

**Marquette University**  
**e-Publications@Marquette**

---

Spanish Languages and Literatures Research and  
Publications

Languages, Literatures and Culture Faculty  
Research and Publications

---

10-1-2009

# Preparing Tomorrow's World Language Teacher Today: The Case for Seamless Induction

Paul A. Garcia  
*University of Kansas*

Todd A. Hernandez  
*Marquette University, [todd.hernandez@marquette.edu](mailto:todd.hernandez@marquette.edu)*

Patricia Davis-Wiley  
*University of Tennessee*

---

Published version. *NECTFL Review*, Vol. 65 (Fall/Winter 2009/2010): 22-51. [Publisher link](#). ©  
2009 The Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (NECTFL). Used with  
permission.

## Preparing Tomorrow's World Language Teacher Today: The Case for Seamless Induction

---

Paul A. García  
*University of Kansas (Retired)*

Todd A. Hernández  
*Marquette University*

Patricia Davis-Wiley  
*The University of Tennessee*

### Abstract

This essay is a call to action. It offers a comprehensive overview of the challenges facing world language (WL) teacher educators and their employers, the K-12 schools, during the teacher induction period. We propose a new paradigm for WL teacher education based on national accreditation standards, best-practice pedagogy, insights from the professional literature on methods education, and the enhanced role of the

---

**Paul A. García** (Ph.D., University of Illinois) is currently Visiting Associate Professor of Foreign Language Education and Director of the Ph.D. program in Second Language Acquisition, Instructional Technology (SLA/IT) at the University of South Florida. Prior to teaching at the University of Kansas (1998-2006), he taught German and Spanish and was the FL supervisor for the Kansas City, Missouri, Schools (1973-1998). He was President of ACTFL in 2000, NADSFL (1989-92), FLAM (1984-88), and ALL (1992-1995). His publications and many conference workshops concern immersion, listening comprehension, and methods/best-practice pedagogy.

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

**Patricia Davis-Wiley** (Ed.D., University of Houston) is Professor of WL/ESL Education in the Department of Theory and Practice in Teacher Education at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. She is a former high school WL teacher, active conference keynoter and presenter in both WL and ESL Education, has research interests in the efficacy of early second language study, and is the new Editor of *The TFLTA Journal*.

## Preparing Tomorrow's World Language Teacher Today

methods instructor/supervisor. In order to become successful in the classroom, the pre-service educator undergoes a seamless period of induction that is student-centered and college/university-supported beyond the classroom arena.

### Introduction

For the foreseeable future, the overall quality of American teacher education will continue to be judged as the mathematical product of two factors. One factor is measurable student achievement. The second is the relationship between the teacher educators and the recipients of their graduates, the K-12 schools that contract the newly-licensed teachers.<sup>1</sup> World language (WL) teacher education is a constituent subset

---

*We who consider  
WL studies essential  
to American  
K-12 education  
must ensure  
that the journey  
from pre-service  
apprenticeship  
(the WL teacher  
candidate)  
to in-service  
professionalism  
(the WL teacher)  
becomes a  
seamless induction.*

---

of this equation. As such, it must conform to both internal and external critical proofing of its induction results. The disappointing contract between *promised* and *delivered* — the arrival of the novice WL teacher to the classroom who is perceived as under-prepared pedagogically or professionally (García & Petri, 1999, 2000; Schrier, 2008) or attitudinally (Wilkerson, 2008) undermines what in another venue would be termed consumer confidence in the product. Based on such insights and conclusions (Levine, 2006), as well as the surveys and case studies described in the next section, this continuing dilemma poses a significant challenge for teacher education.

We who consider WL studies essential to American K-12 education must ensure that the journey from pre-service apprenticeship (the WL teacher candidate) to in-service professionalism (the WL teacher) becomes a seamless induction. This requires the implementation of appropriate standards of attainment for all components of the process in

order to provide stakeholders — parents, students, and school leaders — with a quality professional, the novice teacher.

Presently, this is not the case. Our discipline's in-house critics suggest that WL teacher induction is not in consonance with our goal that language learning is for everyone (*Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* [SFL, 2006]). Pre-service teachers, we are told, are unprepared to work with students in a variety of areas from language skills to cultural content. As a result, this systemic dissonance manifests itself again and again during and after induction (García, 1998; Schulz, 2000; Tedick, 2009; Tedick & Walker, 1995). Tedick (2009) points out that WL teacher preparation programs continue to maintain the grammar-focused status that is evident in K-12 classrooms. She suggests that current practices divorce learning of teaching from language learning for the pre-service major. Furthermore, she argues that student teaching experiences are isolated from teacher education coursework, and WL and schools of education remain disconnected rather than united in the teacher education enterprise. To create, instead, a focused, harmonious system for induction, we offer in this paper our recommendations for transforming the induction of future WL instructors.

The argument that student achievement is a product of the teacher's subject matter knowledge and pedagogical skills (Tedick, 2009) is irrefutable when our own constituents — both senior and novice teachers — provide detailed testimony that challenges maintaining the *status quo* of induction. These proponents of K-16 WL studies include WL faculty and involved community members; they cite multiple examples of process discordance that they have witnessed in their schools, in their children's schools, and among colleagues. Practitioners and researchers enumerate a breadth of internal discontent with WL teacher education that of course resonates externally among education critics and school leaders. The following serves as a synthesis or distillate of such observations:

- Coursework for the WL education major is considered ineffective and inadequate (García & Petri, 1999).
- Teacher candidates perceive themselves overwhelmed by the obligations of teaching (Schrier, 2008).
- Language and education courses are criticized for their content — or the lack thereof. Their perceived irrelevance to the classroom context is related by both the pre-service major and the novice teacher to listeners, including experienced colleagues, who themselves affirm those negative opinions by commiserating that their own education did not portray the real world of the school day either (Cooper, 2004).
- Insufficient and inappropriate field placement opportunities complicate a pre-service major's apprenticeship experience in the classroom (Cooper, 2004; Raymond, 2002).
- Professors express concern that there are fewer quality mentors than are needed to assist inductees. This results in the methods instructor confirming the absence of appropriate visit sites and models, attested to in students' field reports (García, Davis-Wiley, Hernández, & Petri, 2003).
- Pre-service majors tell of having observed best-practice techniques, but they also report having witnessed a good deal of obsolete and worst-practice pedagogy (García & Long, 1999; García & Petri, 2000; Tedick, 2009).
- Pre-service majors also convey instances of a mentor teacher's poor or awkward second language (L2) skills, the overwhelming use of English in the classroom (Wilkerson, 2008), the desultory rote use of textual materials (García & Petri, 2000). Teacher-fronted discussion is the predominant discourse mode, rather than pair or small-group interactions (Lee & VanPatten, 2003).
- The omnipresent worksheet is the overused staple of seat work, (i.e., code for quiet time).
- Experienced teachers share with the teacher candidate that they themselves were not aware of the multiplicity of perspectives — political, legal, social, technical, and pragmatic issues — they initially encountered.

## Preparing Tomorrow's World Language Teacher Today

- Appropriate target language vocabulary and usage, together with cultural aspects considered necessary for effective instruction, had to be learned on the job, in the trenches, by trial and error, and almost always alone.

This formidable indictment of our WL induction process contradicts the successes that our supporters point to for language studies. This apparent disharmony requires a brief digression.

Proponents of WL studies appropriately speak of efforts to achieve standards-based classroom instruction, technology implementation, extended and articulated sequences, and successful immersion language programs. On its face, the juxtaposition of dismal induction results with apparent progress in schools would naturally cause

---

*“How can we assert that we are successful in school language programs if our teacher training results are inconsistent, or worse, our future teacher corps ill-equipped?”*

---

consternation (Allen, 2002; Cooper, 2004; Lange & Sims, 1990). Some of these successes, when reviewed historically (i.e., standards-based WL education), were the result of such forward-thinking leaders as Zimmer-Loew of the American Association of Teachers of German (AATG) and Scebold of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). They caught the wave of American education policy in the 1990s that fostered experimentation and initiatives in classes nationwide, through technology and Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP) grants.<sup>2</sup> Our profession's leaders and many others realized the importance of WLs participating in mainstream educational reform. At

the same time, that intrinsically illogical and third equation — “poor induction equals success” — produces a further question: “How can we assert that we are successful in school language programs if our teacher training results are inconsistent, or worse, our future teacher corps ill-equipped?” We consider immersion programs to be an exemplary case in point.

We know that students in immersion programs on average achieve high academic scores in their schoolwork, despite, or because of, being taught the core content in French or German or Spanish (Bernhardt, 1992; Cummins, 1998; Harley, 1998; Wilburn-Robinson, 1998). Additionally, their L2 proficiency easily outpaces other school-based language programs and is inspirational. The consequent numerical growth of immersion programs over the last 25 years is encouraging [Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), 2007].<sup>3</sup> But at the same time, WL proponents cannot enjoin all communities to adopt immersion as the prevailing mode of language instruction. The fundamental reason is simple. Our immersion teacher cadre is almost entirely not the product of American higher education; the teachers are overwhelmingly foreign imports. Neither their language skills nor their pedagogical training is attributable to a *Made in USA* label. Heritage speakers and non-native teachers are excellent immersion professionals; it is their critical mass in K-12 education that is negligible. Their presence would not sustain even the extant immersion schools if the non-US citizen faculty were to return home, much less provide staff for newly-implemented programs. The success of immersion in language and content for K-12 students is not a direct result of excellence in American WL teacher induction; therefore, induction for French, German, and Spanish immersion, and now Chinese as an L2 or even

immersion language — as was the case with Japanese — remains dependent upon teacher recruitment efforts that take place outside the United States (García, Lorenz, & Robison, 1995). Our colleges do not have a sufficient number of students to replace immersion staff needs or expand programs. The current induction process that we seek to change cannot justifiably claim immersion education as one of its achievements. This explains how the apparently contradictory pattern of successful programming and inadequate teacher induction can coexist.

As much as we recognize the influence of either external or internal factors that discourage change, we must offer an attainable solution to enhance WL teacher preparation. We do so by building upon the experiences and insights of our profession. First, we affirm the absolute need for greater cooperation between stakeholders. This principle would reconnect teacher education to the K-12 sector through structures of continuous mutual support that characterize pre-service through beginning teacher status. Rather than continue a fragmented approach, the new partnership becomes co-mentoring. Such a professional relationship is within the financial reach and faculty capability even of modest-sized colleges and universities, especially those whose historic mission has been to provide their region with teachers, as our project explains below. Changing the sometimes competing pre-service and in-service stages into a purposefully joined unit is how we bring gown (the teacher-educator institution) to town (the teacher employer), in deed and in detail, just as lifelong learning and a self-evolving community are the *sine qua non* for WL education.

The broad framework for our recommendations is a restructured learning continuum based on three key individuals: the university methods professor who also serves as onsite supervisor, the pre-service major, and the cooperating teacher. They are our principal actors and change agents. Although in a sense their roles are not new, it is their collaborative behaviors and contractual responsibilities for promotion and scheduling that undergo and promote change. To operationalize the work of the triad in a general and replicable pattern, we propose the establishment and implementation of a series of demonstration projects over a four or five year period (see Appendix A). Their individual foci would address the varied needs of K-12 WL education: immersion, middle school, early-start, high school. The limited models are purposely differentiated with respect to the specific goals, while the key program components remain the same for the triad. University supervisors with research interests in teacher education are sustained in their quest for promotion or tenure through appropriate research design components. Cooperating teachers learn how their discipline has evolved and continues to do so. The pre-service majors enjoy an appropriate amount of personal attention. Where they exist, district language supervisors participate as full, ex-officio members of the triad. Not to be forgotten of course are the supportive college and school officials who are committed to excellence in K-12 education. A central clearinghouse for the project and its constituents would develop implementation plans, phase-in schedules, and coordinate

---

*The broad framework for our recommendations is a restructured learning continuum based on three key individuals: the university methods professor who also serves as onsite supervisor, the pre-service major, and the cooperating teacher.*

---

## Preparing Tomorrow's World Language Teacher Today

inter-project activities. Costs are more intangible than financial, although reduced teaching duties at both pre-collegiate and post-secondary levels are mandatory; this is a significant issue that must be resolved locally. Evaluation instrumentation to monitor program progress would also be devised by the project administrators.

Our paper first describes three features of the envisioned project: subject-matter preparation for the undergraduate or graduate teacher candidate, the methods course, and the student teaching period. We thereupon examine the connections that need to be made between the first-year teacher and the triad.

### Review of the Literature

In her comprehensive review of major developments in WL teacher education, Schulz (2000) identified four persistent challenges: researching and defining teacher behaviors and performance skills; formal assessment of teacher competencies as a prerequisite for certification; extended study abroad experience as a graduation requirement; and collaboration as an essential component of teacher development. In a more recent review of the literature, Vélez-Rendón (2002) found five critical aspects: the teacher's previous learning experiences; the teacher education program and related pre-service practices; the teacher's beliefs and instructional decision-making processes; the role of reflection; and collaboration between stakeholders as prerequisite to success.

---

*...study abroad should be a requirement of all WL educators.*

---

Other related studies have also evaluated pre-service programs. In order to determine perceptions regarding preparation in the major as well as general and WL pre-service education, and student teaching, Lange and Sims (1990) administered a questionnaire to 95 WL teachers. Results indicated that study abroad should be a requirement of all WL educators. Furthermore, the teacher respondents affirmed the need for more classroom instruction in the development of listening and speaking skills, while, at the same time, commenting that there was too much focus on literature in undergraduate language courses. Teachers recommended that education courses provide more assistance with practical matters such as classroom management.

As with Lange and Sims (1990), Cooper (2004), administered a questionnaire to K-12 WL teachers seeking their perceptions regarding professional preparation. A total of 341 Georgia teachers participated in the survey. The results, consistent with García & Petri (2000), suggested that WL programs should indeed require pre-service teachers to spend more time in supervised and monitored field experiences. Cooper also found that teacher education programs should offer more careful mentoring of student teachers during the student-teaching internship, require teacher candidates to spend more time in a study abroad environment, provide more focused instruction on the development of target language proficiency, and incorporate teaching of effective classroom management strategies.

With specific reference to the implementation of a standards-based approach to WL teaching, Allen (2002) examined the responses of 613 professionals to a nationwide questionnaire designed to measure the extent to which the respondents' beliefs were consistent with the tenets of the national language standards (SFLL, 2006). The results indicated that teachers believed that WL instruction should be delivered in the target

language, available to all students, and be consistent with the *weave of curricular elements* found in the standards. Nonetheless, the data also suggested that teachers continued to use the textbook to define course content. Allen argued that both pre-service and in-service teachers — as well as their students — would therefore benefit from opportunities to observe and experiment with standards-driven approaches to language learning.

Researchers have also identified the importance of the mentor to support the pre-service educator's pedagogical content knowledge. At the same time, they highlight the need for greater communication between mentors and the teacher education program itself (García & Petri, 2000; Raymond, 2002). Raymond, for example, investigated how teachers' understanding was shaped by their methods courses and field experiences. She found that pre-service teachers gained knowledge about how to teach in the methods course and how to implement that knowledge in the field. The data also indicated, however, that WL teacher candidates found it difficult to implement their understanding of how to teach while engaged in a field experience that did not support best-practice developments learned in teacher education courses.

---

*Researchers have also identified the importance of the mentor to support the pre-service educator's pedagogical content knowledge..*

---

In reviewing related goals of methods courses and best-practice implementation during the internship, Wilbur (2007) investigated the methodological training of pre-service WL teachers. Her examination of course syllabi from 32 participating universities suggested that important features such as action research and reflective practice were not integrated into some coursework. Inconsistencies also existed with regard to determining the appropriate use of the target language in the classroom, how to address the needs of diverse learners with a range of instructional strategies, and how to implement standards-based instruction and assessment. These issues are related to the reality that despite a broad consensus on appropriate topics for consideration in methods courses, there exists no national teacher education curriculum for WLs except by default, or dependence upon professorial interpretation of what is important, or innovation of the aspects of the National Consortium for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) that are required for accreditation.

The development of advanced-level speaking proficiency continues to present a challenge for programs and teacher candidates (Cooper, 2004; García & Petri, 2000; Koike & Liskin-Gasparro, 1999; Pearson, Fonseca-Greber, & Foell, 2006; Schulz, 2000). Byrnes (1998) attributed this, in part, to insufficient attention to continued language development after the traditional four-semester language sequence in undergraduate education. To this end, Schulz (2000), Cooper (2004), and Tedick (2009) have argued for greater collaboration between WL departments and schools of education in order to better support the attainment of advanced speaking abilities. In view of the significant insights these researchers offer our field, we believe that it is appropriate to place these recommendations into the contextual framework of one area that is actionable: collaboration. If we are to restructure the preparation of the pre-service teacher and make it the responsive continuum of growth that our teacher candidates need, partnerships must be the framework of our new induction program.



## A New Paradigm for World Language Teacher Preparation

The impact of these investigators' findings assists us in situating collaboration as the contextual framework that is prerequisite to transformation. Cooperation is the appropriate dynamic that must prevail between the WL department and other stakeholders, such as NCATE and its policies and benchmarks. NCATE program standards and the states' departments of K-12 education will play a major role in our reconceptualization of WL teacher induction. We must become cognizant, for example, that the demonstration of *knowledge, skills, and dispositions* takes on a new meaning during pre-service. A significant portion of our proposed changes is a focused sequence of acts between partner institutions, just as NCATE has proposed and enacted in its review of specialty programs across the nation.

The *ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers* (PS, 2002; see Appendix B) continue to resonate in WL higher education circles. They are a powerful, obligatory change agent, due to their almost-unanimous

---

*The ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers continue to resonate in WL higher education circles. They are a powerful, obligatory change agent, due to their almost-unanimous acceptance by the nation's state departments of education. A School of Education attains or maintains national recognition through NCATE; its specialty programs must demonstrate alignment with the appropriate program standards (for WL education, ACTFL/NCATE's PS), and thus its ability to recommend pre-service candidates for state licensure. No discipline is exempt, despite arguments usually raised by subject-matter faculty about academic freedom being limited and the matter of putting forward an alternative view on what defines quality education. Further, and this is key, the responsibility for recognition and eventual state accreditation is now not just the domain of the WL department methods instructor who works with colleagues from the School of Education. Instead, the obligation for accreditation rests squarely upon the entire subject-matter department. Non-induction faculty must become involved. NCATE standards enjoin members of the subject matter or "knowledge" department (mathematics, social sciences, French) to enter into an active partnership in formulating both pre-professional studies and learning through their respective coursework. Those relatively modest and previously indirect cooperative aspects by WL faculty, such as the compilation and subsequent transmission of syllabi and résumés, have been rendered insufficient.*

---

The *PS* require teacher education programs to document what teacher candidates know and are able to do. Performance-based evidence such as portfolios, official ACTFL OPI scores, and samples of unit and assessment plans, for example, directly address the required standards. They must show alignment to reflect the department's unified, purposeful consideration of how to attain specified standards. Traditional topics of concern to the WL faculty, such as the high level of language learning achievement, cultural and linguistic knowledge (*PS* 1, 2), remain central to ACTFL/NCATE standards. Their presence is aligned with pedagogical skills (*PS* 3, 4, 5) as

well as personal and professional dispositions (PS 6), thereby promoting the case for consistent collaboration by all. Having mandated such cooperation for student language achievement, ACTFL/NCATE places that bar at *Advanced-Low* (AL) on the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI) scale for the commonly taught languages. Students must attain at least an AL rating prior to graduation or before applying for state licensure. WL faculty cannot simply suggest that a study-abroad experience be the single recommendation offered for developing speaking proficiency. Instead, the ACTFL/NCATE standards envision a broad, concerted effort for attainment that is the responsibility of the entire WL faculty. The pre-service teacher therefore must rely upon the abilities and creativity of all the WL professors (PS 1, 2) to provide them with curricular, co-curricular, and extramural opportunities to attain the desired level of proficiency — or even higher.<sup>4</sup>

The extensive field experiences for the pre-service major required by NCATE promote language proficiency and its application in the K-12 classroom (PS 1, 3, 4). School visits and observations also begin to assess the teacher candidate's subject-matter knowledge in teaching situations. Skills-getting is combined with meaningful academic skills-using activities. WL students understandably expect guidance and support from WL faculty through course content and more. Recommendations of exemplary K-12 program sites and teachers should be a high priority, because the knowledge of whom to see or where to go cannot be the proprietary duty of one individual in either the WL department or School of Education. We are again mindful of NCATE insistence on a collaborative framework. Together, the language development and skills-using aspects begin early for the future WL teacher. The new induction program emphasizes the commitment to first-hand reflection throughout the undergraduate continuum, which we have characterized in three necessarily overlapping stages: the upper-division or initial period of induction consisting of pedagogy and language classes, the methods sequence, and the period of student teaching. As teacher educators, we need to use that initial declaration by the student who enrolls as a WL education major as the onset of a continual period of in-processing. We do this through creating and implementing activities, procedures, and parallel program offerings that are beyond course registration and a mild generation of paperwork by a new advisor, thus producing the personalized nurturing process that we are describing.

When students make the decision to become language teachers, they have at best a nascent, unrefined idea of what it means to become a teacher. Merely presenting them with a list of desiderata such is not what we recommend — although, to be sure, such a daunting itemization as presented in García (2009) would assist the students' teachers to realize the tasks that await them. The civil polity that characterizes enculturation into the induction program supports a macro-level of involvement. The subject matter department has to develop the steps that empower faculty and students in areas that are prudently planned and executed. We do not offer a proscriptive listing of the requisite features of the induction program because the envisioned demonstration projects will

---

*When students make the decision to become language teachers, they have at best a nascent, unrefined idea of what it means to become a teacher.*

---

## Preparing Tomorrow's World Language Teacher Today

have special areas of emphasis, such as immersion in K-5/6, or high school beginning language teaching. Such characteristics of each project that we consider appropriate would be course content and course offerings: “Do we have a course on traditional children’s literature and games and songs and fables?” “Is there a course that helps students to understand second language acquisition theories?” “Have we revised our course curricula to assist students in the development of advanced language abilities, as recommended by Donato and Brooks, 2004, García, Hernández and Davis-Wiley (2008), Pearson et al. (2006), and Thompson (2005)?”

Additionally, there are the topics of initial and subsequent benchmarking of the students’ speaking proficiency by a faculty knowledgeable in the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines — Speaking* (1999) and the National Association of District Supervisors of Foreign Languages (NADSFL) *Characteristics of Effective Instruction* (1999); a description of national and local language standards; the local, state, and NCATE standards required for teacher certification; and the role of faculty advisors as well as the development of language programming in co-curricular or extra-curricular formats. Study-abroad offerings are publicized; dormitory language floors, culture evenings, literary readings, dramatic offerings, folk and modern dance events, language tutors or native-speaker informants, Skype and e-mail exchange partners, visits to school sites, lectures and presentations by area language school administrators, parents, supervisors and teachers — former graduates now employed at local K-12 schools — are worthy constituents of restructured induction. Finally, it is conceivable that the college or university will grant the WL department a special studies course component so that the student might obtain additional independent-study credits for participating in the various program events that extend and improve his or her cultural and linguistic knowledge. The micro-level of discourse is the personal contribution that the inductee brings to the above features, together with the well-conceptualized mentorship program that serves as a major feature of induction. While we do not proscribe its specific content and character, we stress the importance of ensuring that all pre-service WL teachers have someone in their corner who has *been there*, and can offer advice relating to the journey that the inductee has undertaken. That the mentorship program and other offerings continue through the next stages of pre-service education is essential.

### The New Methods Program

The WL methods sequence we propose is (at minimum) a two-semester course experience, one that is part of the inductee’s upper-division or graduate-level coursework. It offers multiple opportunities for hands-on learning from many areas, and combines general pedagogy with language-specific challenges. We argue that this information-rich component deserves reconsideration in order to address the needs of future educators and their students successfully. Our reason is that the WL classroom of tomorrow has already begun its metamorphosis to a *place* of learning whose walls and traditional modes literally are disappearing. Future induction, we believe, acknowledges a continuous change process produced by the pedagogical, societal,

and technological relationships that define our times. These experiences obligate us to be mindful that future K-12 language students will, aside from technology infusion (Witherspoon, 2006), share few historical or societal frames of reference with their own teachers — our present-day methods students. Two examples, one that is driven by technology and the other societal, illustrate this point.

Classroom materials that we now use for learning activities are determined by a different technology than previously was the case. In 1975, we prized foreign telephone directories or *Yellow Pages*. They assisted our students in deriving visual and authentic, meaningful linguistic contexts about the target language country and its culture. We had no clue that such treasured tomes would become pedagogically obsolete, and discarded, to be replaced by the Internet. Students now bring to the K-12 classroom memory sticks replete with realia and photos or movies to share; they present information, real-time commercials, or documents that relate to classroom activities. For earlier generations of WL teachers, methods instructors declared the printed textbook and its ancillaries to be the principal language influence for students. That is no longer the norm. As teacher-educators, we must prepare our inductees for a scenario where students and their computers will be continual co-constructors of learning, by dint of their instantaneous access to authentic language sources.

---

*As teacher-educators, we must prepare our inductees for a scenario where students and their computers will be continual co-constructors of learning, by dint of their instantaneous access to authentic language sources.*

---

If this first example is not sufficient to convince us to incorporate the dynamics of change in our education of tomorrow's teachers, then this second illustration demonstrates how American society has transformed traditional practice activities for learners. We know that language learning is non-linear, although many textual materials attempt to present information differently. This is true for acquisition order (VanPatten, 1987) and for vocabulary that students need to communicate as they learn. This is precisely where our textbooks, for a variety of pragmatic or political reasons, may not offer pedagogical leadership for a society — or profession — in change. Our texts present to the learner a set of lexical items having to do with the “traditional family.” Words for mother, father, sister, and brother are given so as to assist the teacher in framing the pictorial/oral unit that we know as “My Family.” Students in the first level who tackle this assignment ask their instructors for non-traditional vocabulary that they could not find in the texts. Words such as half-brother or stepsister frequently occur in presentational activities, because that is the students' reality. Students talk — willingly and proudly, about their own families. They do so irrespective of the normed family grouping they may see in the textbook. The beginning speakers go beyond what editors are willing to acknowledge: traditional family groups co-exist with non-traditional home situations — the standard American reality for quite some time. Over the last 15 years, one of the authors has watched and listened as his students drew and presented blended family trees with affection; they were eager to demonstrate their incipient language skills while describing the atypical relationships that the tree displayed. He has observed how his adolescent students update their lexicon to explain

## Preparing Tomorrow's World Language Teacher Today

that they live with a biological parent who is gay or lesbian. No one batted an eye when they heard, *Vivo con mi mamá. Se llama Sandi. Su pareja se llama Carol* (“I live with my mom. Her name is Sandi. Her partner’s name is Carol.”), or when they observed a photo series of *Mein Vater heißt Dan. Ich wohne bei Dan und sein [sic] Partner Bob* (“My father’s name is Dan. I live with Dan and his partner Bob.”). The dynamic aspect of the L2 needed for tomorrow’s students expands what publishers have offered.<sup>5</sup>

As teacher educators, we affirm that our discipline’s future representatives work within a social construct that has been under-represented in the past. Our two examples admonish us that we must prepare our inductees to know how to support students’

---

*As teacher educators, we affirm that our discipline’s future representatives work within a social construct that has been under-represented in the past.*

---

cultural realities and lexical curiosities as these manifest themselves. They must recognize that WL learning in the United States includes social circumstances that textbook editors will presumably continue to avoid or downplay for some time to come. Our examples demonstrate the need to structure the methods experience as a continuous process of collaboration and contemplation of the “What ifs?” of course *content* and course *intent* as we bridge two cultures. Pre-service teachers must question what we do, what we use, and why and how we go about our teaching tasks. The purpose of methods courses, that is, cannot be but an introduction to

the observations and experiences that the teacher candidates and their students bring to the classroom. We have already disabused ourselves of the notion that the only way to teach and learn is the way we ourselves were once taught and learned (and, sooner or later, we shall do the same for our future teachers). Now, we insist, we would do well to teach inductees that the same materials we used are technologically and/or socioculturally inadequate without modification. Their future students require no less a commitment from their teachers’ educators.

We return to the conclusion that we have known for decades: there are simply too many facets of language teacher education for their informational weight to be shoehorned into a modest time frame, the single three-credit methods course. We recall that the structural change of expanding the learning experience for the future WL teacher is not simply the delimitation of content or temporal possibilities. It is not a lengthy, reasoned appeal for merely adding to the number of credit hours — however much we so desire that quantifiable increase. The argument for “more methods time” is certainly appropriate and necessary, but its resolution will come from those who manage the new induction structure. That group includes methods instructors whose leadership duties are undeniably transforming and transformational to students and colleagues, and to the project itself.<sup>6</sup>

These philosophical and supervisory aspects of our paradigm must be in place before we devise the course content or topics to be covered during methods instruction. Having demonstrated the interconnected nature of teacher commitment with systemic intent, we employ that principle to determine the extent of theory and application activities that the pre-service educator requires. We consider this listing in tandem with a brief categorization of the knowledge base gained by the pre-service teacher in

other education courses. After completion of a course in general teaching methods, the teacher candidate knows how to:

- Construct a lesson plan and a unit plan for language students.
- Manage an online grade book.
- Keep anecdotal records.
- Conduct parent-teacher conferences.
- Integrate basic technology into lessons.
- Assess student progress.
- The WL methods activities may focus therefore on the following language and culture-specific and theoretical areas (*PS 1, 3, 4, 5*):
- Theories of second language acquisition;
- Current approaches to teaching languages;
- Language standards and the ACTFL Performance Guidelines for K-12 Learners (1998).

These in turn are augmented by four key components: peer-teaching, structured class visitations, information accessing regarding techniques and classroom activities (from professional journals and online sources), and technology integration.

Any listing of course content, we know, falls far short of attaining completeness and unanimity of agreement. That being noted, we offer these as potential components of the formal methods sequence structure and emphasize that these topics are directly related to *PS 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6*:

- The history of WL teaching;
- Program types, K-12, including immersion and exploratory WL programs;
- Currently adopted textbooks and their evaluation;
- Teaching listening and reading comprehension as well as technology-driven viewing skills (van Olphen, 2009);
- Assessment of student learning;
- Thematic unit creation;
- Incorporating the three modes of communication;
- The role of culture in the classroom — Products, Practices, and Perspectives (*SFLL*, 2006) — as well as the what, when, and how;
- The use of the target language in class by teacher and students;
- Teaching Levels I and beyond; teaching multiple levels in a single period;
- Co-curricular activities and advocacy for WL studies;
- Content-based instruction;
- Classroom management in a WL setting;
- Observing WL teachers and what to look for;
- Professional growth opportunities;
- Implementing culturally authentic activities (songs, games, etc.), thus further emphasizing the role of technology in daily classroom practices.

## Preparing Tomorrow's World Language Teacher Today

Together with student time devoted to the earlier-noted co-curricular activities, their field implementation by the pre-service teacher begins in earnest on the first day of the student teaching experience, which is our next stage of the induction journey.

### The New Student Teaching Experience

We know that the challenges of this most critical period of induction to our triad present them with the reality of continuous, permanent change. “School” is a complex and evolving set of multiple realities. Their relative importance is magnified by the decision-making of the individual participants, teachers and students, as well as by group dynamics that make the dual goals of the classroom day, teaching and learning, elusive, if not at times perhaps even illusory.

To gain admission into the internship, and experience teaching on a sustained basis, our relatively inexperienced but nonetheless appropriately prepared inductee will have demonstrated the requisite skills in language and culture, pedagogical techniques, and personal and professional dispositions by having achieved clearly defined benchmarks such as an Advanced-Low or higher rating on an official ACTFL OPI. The apprenticeship period, typically of 12-15 weeks in duration, is one of learning through teaching and teaching through learning. Such duties as the student teacher assumes under the guidance of the triad's senior members are incrementally taken and carefully paced: no “sink or swim” immersion assignment is even considered. The coordination of class presentations rests with the cooperating teacher and the supervisor. The supervisor's increased presence at the school site effectively serves as more than a symbol of the restructured induction.<sup>7</sup> He or she is the inter-connective component or catalyst for student teaching progress by measured steps embedded with continual support. The supervisor must bring to the project successful personal K-12 experience, the knowledge of what it's like to teach all day, every day, and be capable of offering sound advice and pedagogical strategies. In the past, instances have occurred where methods instructors or supervisors are notably inexperienced in pre-collegiate education, or are from another culture, and thus do not engage the American K-12 student with first-hand or personal experience nor understand the sub-culture network of relationships and contractual obligations which the WL K-12 classroom teacher encounters, other than perhaps through second-hand observations or readings. That is not to say that future supervisors must be omniscient; they do need to have undergone relevant and sustained K-12 teaching as part of their professional obligation to teacher education.

Further, we argue that the partnership between the triad members cannot be forged during a supervisor's infrequent observational visits. Nor can the scope of responsibilities that the cooperating teacher has, despite already being overburdened by many contractual, professional, or personal obligations, be a default condition. It is not the obligation of the cooperating teacher (especially the one who receives only inconsistent support from a university supervisor), we argue, to assist the intern as he or she meets state-mandated classroom contact hours of actual practice teaching while simultaneously maintaining the K-12 students' academic progress in the subject matter.

As the field manager for the inductee's growth, the supervisor is not only a monitor of progress. In our restructured environment, the monitor becomes a mentor. This guide is frequently present, meeting with the cooperating teacher and the student to offer recommendations and even help to prepare materials. The mentor's role, in other words, is neither passive nor simply evaluative. Instead, it establishes an atmosphere of shared responsibilities that permit the successful internship to develop in a manner consistent with NCATE's vision.

The opportunity to share in the creation of his or her practicum, however, does not compel the pre-service candidate to rely on the triad for every act or decision. The inductees must be cognizant of their responsibility for their own success as they attend to the known as well as to the novel, immediate obligations of working daily with students to accomplish specific curricular objectives. Learning about teaching is important; implementing a lesson or unit plan reinforces the advice given for the future, when the frequency of immediate support in that first teaching position is severely reduced. The student teacher must be mindful of so much as he or she develops a unique set of skills. Despite that neophyte's self-confidence and in the face of one's apprehensions, the student must reflect on what has taken place. No summary descriptor of these possibilities, no prescribed list of *do's and don'ts* adequately explores the dynamic, energetic interplay experienced by the student teacher, either at those moments of exhilaration ("Hey, they really got it! They understood direct object pronouns!"), those depths of disillusionment ("Everyone hates me! They don't get my teaching style — they don't know anything about object pronouns. They don't remember yesterday's work. I'm a poor teacher.")

As a result of the unflagging and fatiguing evolution that learning to teach is, our future language instructor must have the correct balance of continually refining skills-based knowledge combined with the fortitude to understand classroom dynamics.<sup>8</sup> Such a perspective might also erroneously permit some to conclude that beyond that of the classroom cooperating teacher, any other mentor role that is close would be inappropriate and less than useful. It is not. The university supervisor's work is essential for providing the reinforcing, focused pattern of collaborative behaviors that we seek. In sharing leadership responsibilities with the cooperating teacher, the university supervisor must be assigned a significant amount of officially sanctioned

---

*As a result of the unflagging and fatiguing evolution that learning to teach is, our future language instructor must have the correct balance of continually refining skills-based knowledge combined with the fortitude to understand classroom dynamics.*

---

and credited workload time to address teacher candidates' needs. The obligation of working with interns cannot be placed solely in the hands of even the most willing and accomplished cooperating teacher by default. Our principle recommendation for the supervisor is that mentorship becomes a deepened level of involvement. The triad would meet at least once weekly for a detailed, extensive review including both live and videotaped observations. Feedback sessions would focus on the intern's work and progress in learning to teach with the same force of presence and scrutiny that the scientist brings to an experiment. By eliminating the traditional practice of occasional intervention and thereby broadening the supervisor's responsibilities and time in the



## Preparing Tomorrow's World Language Teacher Today

field, we will have created a symbiotic relationship where planning, implementation, and critical examination are a triadic and not dyadic event. By reformatting the time allowed for the commitment of talents and close cooperation involved, we give the period of student teaching the appropriate critical mass that is consonant with its importance to teacher education overall. We believe that such a procedure successfully recalibrates the respect due our mission of setting the course for the pre-service teacher's rite of passage from the student's desk to the teacher's.

Our recommendation for strengthening the university supervisor's charge in no way diminishes the role and responsibilities of the cooperating teacher. Rather, our new paradigm enhances the cooperating teacher's duties on behalf of the intern. The restructuring succeeds because all triad members regularly experience the challenges of the day-to-day classroom and resolve issues of planning and implementation. Neither the supervisor nor the classroom cooperating teacher vies for primacy in the triadic relationship. While their individual efforts will intersect, each understands the synergy created by their act of collaboration to assist the student teacher actively. Just as the cooperating teacher provides the intern entrée into the K-12 culture and its practices, the supervisor provides support for pedagogical endeavors and practice. Managerial and modeling aspects, that is, are not the fiefdom of one, but of three. Their collaboration is founded upon the notion that the internship period process is gradual. The knowledge learned ensures that the pre-service candidate has not merely seen or observed school but has lived it. Furthermore, the development of lessons, their implementation, and the subsequent debriefing are too vital for creating a teacher *persona* to be reflected upon only infrequently. Student teaching is too dense a forest of tasks and decision-making for the cooperating teacher alone to lead or show the path. Transformative internship, we argue, is interactive and establishes itself as precursory to a pattern of professional collaboration that clearly demonstrates that teaching is manifestly the act of lifelong learning. As the teacher candidate's place within the triad, and in the classroom, moves from a witnessed mode to the experienced reality and responsibility of active teaching, the required insights, trial lessons and retrials shift the focus from L2 knowledge to L2 pedagogy. The *what*, that is, becomes secondary to the *how* and *why*. Activity patterns fall into these three categories:

1. The intern's L2 confidence level becomes a quest for developing the sustained use of the L2 in front of and with students whose interests range from being positively disposed to L2 studies to being less so.
2. How to teach effectively becomes the consciously emergent goal. The pedagogical repertoire accompanies maintenance or even improvement of L2 skills; the attainment of subject matter knowledge (L2) is understood as a relatively easier task at this stage.
3. Directly related to strategic practice is the issue of disposition, the development of the dynamic relationships between the student teacher and the students. This must be an ongoing discussion topic. A conscientious, ethical framework must be constructed for and with the student teacher. It includes attitudes of pedagogy, legality, and morality. Its growth is prerequisite so that potentially negative matters of generational identification are averted. The use of *Facebook*,

for example, as a networking site used by both the teacher candidate and the teenaged students presents concerns to parents and others.

Emotional and/or physiological and sociocultural proximity may not necessarily produce the desired optimum teaching and learning environment, despite fictionalized portraits of the novice teacher as iconoclastic buddy whom mass media made an indelible cultural product of post-World War II American film and television. Stellar examples of this genre range from the 1948 film *Good News* through *Our Miss Brooks* and *Room 222* to *Dead Poets' Society* (Raimo, Delvin-Scherer, & Zinicola, 2002). Their expected growth, no matter how formulated or abbreviated through references to popular culture, provides teacher candidates with quantifiably increased support and reflective rehearsal. The collaborative behaviors mandate the realization that learning to teach and teaching are not stand-up acts. They are not to be conflated with the act of working in a stand-alone classroom setting that has been characterized as one adult surrounded by many children.

At this time of pre-service or even before, during methods course work, the question of the intern's L2 knowledge has undergone a substantive mode shift. The paramount task is no longer maintaining or improving the target language. Instead, the challenge becomes the modes of L2 usage. Ease, fluidity, and fluency — certainly appropriate aspects of an exceptional level of speaking skills such as the OPI Advanced-Low status and higher delineate — are also hallmarks of the classroom ambiance that define and frame contemporary communicative language teaching praxis. Admittedly, some textual materials may obligate the student teacher to acquire new domains of L2 knowledge. Rather, it is the perceived unforced, straightforward, unconscious production of the L2 that predetermines the necessary modeled usage that promotes students' L2 achievement. The uncertain or apprehensive use of the L2 by the student teacher will, we maintain, lead students, especially those in secondary settings, to draw two conclusions; each is unfavorable to a successful internship:

---

*At this time of pre-service or even before, during methods course work, the question of the intern's L2 knowledge has undergone a substantive mode shift. The paramount task is no longer maintaining or improving the target language. Instead, the challenge becomes the modes of L2 usage.*

---

1. The teacher candidate cannot practice what he or she preaches, i.e., mastery of the L2; the students will think, "If he or she can't speak well, how am I expected to — and why!"
2. The candidate's language breakdowns will invariably lead to English becoming the language of real communication for the class, with only an occasional set of bursts in the target language that must be endured until the teacher returns to English.

Thus, the objective of communication, real-language achievement, is left by the wayside.

Encyclopedic language proficiency of the teacher candidate is not our desideratum at this point. The visible, audible demonstration that his or her knowledge base is

## Preparing Tomorrow's World Language Teacher Today

expanding is an acceptable condition, so long as the audience — the students and their parents — perceives a conversational skills set on the student teacher's part that is commensurate with the role of teacher, and not that of student. A sample of L2 knowledge expectations summarizes the challenge of conveying confidence in L2 use:

- Classroom language expressions, from saying “locker” in German to “Well, let's continue” in French, etc., are mandatory aspects of the teacher candidate's language;
- Discourse behaviors, of appropriate extended length, such as those employed in the modeling of activities or presentational parts of a lesson, are well-formulated, and require no (or very few) false starts or re-statements in English. Connectives and repetitive, routinized L2 language (Fillmore, 1985) are present;
- Textbook chapter vocabulary does not present linguistic stumbling blocks to communication. The student teacher demonstrates a solid grasp of the new lexical items.
- Age- and learner-appropriate topics, be they Hip-Hop music in German or the local Spanish language radio station scene are or become a field of professional growth. Possibilities include film, video, youth culture, advertising, content-related topics in geography, governments, sports, games and songs, for example, complement cultural products, practices, and perspectives (Peterson, 2004) found in traditional formats. In other words, the student teacher as lifelong learner yields right of way to the student teacher as lifelong teacher (*PS 6*).

The interplay between language knowledge and language usage as above described brings with it the welcome interaction of L2 and pedagogical knowledge. The student teacher filters the language and its usage in class through pedagogy, and vice-versa. Those transitional moments, for example, between a series of classroom activities, sometimes considered by observers as a dead-air zone in a classroom, become soaked up by that set of previously created and easily accessible sponge activities (Hernández & García, 2006). Thematic teaching units, to offer another example, are well-created series of student-driven, sustained activities that reinforce and even reformat known language for the student while affording the teacher candidate opportunities to demonstrate an expanded knowledge base-beyond that of the textbook-that enhances teacher-student language usage (Beane, 1997; Curtain & Haas, 1995). Additionally, interactive student-to-student learning activities such as information gap exercises (García & Hernández, 2007; Lee & VanPatten, 2003) produce scaffolded L2 achievement.

We have omitted specific details of the student teaching or internship period in order to emphasize those fundamental requirements that our conceptualized triad and its collaborative responsibilities have to the teacher-candidate for his or her professional growth. As a component of the continuum that we envision for producing highly competent and fully prepared beginning WL teachers, the triad model purposefully initiates a learning process beyond graduation. In this way, we afford greater emphasis to be given to the development of both pedagogical skills and class-

related dispositions than customarily may be found in other induction models. By no means, however, should the teacher-candidate's intensive time of experimentation and reflection be considered a final step to *independent* classroom teaching. Supervisory roles and mentoring/support roles do not end with graduation and state licensure, as we now explain.

### Post-Graduation Induction

The post-graduation phase of the beginning WL teacher's induction into the profession rests on the close collaboration between the school district, the university and the novice teacher that has been cultivated during pre-graduation or pre-service work. As such, it continues the evolving integration we have described. The already established triadic partnership continues beyond the pre-service time, into at least the first academic year, and assumes a new configuration. We next provide a condensed version of the proposed process; a more comprehensive study by the authors is being prepared for the near future.

---

*The post-graduation phase of the beginning WL teacher's induction into the profession rests on the close collaboration between the school district, the university and the novice teacher that has been cultivated during pre-graduation or pre-service work.*

---

Research documents the need for on-going support (Wong, Sterling, & Rowland, 1999; Yopp & Young, 1999), and, consequently, thoroughly grounds ACTFL/NCATE mandates for the integration and full engagement of classroom WL teachers in teacher training efforts (PS 6a). Further, our rationale is founded on well-executed research studies that conclude that novice teachers often struggle as they make the transition from the role of pre-service candidate to that of actual classroom instructor (Fry, 2007). Due to the challenges they encounter, a substantial number consequently leave the profession after a few brief years in the classroom (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). These researchers note that "between 40 and 50 percent" resign after just five years, with 29% of these teachers expressing "dissatisfaction with teaching as a career or with their specific job" (p. 32).

There are of course proven approaches to curtail the mass exodus of new educators. Darling-Hammond (2003) urges teacher educators to begin adequate initial teacher preparation early, so as to indeed keep beginning teachers in the profession immediately following their first few years and beyond. Through her research, she has also found that those novice teachers who remain in education report a high level of satisfaction with their knowledge of curriculum materials, student assessment, lesson planning, technological ability, content area knowledge, pedagogical skills, and classroom management skills. And so it is through the articulated induction period from pre-service to first-year teacher, which we favor, that the attrition rate for the novice WL teacher can be reduced. Blair-Larsen and Bercik (1990) offer a plan the framework of which presages and parallels our suggestions for post-graduation activities. They proposed that this "period of transition from student to professional when beginning teachers are offered supervision and support as they adjust to their new roles" (p. 3) should consist of two parts. Part One is a summer in-service program consisting of 2 weeks; the second component, Part Two, is a system of mentoring,

## Preparing Tomorrow's World Language Teacher Today

coaching, and visitations. The second period would include follow-up graduate-level coursework, collaborative teaching efforts, in-field supervision, online support activities and workshops throughout the first teaching year. This two-part continuation of our induction model follows.

### *Part One: The Summer In-Service Program*

The teacher training institution, in concert with the cooperating school district, formulates and executes this vital new teacher workshop. It will examine, but not be limited to, those aspects of the district's operational activities and educational goals: the school culture, classroom organization, and the local WL program. A sample workshop series is detailed next.<sup>9</sup>

### *The School Culture*

Each individual school has its own particular culture, or hidden curriculum, consisting of a set of unwritten rules and expectations of behavior (Bieber, 1994).

---

*Each individual school has its own particular culture, or hidden curriculum, consisting of a set of unwritten rules and expectations of behavior*

---

Therein lies a common or universal knowledge base that all new instructors need to have, regardless of their school assignments, and prior to assuming initial, first-days-of-school duties. During this two-week staff development time, facilitated by the two senior members of the triad, the WL methods professor at the university and the WL mentor teacher (joined also by the district WL supervisor, should one exist), the following essential questions are addressed:

- Where do I teach, in one room or in several? Where do I park? Where do I have lunch? Do I have an office-type workspace?
- What is the discipline protocol, the expectations for student/teacher interactions, and parental involvement in this matter? What governance policies apply to the role and scope of homework? Is there a grading policy?
- What technologies and equipment will I have available in my classroom(s)? What is their expected role in classroom instruction? How do I find technical support in the building? Do I need special training on the technologies available?
- Who can help me at my building with the many details and advisories found in the New Teacher Handbook that I just received? Who can help me with specific issues not addressed in the handbook?
- What is the expected professional attire for the classroom?
- Does the principal require me to submit lesson plans? Do I need to use a specific format?
- What is the policy for sick days, personal and professional leave? What is the paperwork associated with requesting leave? Do I need to call the principal when I am ill, or do I tell my department chair or a secretary? Do I need to have a week's worth of contingency plans for my students? Who gets a substitute for me?

- What tools are in place for parent/teacher communication? How often and what protocol should be followed?
- Am I expected to sponsor or participate in extra-curricular activities? If so, what are the school's expectations for me in terms of time, travel, and finances? If there is no budget, what procedures must I follow to have a Language Club candy sale?
- How do I keep anecdotal records/documentation of my contact with students and their parents/guardians?
- How do I conduct a parent-teacher conference, and who can help me prepare for such a meeting? What about the "Meet the Teacher Night?" When? Who? How?
- How do I seek assistance for a student with special needs? To what extent is there support for helping this student with my subject area?
- What is the school policy on field trips? Do they frown on or even deny trips to the ethnic restaurant, for example, but approve of museum visits? What are the policies for inviting outside speakers? Do I get them approved? By whom?

#### *Classroom Organization*

- Which textbooks will I use? When do I distribute them to my students? What about ancillary materials, online or in hard copy format? Do I give these out, or do I have simply one class set for each level I teach? What about copyright issues and copies of some pages? What can I do with the texts and what may I not do?
- Do students pay an additional fee for WL classes? Am I allowed to ask students to purchase special materials for my class? What do the library holdings look like for my language?
- Is there a language lab that my students can use? How do I use it? What software and materials are available for our use? How often? How do I schedule it? If there is no lab, how do I access laptops on a cart?
- If there is a budget for them, how do I order special non-print teaching peripherals or materials to use in my classes? How often can I use them? Do I need permission to do so?
- Do I have a special departmental lesson plan format that I must follow? Do I submit my lesson plans to my department head?

#### *The School District World Language Program*

- What is the district's WL curriculum? What part does culture and the four linguistic skills have in it? How are the national standards integrated into the curriculum? Where is the curriculum, and how do I access it?
- Is there a midterm or end-of-the-term test for each language? How and when is it given and assessed? Am I responsible to conduct an item analysis for summative assessments?
- What languages are offered? How are they articulated in the district?
- Is there a program supervisor for WLs? Does the supervisor evaluate me? How often? Which evaluation framework is used?
- What type of support is there for teacher professional development?

## **Preparing Tomorrow's World Language Teacher Today**

In summary, these topics take place in an interactive workshop format at the K-12 site. Depending on the degree of technological support available, parts of these sessions can also occur in a virtual environment. Ideally, the host classroom would belong to a teacher who had been a graduate of the project. Thus, the mentorship cycle continues, and utilizes the triadic nature of collaboration that we promote. Part Two of the post-graduation induction process evolves over the period of the new school year.

### **Part Two: The Mentoring/Visitation Component of Post-Graduation Induction**

The authors anticipate that the second part of the novice WL teacher's mentorship would commence on the first day of the school's regular or general in-service program, which is distinct from the special two-week WL summer in-service. Some strands or topics that had been touched upon during the earlier two weeks will of course be considered during this time, and, indeed, may reoccur throughout the entire year. The first-year teacher would have already met and worked with his or her in-school WL mentor teacher, who in an ideal scenario would be a recognized veteran WL teacher. In some cases, as one would expect, it might happen that the field-based mentor teacher also will have undergone a similar induction process from years earlier. In situations such as these, that is, the former mentee now becomes the mentor, and thus the support cycle continues. The school district's mentor teacher would have participated in the two-week in-service as a co-presenter with the university's teacher educator, and already be familiar with his/her novice colleague mentee. This WL classroom teacher mentor might even receive professional development credit hours from his/her school district for participating in summer in-service session. Members of the triad would work together throughout this first year, and possibly longer, as they deepen and broaden the necessary compatibility and trust levels. The novice teacher would be coached and nurtured, and thus would feel free to seek guidance on any school-related issues that might arise. Being part of the mentoring/coaching team and a WL language teacher, the mentor teacher would be comfortable seeking guidance from the teacher education program's liaison — the methods professor, who attends regularly-scheduled meetings in the schools and conducts observations on a sustained basis — even accompanied by his/her new pre-service students, when (of course) agreed to ahead of time by the host teachers. Informal observations and conversations with the new colleague would occur during each visit. The theme or topic of a specific get-together would focus on a particular skill or concern expressed by the new teacher in the course of this first year. In addition to the face-to-face encounters of the triad members, virtual meetings and conversations (via an Intranet environment, teleconferencing webcam session and/or controlled blogs) could also transpire.

It is possible that the university could establish a for-credit situation that would assist the novice teacher in achieving two other goals, securing an advanced degree and/or moving closer to the next increment on the school district's established step or salary scale. If the new teacher is not terribly overwhelmed with establishing himself/herself during the first semester, it is possible that the second or spring semester of the school year would be an appropriate time to enroll in a university course whose topic or theme would support the teacher's K-12 activities. Such courses as Advanced

Conversation or Francophone or Hispanic Literature could be useful and rewarding, just as would be a course or two in the Education Department that firmly aligns itself with the interests or challenges that the beginning teacher has encountered in the reality of the K-12 classroom.

Given the reality of both fiscal and personnel resources available to sustain professional support for the novice WL teacher, the triad model that we have presented here could certainly become more comprehensive, and be expanded from including a single new teacher mentee from one school to a cohort of WL mentees from either the same school or from different schools within the same school district. Thus, a small group of beginning teachers could be mentored, nurtured and supported by the same cadre of mentor teachers and university personnel. Such an arrangement, given adequate resources, would bridge the concept of a single triadic activity to the widely-accepted Professional Development School (PDS) model of teacher support. Our proposed triad model, however, is indeed different from the PDS triad model, wherein there is an already-established support triad consisting of a university mentor assigned to the PDS to work with novice teachers from a variety of content areas, and their content-specific classroom mentor teachers. Our model is discipline-specific (WL study), its context or pedagogical thrust directly related to language acquisition.

Summer travel and language/culture activities to enhance both the language proficiency and cultural awareness levels of the beginning WL teachers are but the next step for the latter, and can be part of a set of recommendations or goals that the triad's members help to create.

The above are but a few of the possibilities for the post-graduation induction period. Any variation or additional component derives from our belief that the potential for successful induction is directly related to the quantity and quality of support that the novice teacher receives from the methods and university program officials and the local mentors.

In eulogizing his recently assassinated brother Robert F. Kennedy in June of 1968, the late Senator Ted Kennedy set forth their mutual belief that humankind is responsible for charting a course to a better tomorrow, saying, "Our future may be beyond our vision, but it is not completely beyond our control."<sup>10</sup> The amalgam of reality and hope that we hear in this eloquent but simple declarative statement is especially apt in the context of our discussion on language teachers and teacher educators. We cannot predict the future, to be sure. Nor can our profession leave the mapping of that time and place to a governing entity, however, without ensuring first that we veterans formulate, espouse, and endorse well-considered means that propose an improved end, or reform of teacher education — and that our voices be heard, attentively and with the respect due our experience and research findings. At the beginning of this paper, we reminded the reader that American teacher education is based on the perception of a direct relationship between student achievement and teacher preparation, and will continue to be thus evaluated. The sometimes verifiable disconnected or, in some instances,

---

*Any variation or additional component derives from our belief that the potential for successful induction is directly related to the quantity and quality of support that the novice teacher receives from the methods and university program officials and the local mentors.*

---



## Preparing Tomorrow's World Language Teacher Today

coincidental preparation of WL teachers that occurs, will not serve our nation's children well as members of our inevitably increasing bilingual, multicultural society and world. The seamless induction process that we have proposed in these pages may seem revolutionary to some, prosaic and a well-trod pathway to others; the notion of a fixed triad of players as basic to change and its concomitant time and expense to produce success may seem to yet others as simply idealistic and unrealistic. Nevertheless, reform and change are, ironically, stable components of teacher preparation. How we address them for WL teacher-candidates begins with us.

### Notes

1. From among the many scholars and organizations that have wrestled with the topic of teacher education and offered solutions, we cite Levine (2006): "The nation's teacher education programs are inadequately preparing their graduates to meet the realities of today's standards-based, accountability-driven classrooms, in which the primary measure of success is student achievement. (The study) ... concludes that a majority of teacher education graduates are prepared in university-based programs that suffer from low admission and graduation standards. Their faculties, curriculums and research are disconnected from school practice and practitioners" (p. 1).
2. See Richey (2007) regarding the history of FLAP grants, and Falsgraf (2007) for technology in the WL classroom. Regarding Scebold's and Zimmer-Loew's many contributions to the profession, from the oral proficiency movement to the collaborative that created our national standards and after, the reader is referred to these essays for a representative sample: Scebold & Wallinger (2000), Wallinger & Scebold (2000), and Zimmer-Loew (2000). Kline (2001), on behalf of the Northeast Conference, wrote a memorial tribute to Scebold, in which she discusses his contributions, at: <http://www2.dickinson.edu/prog/nectfl/armemoriom3.html>. Other tributes to Scebold may be found in the November/December issue of *Foreign Language Annals*, 34, 6 (2001), and *The Modern Language Journal*, 85, 4 (2001), 644.
3. The listing of US immersion programs from 1971-2006 is available online at: <http://www.cal.org/resources/immersion/Doc/GrowthofTotalandPartialImmersionProgramsinUS.pdf>
4. By no means do we suggest that study abroad is not an important WL induction component. It is critical; its investigation assists us in understanding the role of study abroad for second language acquisition. Indeed, one co-author recently published a research study on the efficacy of study abroad for language proficiency (Hernández, in press). Just as the NCATE standards call for an integrated study-abroad presence, we emphasize here the concept that second language acquisition be viewed as a totality of several types of experiences. Several language-using components, such as service learning, for instance, will assist students in achieving the language benchmark as complementary to study abroad programs. Study abroad should not of course be considered to be the only means to develop oral proficiency.

Its absence, on the other hand, cannot be given as “the reason” why a department’s WL teacher candidates cannot attain Advanced ratings on the ACTFL OPI.

5. We understand the economics involved; selling textbooks that feature alternative family situations in locales such as Florida (and its Proposition 2 of 2008), or California (and its Proposition 8), are important business-related factors when deciding on the expensive funding allocation for developing book projects. It is left to the teacher whose WL learning environment is situated in an American social experience to address the students’ reality. See Dorwick and Glass (2003) for a cogent discussion on the (at times) significant disparities between WL education policies and actual textbook materials and classroom practices.
6. Their contributions also mandate change in another structural sector, the system of rewards under which they work. From the departmental perspective, the methods professors have assumed a differentiated dimension that is critical for program stability and success. It is imperative that they be contracted under promotion or tenure standards that are distinct from those of faculty who possess traditional language and cultural specializations.
7. We acknowledge that changing the job responsibility of the supervisor is a cost-related issue that this model must take into consideration.
8. Again, it is important that the university supervisor not rely upon infrequent monitoring visits to the intern, to offer some words of encouragement or make a suggestion between classes, or during a formal, after-school debriefing. Such meetings have played out in many schools for many decades, as the authors personally can attest to from their own pre-service preparation in different parts of the country — in three different decades (the 1960s to the 1990s). We have already argued that to continue previous practice in this regard is dysfunctional. It appeals, first, as a *de facto* condition to those who erroneously assume that teaching is but a matter of *practice*, a *sink-or-swim* journey until, finally, one *gets it right*. Second, the infrequency of consultation is disingenuous: it masks the requisite demand for attention to detail that must occur for the future teacher’s success *and* student learning.
9. The Blue Valley, Kansas, School District has instituted a 2-week, pre-service teacher workshop for beginning WL teachers. The authors acknowledge the work and achievements of their colleague, Diane DeNoon, District Coordinating Teacher, for her participation and presentation in the workshop we jointly offered at the ACTFL Annual Convention in 2007.
10. Senator Edward M. Kennedy. (1968) Tribute to Senator Robert F. Kennedy, June 8, 1968, St. Patrick’s Cathedral, New York City. Retrieved August 28, 2009 from <http://www.jfklibrary.org/Historical+Resources/Archives/Reference+Desk/Speeches/EMK/>

## References

*ACTFL/NCATE program standards for the preparation of foreign language teachers* (2002). Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

## Preparing Tomorrow's World Language Teacher Today

- ACTFL proficiency guidelines — Speaking* (1999). Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- ACTFL Performance Guidelines for K-12 Learners* (1998). Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Allen, L. (2002). Teachers' pedagogical beliefs and the standards for world language learning. *Foreign Language Learning*, 3, 518-528.
- Beane, J. (1997). *Curriculum integration: Designing the core of democratic education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bernhardt, E. (1992). *Life in language immersion classrooms*. Clevedon, England. Multilingual Matters.
- Bieber, J. (Producer). (1994). *Learning disabilities and social skills with Richard LaVoie: Last one picked...First one picked on*. Washington, D.C.: Public Broadcasting Service.
- Blair-Larsen, S.M., & Bercik, J.T. (1990). A collaborative model for teacher induction. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 341 642)
- Byrnes, H. (1998). Constructing curricula in collegiate foreign language departments. In H. Byrnes (Ed.), *Learning Foreign and Second Languages: Perspectives in Research and Scholarship* (pp. 262-295). New York: Modern Language Association.
- Center for Applied Linguistics. (2006). *Directory of foreign language immersion programs in U.S. schools*. Retrieved June 1, 2009, from <http://www.cal.org/resources/immersion/>
- Cooper, T.C. (2004). How foreign language teachers in Georgia evaluate their professional preparation: A call for action. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37, 37-48.
- Cummins, J. (1998). Immersion education for the millennium: What we have learned from 30 years of research on second language immersion. In M.R. Childs & R.M. Bostwick (Eds.), *Learning through two languages: Research and practice. Second Katoh Gakuen International Symposium on Immersion and Bilingual Education* (pp. 34-47). Katoh Gakuen, Japan.
- Curtain, H., & Haas, M. (1995). Integrating foreign language and content instruction in grades K-8. Retrieved on June 16, 2009, from <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/int-for-k8.html>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Keeping good teachers: What leaders can do. *Educational Leadership*, 60, 7-13.
- Donato, R., & Brooks, F.B. (2004). Literary discussions and advanced speaking functions: Researching the (dis)connection. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37, 183-199.
- Dorwick, T., & Glass, W.R. (2003). Language education policies: One publisher's perspective. *Modern Language Journal*, 87, 592-594.
- Falsgraf, C. (Ed.). (2007). *National educational technology standards for students: Foreign language units for all proficiency levels*. Eugene, OR: International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE).

- Fillmore, L. W. (1985). When does teacher talk work as input? In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 17-50). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Fry, S. W. (2007). First-year teachers and induction support: Ups, downs, and in-betweens. *The Qualitative Report*, 12, 216-237.
- García, P.A. (1998). Allegro sostenuto: Concerns for the FLES administrator. In G. Lipton (Ed.), *A celebration of FLES: Sequential FLES, FLEX, and immersion* (pp. 29-44). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- García, P. A. (2009). What every beginning language teacher needs to know...Or begins to learn. In G.C. Lipton (Ed.). *A practical handbook to elementary foreign language programs*. (5th ed., pp. 423-426). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- García, P.A., Hernández, T.A., & Davis-Wiley, P. (2008, November). *From intermediate to advanced: Opening the mind to extended discourse*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Orlando, FL.
- García, P.A., & Hernández, T.A. (2007). Information gap activities: A standards-based strategy for promoting oral proficiency in a thematic context. *Florida Foreign Language Journal*, 4, 10-17.
- García, P.A., Davis-Wiley, P., Hernández, T.A., & Petri, E. (2003, November). *Student teachers and supervision: Priority concerns for tomorrow and today*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Philadelphia, PA.
- García, P.A. & Long, S. S. (1999). Recruitment and retention. *New Visions in foreign language education*. Iowa State University and Yonkers, NY: ACTFL. Retrieved August 29, 2009, from <http://www.actfl.org/files/public/PaperWrittenByNewVisionsTaskForce.pdf>
- García, P.A., Lorenz, E., & Robison, R. (1995). Immersion programs enter the middle school: Research, strategies, and considerations. In R. Donato and R. Terry (Eds.), *Foreign languages: The journey of a lifetime* (pp. 37-74). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- García, P.A., & Petri, E. (1999, November). *Teachers for tomorrow — and today*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Dallas, TX.
- García, P.A., & Petri, E. (2000, March/April). Reshaping the future of language teaching. *American Language Review*, 26-30.
- Harley B. (1998). French immersion research in Canada: The 1990s in perspective. *Mosaic*, 6, 3-10.
- Hernández, T. A. (In press). The relationship between motivation, interaction, and the development of second language oral proficiency in a study abroad context. *The Modern Language Journal*, 94.
- Hernández, T.A., & García, P.A. (2006). Rediscovering sponge activities: A strategic approach to time on task. *Vida Hispánica*, 34, 10-12.
- Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership* 60, 30-33.

## Preparing Tomorrow's World Language Teacher Today

- Koike, D.A., & Liskin-Gasparro, J.E. (1999). What is a near-native speaker? Perspectives of job seekers and search committees in Spanish. *ADFL Bulletin*, 30, 54-62.
- Lange, D.L., & Sims, W.R. (1990). Minnesota foreign language teachers' perceptions of their pre-professional preparation. *Modern Language Journal*, 74, 297-310.
- Lee, J.F., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen* (2nd ed). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school teachers*. Washington, DC: Education Schools Project. Retrieved April 10, 2009, from [http://www.edschools.org/pdf/Educating Teachers Report.pdf](http://www.edschools.org/pdf/Educating_Teachers_Report.pdf)
- National Association of District Supervisors of Foreign Language. (1999). *Characteristics of effective foreign language instruction*. Retrieved May 15, 2009, from <http://www.nadsfl.org/characteristics.htm>
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (2006). *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Alexandria, VA: Author.
- NCATE. (2008). *Professional standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation Institutions*. Washington D.C.: National Consortium for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- Pearson, L., Fonseca-Greber, B., & Foell, K. (2006). Advanced proficiency for foreign language teacher candidates: What can we do to help them achieve this goal? *Foreign Language Annals*, 39, 507-519.
- Peterson, B. (2004). *Cultural intelligence: A guide to working with people from other cultures*. Boston: Intercultural Press.
- Raimo, A., Delvin-Scherer, R., & Zinicola, D. (2002). Learning about teachers through film. *The Education Forum*, 66, 314-323.
- Raymond, H.C. (2002). Learning to teach foreign languages: A case study of six preservice teachers. *NECTFL Review*, 51, 16-25.
- Richey, R. (2007). The foreign language assistance program (FLAP). *Learning languages*, 18, 19-20.
- Scebold, C. E. & Wallinger, L. (2000). An update on the status of foreign language education in the United States. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84, No. 612, 1-9.
- Schrier, L.L. (2008). The overwhelmed generation and foreign language teacher preparation: Developing strategies to work with the mental health challenges of preservice teachers. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41, 282-309.
- Schulz, R. (2000). Foreign language teacher development: MLJ perspectives 1916-1999. *Modern Language Journal*, 84, 496-522.
- Tedick, C. (2009). K-12 Language teacher preparation: Problems and possibilities. *Modern Language Journal*, 93, 263-267.
- Tedick, C., & Walker, C. (1995). From theory to practice: How do we prepare teachers for second language classrooms? *Foreign Language Annals*, 28, 499-517.
- Thompson, C. (2005, January). *Addressing proficiency development in upper-division courses*. Paper presented at the 2005 Hawaii International Conference on Arts and Humanities, Honolulu, HI.

- van Olphen, M. (2009). Four skills plus viewing. In G. Lipton (Ed.), *A practical handbook to elementary foreign language programs* (5<sup>th</sup> ed). (pp. 459-460). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- VanPatten, B. (1987). Classroom learners' acquisition of *ser* and *estar*: Accounting for developmental patterns. In B. VanPatten, T.R. Dvorak, & J.F. Lee (Eds.), *Foreign language learning: A research perspective* (pp. 61-75). Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Vélez-Rendón, G. (2002). Second language teacher education: A review of the literature. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35, 457-467.
- Wallinger, L. & C. E. Scebold (2000). A future shaped by a united voice. In R. M. Terry (Ed.), *Agents of change in a changing age. Northeast Conference Reports* (pp. 211-236). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Wilbur, M.L. (2007). How foreign language teachers get taught: Methods of teaching the methods course. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40, 79-101.
- Wilburn-Robinson, D. (1998). The cognitive, academic, and attitudinal benefits of early language learning. In M. Met (Ed.), *Critical issues in early language learning: Building for our children's future*. (pp. 37-43). Reading, MA: Scott Foresman Addison Wesley.
- Wilkerson, C. (2008). Instructor's use of English in the modern language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 41, 310-320.
- Witherspoon, T. (2006). Multimedia and millennials: Using images, sounds, and video to empower learning. Retrieved on September 20, 2008 from <http://www.essdack.org/?q=node/983>
- Wong, P.A., Sterling, H.A., & Rowland, P.M. (September, 1999). *Effective induction practices for beginning teachers: A qualitative research evaluation study*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Arizona Educational Research Organization, Flagstaff, Arizona.
- Yopp, R. H., & Young, B.L. (1999). A model for beginning teacher support and assessment. *Action in Teacher Education*, 21, 24-36.
- Zimmer-Loew, H. (2000). Professional development and change. In R. M. Terry (Ed.). *Agents of change in a changing age. Northeast Conference Reports* (pp. 169-209). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

## Appendix A

### The Pilot Project for Teacher Induction

The pilot project referred to forms the basis of a grant proposal being prepared for submission in 2010. It is formulated upon many aspects of teacher induction that are discussed in this paper. We offer here a substantive summary of the activities and framework that is envisioned. Extensive detail has been purposely omitted for grant-related reasons.

The project envisions four differentiated Centers for Language Teacher Education for pre-service candidates in world languages. This will be a collaborative entity between NCATE-recognized teacher education institutions and local K-12 districts

## **Preparing Tomorrow's World Language Teacher Today**

that have an established record of WL study commitment and working relationships with their universities (IHEs). The enterprise will have an individual or regionally-based, specialized focus on the development of accomplished beginning teachers for K-6 FLES, immersion, or middle and high school levels. In addition to regular managerial responsibilities (i.e., financial, clerical, grant-related), the IHEs involved will commit to offering an appropriate number of credit hours of structured methods programming and support activities for the undergraduate or graduate WL education major, including the employment of additional full-time faculty (both tenure-earning as well as adjunct instructors/supervisors as needed to work in triads with the teacher-candidates). The school districts will provide staff, classroom facilities, and time for direct mentoring programs, summer in-service periods, release time and supervision, as well as a commitment to continue the WL project through the pilot period (4-6 years). The cycle of the project's activities involves a planning year as well as formative and summative evaluation periods. Appropriate benchmark-related measurement of progress activities are included, thus providing the WL profession at large with a significant research base that will lead to the transformation of pre-service education activities that are currently employed.

Direct oversight of the project will rest in the hands of a project director at each university site working in cooperation and collaboration with appropriate stakeholders and representatives of national language organizations serving as an advisory body under the general direction of an executive project director.

### **Appendix B**

#### **ACTFL/NCATE Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers**

- Standard 1: Language, Linguistics, Comparisons
- Standard 2: Cultures, Literatures, Cross-Disciplinary Concepts
- Standard 3: Language Acquisition Theories and Instructional Practices
- Standard 4: Integration of Standards into Curriculum and Instruction
- Standard 5: Assessment of Languages and Cultures
- Standard 6: Professionalism ACTFL/NCATE (2002)