on Education.			x																												
Brown, H. D. (2001). <i>Teaching by principles</i> . White Plains, NY: Longman.																								x							
Cattani, D. (2002). <i>A classroom of her own: How teachers develop instructional, professional, and cultural competence</i> . Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.																								x							
Chamot, A., Barnhardt, S., El-Dinary, P., & Robbins, J. (1999). <i>The learning strategies handbook</i> . Pearson ESL.																													x		
Curtain, H. & Pesola, C. (1994). <i>Languages and children, making the match</i> . Longman.	x																								x			x			
Dudeney, G. (2000). <i>The internet and the language classroom: A practical guide for teachers</i> . Cambridge University Press.																	x														
Emmer E., Evertson, C., & Worsham, M. (2000). <i>Classroom management for secondary teachers</i> . Allyn and Bacon.		x														x															
FLTeach subscription, http://www.cortland.edu/flteach/							x			x		x								x		x		x			x	x	x		x
Hall, J.K. (2001). <i>Methods for Teaching Foreign Languages: Creating a Community of Language Learners</i> . Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.										x							x														

Table 6 (continued)

Description of Course Content	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	4	5
Kellough, R., & Kellough, N. (2003). <i>Secondary school teaching: A guide to methods and resources</i> . New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.																x															
Kottler, E. (2004). <i>Secrets for secondary school teachers: How to succeed in your first year</i> . Corwin Press.			x																												
Lee, J. & VanPatten, B. (1995). <i>Making communicative language teaching happen</i> . New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.	x													x																	
Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1993). <i>How Languages are Learned</i> . Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.							x						x																		
Omaggio Hadley, A. (2001). <i>Teaching language in context</i> . Heinle & Heinle.		x		x		x					x		x				x				x		x	x		x					
O'Malley, J. M., & Valdez-Pierce, L. (1996). <i>Authentic assessment for English language learners: Practical approaches for teachers</i> . New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.																													x		
Oxford, R. (1990). <i>Language learning strategies</i> . Boston: Heinle and Heinle.														x																	
Rogers, S., Ludington, J., & Graham, S. (1997). <i>Motivation and learning</i> . Evergreen: Peak Learning Systems.																x															
Rubin & Thompson. (1994). <i>How to be a successful language learner</i> . Heinle and Heinle.										x																					
(1999). <i>Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century</i> . American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Yonkers, NY. Author.		x	x		x	x	x		x	x			x	x			x	x				x				x	x			x	
Shrum & Glisan. (2000). <i>Teacher's handbook: contextualized language instruction</i> . Heinle & Heinle.		x	x		x		x		x	x	x						x				x	x	x				x		x	x	x
<i>Teaching Cultures of the Hispanic World</i> .									x																						

Table 6 (continued)

Description of Course Content	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	4	5
Ur, P. (1996). <i>A course in language teaching: Practice and theory</i> . Cambridge University Press.																								x							
Wong, H. K., & Wong, R. T. (2001). <i>The first days of school: How to be an effective teacher</i> . Harry K. Wong Publications.																													x		

Table 7

Theories

Keywords: theory, SLA

<i>Description of Course Content</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Q</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	
G: Interpret and analyze SLA theories and related terms.	x	x	x	x		x	x			x	x															x		x		x		
G/CDT: Progress towards the development of an informed theory of foreign language teaching based on knowledge of second language acquisition and theoretical principles of language learning and teaching.		x			x						x		x				x					x	x	x	x					x	x	
G: Understand major methodological approaches in the U.S.	x	x	x	x		x																	x				x			x	x	
G/CDT: Understand theories and standards which form the basis of current best practices in FL teaching.	x	x	x	x	x				x		x	x									x	x				x		x			x	
G: Begin to construct a Christian approach to methodology.																													x			
G: Read/research professional literature with understanding, recall, synthesize and apply material learned in the course and through the course readings.											x	x	x										x	x		x		x	x			
G: Understand basic issues concerning theory and practice and the role of research.																		x				x										
CDT:Linguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and educational theory.											x																					
CDT: Pragmatics																									x						x	
G: Understand human cognitive development and brain research																									x							
G: Understand impediments to reform in FL teaching practices.	x																														x	
CDT: Characteristics of effective FL teachers									x																							
CDT: Models of FL teaching											x																					
CDT: Content-based instruction																															x	
CDT: Total Physical Response Storytelling (TPRS)	x		x																		x		x					x	x			x

Table 7 (continued)

Description of Course Content	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	4	5
CDT: Socio-cultural Theory	x																														
CDT: Zone of Proximal Development	x																														
CCT: Scaffolding	x																														
CDT: The Monitor Model/error correction/accuracy	x						x										x														
G/CDT: Communicative language teaching	x					x											x			x		x									
G: Understand the Retention Learning Model									x																						
CDT: Define proficiency													x							x											
CDT: Krashen's Input Hypothesis															x		x					x			x		x				
CDT: Swain's Output Hypothesis																	x					x					x				
CDT: The negotiation of meaning																						x									
CDT: Interpersonal mode of communication, interaction																	x					x					x				x
CDT: Rationale for early beginning and long sequence of foreign language study																x													x		
CDT: Linguistics																x															
CDT: Grammar-translation method																x															
CDT: Audio-lingual method																x					x										
CDT: The Silent Way																x															
CDT: Suggestopedia																x					x										
CDT: Notional-Functional, Natural Approach																x															
CDT: The Rassias method																x															
CDT: Use of Bloom's taxonomic levels in K-12 teaching of target language and culture(s)																x															
(Theory tabulations)	10	4	4	3	2	3	2	0	3	1	6	2	3	0	9	1	6	1	0	6	3	9	2	3	3	2	6	4	3	7	2

Table 8

National Standards

Keywords: Standards, ACTFL

<i>Description of Course Content</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Q</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
G: NCATE/INTASC/NBPTS/state standards		x	x			x										x										x	x		x		x
G/CDT/A: National Standards (ACTFL)	x	x	x					x	x		x	x	x								x			x	x	x	x		x		
G: Understand and integrate Standards in planning, instruction, and selecting and designing instructional materials.	x							x	x	x		x			x	x	x			x	x								x		
CDT: Understand ACTFL rating scale & proficiency-based curriculum.									x																					x	
A: Create lesson plans with the corresponding Standards listed in the lesson objectives.					x	x															x			x						x	
G: Lesson design reflects theoretical underpinnings of SLA																					x	x	x		x					x	
CDT: Sources & Resources for achieving the 5 C's														x																	
CDT: The evolution of methods into Standards-based															x																
G/CDT: National Standards and assessment															x						x	x									
CDT: Assessing Standards-based L2 performance in context								x	x	x				x								x					x		x	x	
G: Apply ACTFL proficiency standards to teachers.			x	x			x		x		x									x		x				x				x	
CDT: Reflect on own SLA experience and attained level of Standards.										x	x							x					x							x	

Table 9

Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Keywords: pedagogy, teaching, instruction, strategies

Description of Course Content	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	4	5	
CDT: Deductive vs. Inductive language teaching	x																								x							
CDT: Listening	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x				x	x		x	x	x	x	x			x	x
CDT: Pre- and post-listening activities and strategies							x														x	x										
CDT: Reading	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x			x	x		x	x	x				x	x		x		x	x	x			x	x
CDT: Teaching language through literature							x								x																	
CDT: Pre-, post -, and during reading activities and strategies							x										x															
CDT: Speaking	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x			x		x				x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x
CDT: Developing oral interpersonal and presentational communication																					x		x			x		x			x	
CDT: Writing	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x		x				x		x				x	x	x	x		x	x	x			x	x
CDT: Writing to learn; extending and reinforcing concepts							x																									
CDT: Composition, the writing process, pre- and post-writing, peer editing							x				x						x					x										
G/CDT: Culture, integrating culture	x	x		x			x	x		x	x		x		x		x				x	x		x	x	x	x	x			x	x
G/CDT: Using authentic (cultural) materials							x	x	x	x		x	x	x			x															
CDT: Teaching culture through literature							x	x																								
CDT: Cultural songs															x																	
CDT: Use of video and audio materials to teach culture							x																									
G: Demonstrate familiarity with cultures represented by the target language as they relate to products, practices and perspectives.																										x						
CDT: Cross-cultural awareness							x																				x					
CDT: Grammar	x	x	x		x	x			x	x		x			x						x		x		x	x	x					
CDT: The role of grammar in a communicative classroom								x									x					x										
G: Demonstrate the use of error correction strategies.										x							x									x						

Table 9 (continued)

Description of Course Content	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	4	5	
CDT: Vocabulary incorporation					x	x				x		x			x		x					x			x						x	
G: The teacher understands the tools to create meaningful learning experiences for students, and resources for providing <i>comprehensible</i> instruction for all students.							x														x				x							
G: Understand and use a <i>variety</i> of instructional strategies to encourage and to promote students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.							x			x	x	x							x			x			x	x				x	x	
CDT: The integration of L2 skills in instruction, organizing content and planning for integrated language instruction.							x			x										x		x					x					
G: Integrate other disciplines in instruction.	x																					x				x					x	
G: Lesson design reflects theoretical underpinnings of SLA.																					x	x	x		x						x	
G: Design interactive, learner-centered lessons.								x																	x							
CDT: Using an interactive approach to develop interpretive skills																				x		x										
CDT: The role of context in learning, contextualized lessons							x					x							x		x	x			x	x	x			x	x	x
CDT: Demonstrate the use of audio-visual aids, e.g., slides, videos, cassette player, overhead projector, flannel boards, puppets, manipulatives, realia, maps, etc.					x										x																	
G: Select and/or create, use, and evaluate materials to maximize and enrich lesson presentation.		x		x	x	x					x											x										x
CDT: Role of the textbook/textbook evaluation															x		x				x	x										
CDT: Adapt textbook to proficiency-based instruction.																					x	x										
CDT: Teaching heritage speakers								x															x				x					
CDT: Sponges & games														x																		
CDT: Warm-ups																																x
CDT: Paired/group activities, cooperative learning	x														x	x	x					x			x							
CDT: Information gap activities																	x					x										x
CDT: The role of dialogues																	x															

Table 9 (continued)

Description of Course Content	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	4	5
CDT: Teaching pronunciation and difficult sounds in the target language															x									x	x						x
CDT: Demonstrate effective feedback techniques including error correction and positive reinforcement.															x																
G: Demonstrate knowledge of verbal and non-verbal communication techniques.		x													x															x	
CDT: Using drama to teach L2																															x
CDT: Observe Annenberg teaching videos.																															x
(PCK tabulations)	9	8	5	6	4	7	1 8	1 0	6	8	7	7	5	3	1 4	2	1 5	0	2	1 1	9	1 6	7	5	1 3	1 4	8	0	3	1 5	8
A: Micro-teaches (from Table 22)		x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x					x		x		x	x	x			x		x

Table 10

The Use of L2 in the FL classroom

<i>Description of Course Content</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Q</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	
G: Display an advanced knowledge of the language and culture to be taught, in order to support and to enhance student development and learning.											x									x						x						
CDT: The importance of teachers' language proficiency																				x										x		
CDT: Consider the use of English during classroom observation.																									x							
G: Apply ACTFL proficiency standards to teachers.			x	x					x																							
G: Obtain OPI Advanced Level prior to student teaching.							x													x												

Table 11

Technology in the FL Classroom

Keywords: technology, media

<i>Description of Course Content</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Q</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
G: Match current technologies to FL course goals and objectives.				x				x	x	x	x						x			x		x			x		x				
G/CDT: Demonstrate proficiency in technology appropriate for a classroom setting.			x					x								x		x					x				x				
G: Use technology to contextualize and to integrate language instruction.																													x	x	x
G: Become familiar with multimedia to enhance teaching, learning, and assessment.							x	x				x	x								x	x			x	x					
CDT: Using the internet/web sites as (cultural) resources		x					x													x											
A: Design a lesson using www and/or internet technology.													x								x			x							
A: Design a web page.								x																							
A: Create a PowerPoint presentation.	x																						x								
CDT: Online teacher & student resources		x																													
CDT: Computer Assisted Instruction (CIA)							x								x																
CDT: Distance learning							x																								
G: Use technology to communicate and to collaborate.								x																							
A: Create an electronic Pre-Service teacher portfolio.							x		x		x		x		x					x			x	x			x			x	x
CDT: Language laboratory/Computer Resource Center															x																
CDT: Analyze of commercially-made French and Spanish computer software K-12.															x																

Table 12

Learner Diversity

Keywords: diversity, individual

<i>Description of Course Content</i>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	4	5	
G: Demonstrate a belief tat all individuals can develop, learn, and make positive contributions, affirming that second language learning is appropriate for <i>all</i> students regardless of ability, language background, race, ethnicity, gender, religion, and other cultural factors.																									X	X			X			
G: Understand instructional practices that reflect learner diversity, (how students may differ in their approaches to learning) and create instructional opportunities that are equitable and adaptable to diverse learners; exceptional students as well as those in at-risk categories.	X	X					X	X	X	X		X					X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X	X
CDT: Learning styles, learner diversity, individual learner characteristics: types, assessment, diagnosis, and role in methodology			X		X		X							X	X	X											X					
G: Identify, discuss, and respond to multicultural dimensions in the classroom, including social and cultural minorities.										X					X																X	
G: Match instructional plans with students’ cognitive, social, linguistic, cultural, emotional, and physical needs.																					X	X										
G: Design lessons that are age and subject appropriate.								X	X						X					X	X	X										
CDT: Nature of 9-12 learners		X	X																													
G: Understand adolescent learner development theories.	X	X	X				X			X																				X		
CDT: Include learner modifications/accomodations in lesson plans (special needs).						X		X							X																	
CDT: Issues of learner disabilities														X																		
CDT: Sensitivity to the needs of students															X																	

Table 12 (continued)

<i>Description of Course Content</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Q</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	
CDT: Use students’ strengths as a basis for growth, and their errors as an opportunity for learning.																														x		
G: Be concerned about all aspects of a child’s well-being (cognitive, emotional, social, and physical), and alert to signs of difficulties.																														x		
G: Respect the privacy of students and confidentiality of information.																														x		

Table 13

Learning Strategies

Keyword: strategies

Description of Course Content	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	4	5
CDT: Strategies: cognitive, metacognitive, compensation, memory							x																								
CDT: Strategies for successful student learning																				x										x	
CDT: Helping students to reflect on their own learning																													x		

Table 14

Planning for Learning

Keywords: plan, curriculum, lesson, unit

<i>Description of Course Content</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Q</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	
G: Demonstrates planning based on knowledge of subject, students, community and curriculum goals, understand learning theory, curriculum development, and student development and know how to use this knowledge in planning instructions to meet curricular goals.		x				x		x	x		x	x						x								x				x	x	
CDT: Curriculum planning , goals, and objectives (vertical and horizontal)						x		x													x	x									x	
G/CDT: Constructing daily and unit plans, demonstrate good planning skills through the creation of unit and lesson plans.		x	x		x			x		x				x	x	x	x				x	x					x			x		x
G: Plan and conduct lessons with clearly identified student performance and mastery outcomes.										x												x										
G: Understand decision-making related to content, approach, & activities	x					x																										
CDT: Upon reflection, continuously adjust and revise plans, outcome assessments, and learning experiences, based on student needs and changing circumstances.														x																x		
CDT: Lesson pacing																	x									x						
G: Focus on time-on-task issues during instruction.														x												x						
CDT: Developing district/teacher criteria for materials selection							x																									
CDT: Advanced Placement & International Baccalaureate courses		x						x																								
CDT: Pros and cons of block scheduling		x																										x				
CDT: Integrating language study in the middle school curriculum																														x		

Table 15

Classroom Management, Behavioral, and Affective Considerations

Keywords: motivation, manage, affective

<i>Description of Course Content</i>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	4	5
G/CDT: Utilize varied motivational strategies, recognizing the value of intrinsic motivation to students' life-long growth and learning.	x																					x		x		x			x		
G: Understand individual and group motivation and attitudes toward teaching and learning language.	x	x					x																								
G: Create and manage an optimum classroom environment conducive to second language learning.															x	x		x								x			x		
G: Understand how to create a supportive classroom.	x	x			x	x																								x	
G: Value the role of students in promoting each other's learning and recognize the importance of peer relationships in establishing a climate of learning.																												x	x		
G: Foster student responsibility for learning.																														x	
CDT: Affective, social							x																								
CDT: The role of anxiety							x																								
CDT: Games and motivational techniques															x																
CDT: Paired/group activities, cooperative learning	x														x	x	x					x			x						
G: Demonstrate an understanding of the principles of good classroom management.		x				x	x	x																	x					x	x
CDT: Discipline and behavior management			x		x										x	x	x			x											
G: Be willing to work with other professionals to improve the overall learning environment for students.																												x			
CDT: Wong videos – <i>First Days of School</i>			x																												

Table 16

Assessment

Keywords: assess, test, evaluate

<i>Description of Course Content</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Q</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	
G: Understand the uses, advantages, and limitations of different types of formal and informal student assessments.		x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x					x	x		x	x	x				x				x		x
G: Implement assessment strategies that are aligned with instruction and which address all language modalities (i.e., listening, reading, speaking and writing) and culture in order to measure student achievement and proficiency.																										x					x	
G: Understand and implement ongoing, daily assessments as essential to the instructional process and recognize that many different assessment strategies, accurately and systematically used, are necessary for monitoring and promoting student learning.																						x								x		
G: Use assessment to identify student strengths and promote student growth rather than to deny students access to learning opportunities.																														x		
G: Demonstrate effective techniques for evaluating FL students of differing abilities.												x	x																			
CDT: Testing/evaluation											x					x	x						x	x	x			x				
CDT: Varieties of tests: proficiency, aptitude, diagnostic, oral assessment, pre-test/post-test, placement, achievement		x	x					x		x		x			x		x															
CDT: Test construction	x	x	x	x					x												x		x									x
CDT: Test writing, administration, evaluation and interpretation based on stated objectives															x																	
G: Demonstrate techniques for evaluating student performance by describing or writing sample evaluation items or instruments with evaluative rubrics.																					x											

Table 16 (continued)

<i>Description of Course Content</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Q</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	
CDT: Assessing Standards-based L2 performance in context								x	x	x				x						x		x				x	x			x	x	
G: Identify student performance outcomes for planned lessons.																						x										x
CDT: Comprehension monitoring							x																									
CDT: Questioning strategies																x																
CDT: Authentic assessment							x																								x	
CDT: Testing cultural knowledge							x																									
CDT: Testing what you teach the way you teach it							x																									
CDT: Holistic evaluation							x																									
CDT: Student portfolios, projects, and videos							x								x							x										
CDT: Evaluating writing																		x														
CDT: Evaluating listening skills																		x														
CDT: Evaluating reading skills																		x														
CDT: Using the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI)																					x											

Table 17

Reflective Practice

Keyword: reflect

<i>Description of Course Content</i>	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	4	5
G: Analyze own personality and learning style.								x																							
CDT: Reflect on own SLA experience and attained level of Standards.										x	x							x					x							x	
CDT: Reflections on lab/classroom observation experience	x																			x			x		x						
A: Keep a reflective journal.											x														x						
G: Make instructional decisions and analyze and evaluate how they affect the learning process.																				x											
G/CDT: Self-assess teaching effectiveness.		x					x					x								x	x								x		
G: Use reflective practices to improve over time; understand the importance of reflection and self-assessment.	x	x	x			x	x	x			x	x						x		x		x	x			x				x	
G: Show evidence of becoming a life-long learner.	x		x																		x	x	x						x	x	
G: Actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally, viewing learning as an ongoing process.							x	x		x								x											x		
G: Become involved in on-going areas of methodology such as listservs and reading professional journals.													x							x								x			
G: Use constructive suggestions in strengthening teaching skills, give and receive help.																					x								x		
G: Develop a critical and reflective attitude about teaching.											x										x									x	
CDT: Engaging in teacher action research																							x								
G: Stress management					x																										

Table 18

Teacher Voice and Identity

Keywords: professional, community

Description of Course Content	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	4	5	
G/CDT: Adopt professional attitude and disposition appropriate for a successful teaching career.																								X						X		
CDT: Development of self-confidence															X																	
G: Be a thoughtful and responsive listener.																														X		
G: Communicate effectively.																			X	X												
G: Address issues of professional, ethical behavior; demonstrate ethical conduct and professionalism.										X										X												
G: Serve as a role model: clear, pleasant, accurate, caring; the role of the teacher.								X															X							X		
G: Adapt to school culture, being sensitive to community and cultural norms.																														X		
CDT: Encouraging positive interaction among various cultures in the community															X																X	
CDT: Communication with parents, administrators, and community															X			X												X	X	
G: Foster relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.	X		X				X																									
CDT: Help FL become alive for students by making community connections outside of the classroom.										X																						
G: Work cooperatively and collaboratively with other teachers across the curriculum in planning and reflecting.															X							X									X	
G/CDT: Understand and communicate the value of learning language other than English to students, colleagues, administrators, parents and the community at large.			X														X									X						
G: Participate in professional organizations for growth and advocacy; attend state and/or local conferences.			X	X		X		X	X		X	X			X		X			X			X			X		X				X
G: Research and present on a topic of interest to FL teachers at the state FL conference.											X																					

Table 19

Other

<i>Description of Course Content</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Q</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
G: Demonstrate proficiency in English and L2 at an intermediate-high level in writing and speaking, and an advanced level in reading and listening.			x	x		x																									
G: Understand the necessary university-school collaboration.			x																												
CDT: Awareness of local, state, national, and embassy resources															x																

Table 20

Areas of Emphasis in a Single Syllabus

<i>Description of Course Content</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Q</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
The concept of instruction for communicative competence	x																														
TPRS (6 class sessions)	x																														
Advocacy, FL organizational membership				x																											
5 mini-lessons with one accomodation/modification for each-using the same textbook series. 3 to be videotaped, self-evaluated and peer evaluated.					x																										
Integrated, standards-based instructional approaches vs. 4 skills										x																					
Reading professional journals, research projects, research-based presentations, theoretical approach											x							x													
Interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational modes																	x														
Classroom management																x															
Linking instruction and assessment																														x	

Table 21

Related Practicum Experiences

<i>Description of Course Content</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>	<i>K</i>	<i>L</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>O</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>Q</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>S</i>	<i>T</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>W</i>	<i>X</i>	<i>Y</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>
½ semester in a school setting				x											x																
50+ hours of classroom experience							x																							x	
40-50 hour lab experience in a school/observation	x						x																						x		
30-40 hours of observations and lessons								x																x	x						
7 weeks observation in a secondary school		x																													
10-20 hours of classroom observation						x							x									x						x			
9 hours of classroom observation																											x				
3 Secondary classroom visits																					x										
Observation of 2-3 college FL courses & pre-observation instructor interview						x																				x					
One HS or MS classroom visit											x																				
Unspecified amount of field experience			x		x									x		x	x	x					x								x
Observation of immersion classrooms																														x	

Table 22

Course Assignments and Grading

Description of Course Content	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	4	5	
Mid-term exam	x	x	x	x		x	x		x						x		x				x	x	x	x		x						
Final Exam	x	x	x	x			x		x		x	x	x								x	x	x			x	x	x	x			
Class participation	x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x								x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x
Blog participation																										x						
Daily assignments																x																
Reflective journals on readings/classroom/FLTeach discussions	x						x													x			x	x								
Prepare weekly discussion questions based on readings.											x																		x			
Quizzes												x									x				x				x			
Pop quizzes about readings				x							x											x										
Tests																											x	x				
Reflective journal/paper/presentation on observations in the field	x		x		x		x	x													x	x	x		x			x				x
Field assessment				x	x			x								x																
Observations			x			x			x																							
Interview report of a current FL teacher																													x			
Papers (article summaries, L1 vs. L2, Nature of learners, theory)	x	x			x	x	x	x		x	x		x	x			x	x			x	x	x	x			x		x			
Syllabus		x				x																										
Micro-teaches		x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x						x		x		x	x	x			x		x
Demonstrate a warm-up activity												x																				
Lesson and/or Unit plan	x	x	x			x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x					x		x	x	x	x	x		x			x	x	
Create 3 original information-gap and jig-saw speaking and reading tasks appropriate for the level of language proficiency.																						x										
Mid-term presentation on one selected SLA topic											x																					

Table 22 (continued)

Description of Course Content	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	4	5
Enrollment in professional organization																				x											
Final project: research presentation for state FL conference											x																				
Attendance at state or local FL teaching conference												x	x							x								x			x
www resource file																								x							
Web page/Tech/PowerPoint /multi-media project				x	x		x	x	x									x			x						x				
PowerPoint presentation on class readings/theory																							x					x			
Videotaped lessons/ peer teaching					x		x								x																x
Realia/visual file					x	x																		x		x					
File box/materials portfolio/resource file							x				x	x	x																		
Cultural artifact reflection and hypothesis												x																			
Present a Cultural activity which incorporates technology.																					x										
Résumé/Job search					x								x																		x
Behavior/classroom management plan		x	x		x		x									x															
Textbook evaluation						x						x					x				x										
Personal Professional Development Plan	x						x		x								x														
Teaching philosophy																x															
Lesson assessments and grading rubrics		x					x											x				x					x				
Pre-Service teacher portfolio							x	x	x		x		x		x			x		x			x	x			x		x	x	x
Speech, brochure, or position paper on the value of FL study									x													x									