

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Plan B and other Reports

Graduate Studies

5-2019

Teaching and Learning in the Spanish as a Foreign Language Classroom

Chemaris Gutiérrez Ethington
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports>



Part of the [Secondary Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Gutiérrez Ethington, Chemaris, "Teaching and Learning in the Spanish as a Foreign Language Classroom" (2019). *All Graduate Plan B and other Reports*. 1383.
<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports/1383>

This Creative Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Plan B and other Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



Teaching and Learning in the Spanish as a Foreign Language Classroom

by

Chemaris Gutiérrez Ethington

A portfolio submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING

Approved:

Dr. Karin deJonge-Kannan
Major Professor

Dr. María Luisa Spicer-Escalante
Committee Member

Dr. Sonia Manuel-Dupont
Committee Member

Dr. Bradford J. Hall
Department Head

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

Logan, Utah

2019

Copyright © Chemaris Gutiérrez Ethington
All rights reserved

ABSTRACT

Teaching and Learning in the Spanish as a Foreign Language Classroom

by

Chemaris Gutiérrez Ethington: Master of Second Language Teaching
Utah State University, 2019

Major Professor: Dr. Karin deJonge-Kannan

Department: Languages, Philosophy, and Communication Studies

This portfolio is a compilation of the author's beliefs about teaching and learning in the Spanish language classroom. It centers around the teaching philosophy statement emphasizing the author's beliefs regarding the role of the teacher, the role of the students, and expectations in the second language classroom.

Three research papers are included to support the teaching philosophy statement. The first paper highlight the importance of teaching communicatively in the foreign language classroom with a co-teacher. The second paper explains dual language immersion and its importance in Utah education. The last paper focuses on the teaching of pragmatics in the foreign language.

Following the research perspectives, three annotated bibliographies highlight key sources the author read to learn about the major topics discussed in this Portfolio.

(110 pages)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members, Drs. Karin deJonge-Kannan, María Luisa Spicer-Escalante, and Sonia Manuel-Dupont. Thank you, Dr. de Jonge-Kannan for countless hours reviewing my work and guiding me from the beginning of the MSLT program to the end. Your support these last years has been invaluable. Thank you for seeing my potential and reminding me of what I can do as an educator and as a student.

To Dr. Spicer-Escalante, thank you for the many opportunities you offered to help me improve my teaching skills at the university and as a cooperating teacher. Thank you for encouraging me to research topics that ended up improving my teaching ability. Thank you for your encouragement to continue my studies in the field of Second Language Acquisition. I will treasure these four years of working with you in class and with clinical students.

To Dr. Manuel-Dupont, thank you for serving on my committee. Your expertise in language acquisition and your feedback on my work are greatly appreciated.

Thank you to the other professors that have motivated me and inspired me to become a better teacher. To Dr. Abdulkafi Albirini, Dr. Joshua Thoms, Dr. Kevin Krogh, Dr. Cinthya Saavedra, and Dr. Mark Waltermire, thank you for your invaluable assistance in completing this program.

To my classmates in the MSLT program, thank you for your friendship and encouraging words. To my fellow adjunct instructors, thank you for your support and mentorship.

Most importantly, I want to thank my family for their support and patience while I pursued this degree. To my mother, Vicky, for your encouraging words and your example

throughout the years. To my brother, José and my sister, Vicmarie, thank you for your support as well. Lastly, and most importantly, to my children Arwen and Jakob. Thank you for your patience and your love towards me. I love you. And thanks to my Heavenly Father for inspiring me to want to learn more in order to better serve my students.

Chemaris Gutiérrez Ethington

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
LIST OF FIGURES.....	x
INTRODUCTION.....	1
TEACHING PERSPECTIVES.....	2
Apprenticeship of Observation.....	3
Professional Environment.....	8
Teaching Philosophy Statement.....	9
Professional Development through Teaching Observations.....	18
Self-Assessment of Teaching Statement.....	22
RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES.....	33
LANGUAGE PAPER.....	34
Purpose & Reflection.....	35
Collaborative Teaching in the Secondary Classroom: The Benefits of Co-teaching in Foreign Language Education	36
LITERACY PAPER.....	44
Purpose & Reflection.....	45
The Spanish Dual Language Immersion in Utah: The Development of the Bridge Program	46
CULTURE PAPER.....	58
Purpose & Reflection.....	59
Teaching the Pragmatics of <i>tú</i> and <i>usted</i> to Beginner Learners of Spanish	60

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHIES.....	71
Communicative Language Teaching	73
The Benefits of Co-teaching in Foreign Language Teaching	82
Dual Language Immersion in Utah	88
LOOKING FORWARD.....	92
REFERENCES.....	93

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AP = Advanced Placement
ACCESS = Automatization in Communicative Contexts of Essential Speech
Segments
ACTFL = American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
ALM = Audiolingual Method
CLT = Communicative Language Teaching
DLI = Dual Language Immersion
ELL = English Language Learner
ESL = English as a Second Language
FL = Foreign Language
FY = Fiscal Year
IELI = Intensive English Language Institute
IDEA = Institute for Data Evaluation and Analysis
L1 = First Language / Native Language
L2 = Second Language
MSLT = Master of Second Language Teaching
OCRGC = Office of Legislative Research and General Counsel
OPI = Oral Proficiency Interview
PTSC = Parent, Teacher, Student Conferences
R = Rule
SB = Senate Bill
SFL = Spanish as a Foreign Language
SLA = Second Language Acquisition
TA = Teaching Assistant
TBA = Task-Based Activities
TBLT = Task-Based Language Teaching
TL = Target Language
TPR = Total Physical Response
USOE = Utah State Office of Education
USU = Utah State University

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Buying a house	23
2. Asking directions	27
3. Los interrogativos	30

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Rubric for the end of the Sports unit.....	13

INTRODUCTION

This portfolio is the culmination of my studies in the MSLT program from Fall 2014 to Spring 2017. At its center is my teaching philosophy statement in which I explain what I see are best practices for a language teacher and what the students should do in order to have a positive language learning experience.

Following the teaching philosophy, I include three research papers that I wrote in my classes. These papers have also defined me as a teacher. First, I examine how co-teaching can benefit students in the foreign language classroom. The paper discusses my personal experience as a teacher and how my students perceived learning Spanish with two teachers. My second paper discusses the dual language program in Utah and how the Bridge Project was implemented. My final paper discusses the pragmatics of teaching formality in the Spanish classroom. I also include potential lesson plans that could help me teach *tú* vs *usted*.

This portfolio concludes with three annotated bibliographies of key topics in this Portfolio, including communicative language teaching, co-teaching and Dual Language Immersion in Utah.

Finally, in the section titled “Looking Forward”, I express my goals for the next five years after I finish the MSLT program.

TEACHING PERSPECTIVES

APPRENTICESHIP OF OBSERVATION

I have been blessed with parents who value education. I remember a story told by my mother that my father once tried to trick me into exchanging a \$20 bill for \$1 bill assuming that I would exchange it as it was paper money. She says that I rejected his offer because his bill was for \$1 and mine had a 2. I was only two years old but I had been learning. I started Kindergarten when I was 4 even though the rule was that I needed to be 5 by the beginning of September. I remember learning to read within the first months of school. My mother had to take a subscription to the newspaper to give me more opportunities to practice reading. Even though I was 5 years old, I enjoyed reading a lot. This love for reading helped me develop a love for speaking and writing, in particular spelling.

When we were growing up, our mother would have us spell words every night for about 30 minutes. It was fun. Not only were we spending time as a family and learning from each other, but we were also learning language and how to use it.

In Puerto Rico, taking English and Spanish classes is obligatory from first to twelfth grade. However, that does not mean that we learn to speak both languages. Spanish is my heritage language and it is the medium of instruction, meaning that students have to use cognitive skills and analyze texts even from the beginning. English, on the other hand, is taught as a foreign language. Students are taught vocabulary and grammar drills. Based on that system I took English for 12 years, doing grammar drills and having minimal speaking opportunities. I did fairly well, I passed the AP English test but I was scared to speak in front of others for fear of making a mistake. Looking

back, I wish I would have spoken English or at least attempted to speak it with my teachers and peers. In Spanish, although we did analytical work, the first month of each year was conjugation drill time. We spent a whole month conjugating verbs in present, preterit, future, past participle, pluscuamperfect, imperfect, etc. I dreaded the beginning of the year because I found conjugating verbs tedious. This teaching style is not the greatest when a student is learning a foreign language. However, in my Spanish class, since all of the students spoke Spanish, it helped us with all of the reading and writing we had to do the rest of the year.

The opposite happened when I took French. I lived in a small town where languages other than Spanish and English were not taught. During my sophomore year, my mother started working as the school counselor at a private school near our home town. It was about 20 minutes away by public transportation. The English teacher at that school finished her endorsement to teach French and she wanted to offer French language instruction. This class was not part of the school curriculum but was approved by the school as an extracurricular activity. My mother asked me if I wanted to take French and I was immediately onboard. I mentioned this opportunity to my two best friends and both of them joined me for the first French class. The experience was totally different than what I had experienced in language learning. The teacher gave us a copy of the French 101 textbook. We met twice a week for one hour each day. The class started with a group of 10 students but at the end of the semester, only three students remained, my friends and I. Part of the class was discussing the homework but the rest of the class was for speaking the language. I was amazed at how much I was able to understand. Looking back, I realized she was using a system similar to the Communicative Language

Teaching approach. She would bring authentic texts to class, speak in French all the time, and help us research on our own. I still remember listening to music in French and watching movies that were filmed in France. Almost 18 years have passed since that first day in the French class but I still remember much. I cannot speak fluently but I can do a decent job in speaking and understanding the language.

Several years later, I attended the University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras Campus. I remember not wanting to take Spanish classes because I did not want to do verb conjugation drills. I had the credits needed due to my AP results and did not need to take Spanish classes at the University. I decided to declare Physics as my major because I was planning to move to the mainland to pursue my studies in Meteorology. I ended up in Utah and loved it. After several classes, I decided that I needed a break in my concentration classes and I needed an easy class. While taking Span 3060 at the University of Utah, my vision of taking Spanish classes changed. I was able to express myself without all of the drilling.

In 2003, I decided to serve a religious mission and was assigned to serve the Hispanic people of California. After having been assigned English speaking companions and seeing their hardships learning Spanish, I decided I wanted to teach Spanish as it came natural for me. Upon my return to Utah, I changed my major to Spanish Teaching. I have since developed a deep love for teaching, especially teaching my language, Spanish. I graduated in 2008 from the University of Utah with a Bachelor of Arts in Spanish Teaching and a minor in Meteorology. Soon after my graduation, I was married and my husband and I moved to Logan. I found a job teaching sixth grade Spanish. I started teaching mostly in Spanish but after some criticism from parents, I backed off a

little bit and I started doing what I disliked in my former years as a student: I started doing grammar drills. It was comfortable, yes, more grading, but comfortable. I knew it was not as effective as speaking and listening in Spanish all the time but I did not want to fight with parents. I also thought I would lose my job if I did not give in to parents' demands. This acquiescence actually contributed to my quitting because I did not like teaching anymore if I had to teach with the Audiolingual method (ALM). I also took a year off to care for my infant son. I had started teaching full of dreams, but I allowed them to be destroyed by the comments of some parents.

During this time of my life, I was debating whether I wanted to go back to teaching or if I should embark on a new journey. I contemplated returning to the university and earning a degree in law. Something inside me kept yearning to teach again. A year later I had the opportunity to teach Spanish at a charter high school in North Logan, Utah. When I accepted the position, I was using it to decide if I should continue teaching or if I should find a different career. Teaching at the charter high school has reignited my love for teaching and motivated me to pursue the Master of Second Language Teaching at Utah State University. I was still struggling to let go of the grammar drill/audiolingual method. What I learned is that my students wanted to take Spanish either because they needed a credit or because they really wanted to communicate in Spanish. Therefore, in the school year 2014-2015 I started using the communicative language teaching approach. While it is different from ALM and it requires a lot of preparation, I have seen success in those students that really want to learn to communicate in Spanish.

As a result, I am more eager to continue the Communicative Language Teaching approach in my classes. It benefits everyone, especially the students, and they are the reason I am a teacher today. I want to help prepare my students for life outside of high school so that they can have more opportunities because they speak two languages.

PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT

As I finish my master's degree, I have taught Spanish in the public education system for eight years. As a native speaker of Spanish and fluent in English, I have plenty of opportunities to make a difference in the area of Second Language Acquisition. My goal is to teach at the university level. Teaching Spanish is very important to me, not because it is my native language but because it is a beautiful language and very useful. As a language learner myself, I can relate to some of the struggles students face. My goal is to teach them in such a way that they can achieve their educational goals. My portfolio focuses on the benefits of the communicative language approach and task-based activities. My teaching philosophy and artifacts will address several aspects of teaching Spanish as a second language at the high school level that can also be applicable at the university level.

TEACHING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

In today's world, speaking a second language could be very beneficial (Merritt, 2013). As an L2 user of English, I have experienced the benefits of speaking a foreign language such as being more perceptive and being better prepared to teach a particular L2-using population. I consider it my responsibility to prepare my students for a world in which they will need some skills to provide for themselves. Learning a language can be beneficial for my students in the sense that they can be more perceptive, and their decision-making skills will improve (Merritt, 2013). Merritt (2013) also states, "students who study a foreign language tend to score better on standardized tests than their monolingual peers" (p. 1). In this teaching philosophy, I would like to introduce the themes that are important to me as an educator: the role of the teacher, the role of the student, and expectations in the L2 classroom. But first, I will start with the framework on which my views are built.

My teaching philosophy is founded on the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) method. Lee and VanPatten (2003) explain the Communicative Language Teaching approach as follows "the instructor [is] no longer simply the drill leader but [is] also charged with providing students with the opportunities for communication, that is, using the language to interpret" (p.10). Using the CLT Approach, I have seen a dramatic change in my students' learning and their interaction while producing language as described in my Apprenticeship of Observation. Savignon (2007) also states that "throughout the history of the world, the goal of most naturally occurring or out-of-school language learning has always been the development of useful communication skills to meet needs of immediate or long-term social interactions" (p. 208). From that

perspective, I will now explain my role as a teacher, with specific focus on my experiences of what has worked for me and what has not.

The role of the teacher

As a student, I saw many teaching practices that I disliked. One of those practices was that the teacher gave a lecture and the students were to listen and take notes. This method of teaching is referred to as the Atlas complex by Lee and VanPatten (2003, p. 6). Students dreaded going to class because it was not fun to sit, listen to the teacher, read the book, and answer questions regarding the text day after day. I believe that, instead, the role of the teacher is to guide the students and keep them engaged. When students are engaged, they are more willing to participate and apply the material that has been taught. As a teacher, I want “to teach in such a way that students will be equipped with the necessary ... skills that will enable them to perform in real life....” (Spicer-Escalante, DeJonge-Kannan, 2014, p. 2437). The goal of my school is to teach students to perform after they leave high school; therefore, helping my students learn to communicate with others is essential.

My philosophy has always been that the student needs to be able to speak the language. Although this can be accomplished by the Audiolingual method, it does not mean communication will be accomplished (Ballman, Linskin-Gasparro & Mandell, 2001; Lee & VanPatten, 2003). Ballman, Linskin-Gasparro and Mandell (2001) explain why classroom communication is important. “Learning to communicate is recognized as a principal goal of language learning and, at the same time, by communicating, students learn the language” (p. 8). Gurunathan and Geethanjali (2016) state that “any method that fosters acquisition of a language is a welcome method” (p. 111). As I provide my

students with more opportunities to communicate, I hope to inspire them to continue learning Spanish.

During my first year as a Spanish teacher, I thought I was teaching communicatively. I used the book as a reference and I asked my students to practice speaking the language. I was really enjoying teaching Spanish and seeing the progress my students were making. Looking back, I realize that even though I was asking my students to practice speaking in Spanish, the conversations were not meaningful. Students' utterances would be isolated sentences. In reality, I was not teaching communicatively. According to Spicer-Escalante and DeJonge-Kannan (2014), "the hallmark of CLT and the main characteristic of TBA [is]: to prepare students to perform real-life tasks in scenarios that they are likely to encounter in their personal and professional lives, away from fill-in-the-blank exams, memorization of grammatical rules, and multiple choice tests" (p. 2483). The benefit that I see from this approach is that my students will be able to express themselves in Spanish outside of the classroom.

The teacher has the responsibility to model the different activities and the student has the responsibility to participate and apply the language. Students will need to use the vocabulary and grammar many times in different contexts and in meaningful ways, so they can retain and use the words and structures. Once they try using their limited vocabulary to create a conversation, and after many attempts communicating, they do a good job to the point that they do not ask again to use their notes in their conversation.

In my personal experience, I started with a version of teaching communicatively, then the Atlas Complex, then the Audiolingual Method and finally CLT. CLT gives the opportunity to both instructor and learners to prepare and participate in lessons that are

meaningful. Those lessons follow a pattern of using task-based activities and culminating with the communicative goal. The communicative goal should be something that the students can apply in their real life (Ballman, Linskin-Gasparro & Mandell, 2001). For example, a lesson to learn numbers could culminate in students exchanging phone numbers, which can be applied in various settings in life.

CLT can be used with NCSSFL-ACTFL Can-Do Statements (2014). The Can-Do Statements are part of the Common Core Standards for Foreign Language learning adopted by the Utah State Office of Education in 2014. As a teacher, I can set goals for my students based on their levels. I can assess them on speaking, listening, writing, and reading. Shrum and Glisan (2010) talk about spontaneity in communication. When I started teaching, I gave my students a spoken test. Because I intimidated some students (in the sense that they are afraid to make a mistake in front of the teacher), I asked my students to prepare a conversation based on the topics I would give them. They did great when speaking with another student. An important fact is that although students can rehearse their topic, they should not memorize it.

During the last three school years (2014-2017), I asked the students to do a spoken test. The difference is that I give them several topics for them to rehearse but they did not know who would be their partner. According to Messick (1996) “in the case of language testing, the assessment should include authentic and direct samples of the communicative behaviours of listening, speaking, reading, and writing of the language being learned.” (p. 1). This is the reason I do spoken tests, that is, students need to be evaluated the same way they are taught. Since I am including more communication tasks, it is fair for me to evaluate my students in the speaking and listening skills.

At this moment, I am using the Can-Do Statements from ACTFL/USOE.

However, my goal is to develop my own Can-Do Statements for every unit and add them to the skills that the students have developed. For example:

Figure 1: Rubric for the end of the Sports unit

<p style="text-align: center;">Novice low</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> I can tell which sports I like/dislike. <input type="checkbox"/> I can give dates, times, and weather information <p style="text-align: center;">Novice mid</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> I can talk about the price to the events. <input type="checkbox"/> I can invite my friends to go to a game. <p style="text-align: center;">Novice High</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> I can ask/describe a particular sport (equipment needed, simple rules). <input type="checkbox"/> I can ask directions to a place (Particularly where a game will be held). <input type="checkbox"/> I can accept or reject an invitation. <p style="text-align: right;">Adapted from ACTFL Can-Do Statements</p>

The example shown above offers a way in which the students can assess themselves. Not only will it give my students the opportunity to see how much they have mastered in the language, but it will also give me a way to know where my students struggle. Thus, I can modify my lessons and help my students learn and succeed.

The role of the teacher is to provide all of the elements needed in order that the student will be successful in the class. This also includes communicating with parents and

explaining the CLT method. Most parents are not familiar with this method and worry that their student (K-12) will fall behind or not learn what they consider to be important in language learning. As a teacher I know the importance of reading and writing but those skills can come as the students improve their speaking and listening skills. In *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen*, Lee and VanPatten quote Brown (1977), who encourage parents to “believe that your child can understand more than he or she can say, and seek, above all, to communicate.... If you concentrate on communicating, everything else will follow” (p.26). Although Brown (1977) wrote about L1 development in young children, this can apply to any children and adult learners. This quote is meaningful to me because I can explain the CLT method to parents and ease their worries. When I concentrate on providing comprehensible input, students will be able to communicate in the L2 as they continue practicing speaking with communication as the final goal.

Gurunathan and Geethanjali (2016) explain more of what a good teacher is. They state that a good teacher “should be a motivator, facilitator and monitor but not a dictator or fault finder” (p. 115). As an L2 teacher, I work hard to prepare lessons that are meaningful to my students. This is done by preparing before class, taking in consideration my students’ needs, and foreseeing possible questions. Savignon (2007) adds to the role of the teacher the role of motivator. She states, “by encouraging the students to ask for information, to seek clarification, to use circumlocution and whatever other linguistic and non-linguistic resources, they could muster to negotiate meaning, to stick to the communicative task at hand” (p. 209).

Role of the student

It is important to recognize that the student is a human being with the potential of learning any language and even multiple languages. As a teacher, I have encountered different learning styles and learning skills. It is the responsibility of the student to prepare as much as they can and participate in class. Students can prepare for class by practicing speaking outside of the classroom. Although it is hard for students in Logan, UT, to practice Spanish in a Spanish environment outside of school, they can still practice by going to places with Spanish speakers, watching TV in Spanish, or listening to music in the target language. Other ways that the students can prepare before class consist of use of technology, in the form of websites and/or apps such as Duolingo, Spanishdict, and resources given by the teacher. These resources can be vocabulary sheets, grammar explanations in written or spoken form. I personally like Edmodo (similar to Facebook but for schools) where students can communicate with each other in class and at home while being moderated by the teacher, Duolingo for Schools (it allows me to have access to what the student has been doing), and Linguafolio (students have the availability to assess themselves and provide evidence of their knowledge). As it is the teacher's responsibility to create engaging student-centered activities, it is the responsibility of the student to participate. One of the reasons that someone takes a language class is because communication is the goal (Ballman et al., 2001). It is the responsibility of the student to negotiate for meaning.

It is understandable that there will be frustration while learning a language taught 100% in the target language. Students may need to ask for repetition or express that they do not understand (ask for clarification) (Lee & VanPatten, 2003). Lee and VanPatten

also mention that children are not talked to the same as adults and that language learners similarly need modification of the input. One important element that students need to understand is that in a way, they are like young children learning to speak. They have the advantage that they can process information in a faster way but nonetheless, students need to understand that nothing in language acquisition comes quickly, there is no such thing as an instantaneous acquisition (Lee & VanPatten, 2003).

Krashen (1992) proposed the input hypothesis as part of second language acquisition (SLA). He mentions five hypotheses that are part of the input hypothesis; however, I want to expand on the affective filter hypothesis. Krashen (1997) states that “comprehensible input is necessary for acquisition, but it is not sufficient. The acquirer needs to be open to the input” (p. 3). He defines the affective filter as “a mental block that prevents acquirers from fully utilizing comprehensible input they receive for language acquisition” (p. 3). Although the role of the teacher is to provide comprehensible input to students and an environment that is conducive for students to speak and express themselves in the language classroom, it is up to the student to not fear making mistakes, which will allow the affective filter to be low. Once the students’ affective filter is low, “acquisition is inevitable” (Krashen, 1997, p. 4).

Expectations of an L2 class

Ellis (2012) reviews longitudinal studies on certain aspects of learner talk in the L2 classroom. Two of these aspects are the silent period and private speech. According to the studies cited in his book, some students are generally silent the first month or even two or three months while learning a language. The question is why some students remain silent while others do not (Ellis, 2012). In my personal experience, some students

are shy, others are afraid of making a mistake and do not want to speak until they are completely sure it will be correct. I was one of those students. I did not realize that the teacher would help me become better at speaking. Now that I am a teacher, most of my students want to practice speaking. I am giving time to those students that need the time to process the new knowledge. Although some students are shy and may not be ready to start speaking in the L2, when I promote an environment of trust, students begin to practice the language. I try to build a low-stress environment by providing multiple ways of feedback, using pictures, gestures/non-verbal responses, even using the L1 when needed. I still expect my students to try speaking the language for that is the way they will really learn it. I encourage them to participate in class, to negotiate meaning with me and with their fellow students. I urge them to try to practice speaking Spanish outside of the classroom either by themselves, with friends and family members, and when they feel ready, while ordering food.

As a teacher, I expect to give the best of me. As a native Spanish speaker, I must give as many opportunities for communication in my classroom. I need to motivate (not obligate) my students to communicate in Spanish and to do their best.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH TEACHING OBSERVATION

Throughout my teaching career, I have had the privilege and opportunity to observe many language classes in different settings from first grade to college classes. All the teachers I observed displayed a passion for the language they teach. In this section of my portfolio, I will share my observations on these classes, and how these experiences have influenced the way I teach. I include my reflections on observations of one English class in the Intensive English Language Institute (IELI), two Spanish 1010 classes, two French 1010, and four student-teachers teaching Spanish 1 (elementary Spanish). Although I observed other language classes, I have chosen to write about the classes I observed several times in my years in the MSLT program.

My Teaching Philosophy Statement is based on the role of the teacher, the role of the student, and expectations for an L2 classroom. Teachers have to provide students opportunities to practice the L2 in meaningful lessons. The role of the student is to practice the target language. In order to acquire the language more efficiently, the affective filter must be lowered.

The first class I observed was in ESL. The class was composed of international female students whose L1 was not English; their L1 varied from Chinese to Arabic and Spanish. The instructor prepared a lesson on what the students wanted to study in college with a communicative goal of students applying and interviewing for college. The class began with a warm-up activity from the previous lesson on what they were planning to do for fall break. As I observed teacher-student interaction, I noticed how eager the students were to participate and share their plans. As the instructor explained to me later, these students were very shy at the beginning of the semester, but they had gained confidence

in the short period of one month. The lesson included videos of people's college experiences including several universities. Students were also provided with the vocabulary needed for the communicative goal. The lesson concluded with an "interview" at a convention where students needed to ask questions about the college programs offered.

After observing the English lesson, I thought it would be a good idea to teach a similar class to my high school students on how to apply for a job. I used similar elements that I learned from my observation and I helped my students while they were researching the jobs they wanted to apply to during the summer. We then had an "interview" in which they expressed themselves, just like a job interview.

The second class I observed was a French 1010 class. When I talked with the French instructor about the class, I was told the class would be about being investigators. The goal was to create a lesson reviewing a grammar concept, such as the preterit, without going through the mechanics of a grammar based lesson. I was definitely intrigued as using the preterit in French can be as difficult as in Spanish. The lesson began by talking about the preterit through a story. The story had pictures and different examples on how to use the preterit depending on the situations. After that introduction, the students worked on an "interview" task where they would become the investigators and they had to gather the alibis of the suspects. I was impressed with how the students were engaged and talked most of the time in French. I decided to also participate in the lesson to experience what the students were experiencing as I have a basic level of French. It was amazing how they would explain to me the meanings of the words I could not understand by using descriptions in French, finding common ground. This lesson was

fifty minutes long, however, forty minutes was student-centered; the instructor only acted as the guide.

After I observed this class, I could not teach a similar lesson that year because I have already taught about the preterit. However, a year later, I did incorporate the lesson in my curriculum. My communicative goal was to be able to defend themselves in any given situation. My class was very engaged with this lesson and they were able to understand the grammar concepts through application.

The last two classes I observed were in elementary Spanish. As a Spanish teacher, I like to observe other Spanish instructors and see what strategies they are using and how students respond to the language teaching. These two classes were taught by two different instructors. One of the lessons was heavy on the grammar explanation with explanation in English. This class allowed me to reflect on my own teaching, and I realized that sometimes I spend most of the time doing grammar because it is what the book requires. However, when I observed the other lesson, the instructor spent 10 minutes in grammar review through an activity the students seemed to know well. After the review, the students practiced the vocabulary about transportation through different activities. As a final activity, students were to find different places at a “train station” by asking for information. In this lesson, I was able to see the role of the teacher as a facilitator, who provided activities that were more student-centered. I was able to learn different ways to engage my students without relying on extensive grammar explanations. Observing these classes in Spanish has helped me be more conscientious about my teaching, which in turn has helped me to help future teachers of Spanish.

The final observation was of myself as a cooperating teacher. I have had the opportunity to be a cooperating teacher to four pre-service teachers. I observed these pre-service teachers, and in so doing, I have seen myself. Student teachers, or pre-service teachers, bring new ideas to the classroom but in a way, they also adopt the teaching style of their cooperating teacher.

While observing these pre-service teachers, I have been able to see different ways to introduce vocabulary that I never thought possible. I also saw characteristics they learned from me. While observing these characteristics, I realized I could do much more in terms of teaching communicatively. By observing each pre-service teacher for the last two years, I have changed some of my teaching style, which has made me a better teacher.

As a professional in education, I have been able to see some of my flaws. However, it has also motivated me to keep improving my skills as an educator. Observing other teachers has given me the opportunity to incorporate other techniques that will help my students learn in diverse ways. I have seen confirmation that teaching communicatively can be done with preparation and desire.

SELF-ASSESSMENT OF TEACHING STATEMENT

As an educator, I have seen the importance of self-reflection as it allows me to adjust my lessons based on such reflections. However, I have never liked recording my teaching because I always expect perfection from myself. As I watched myself teaching at the beginning of my teaching career, I realized I needed to make some changes but there was no guide. When I started the MSLT program, I was not looking forward to recording myself and doing a self-assessment but I liked the idea of having someone else observe my classes and giving me feedback. Spicer-Escalante and DeJonge-Kannan (2016) explain that “a sincere commitment to personal professional growth and development is key” (p. 636). My attitude changed because of that. Spicer-Escalante and DeJonge-Kannan (2016) further state that “only instructors who are willing to enhance their teaching through continual self-reflection on their areas for improvement will be successful in this endeavor” (p. 637). Doing this self-assessment has helped me not only see myself as others see me but also what I can improve. I will discuss here several lessons and the changes I made based on my personal observations and the observations from my peers, student teachers, and clinical students.

Lesson plan on how to buy a house

First, I will discuss a lesson I designed to help my L2 students learn the vocabulary needed to buy a house while speaking Spanish. The goal for this lesson plan was for students to be able to talk to a realtor to buy or rent a house by describing their ideal house. I did this lesson plan twice for the last two years and each time I changed something, thus helping me grow as a teacher. The original lesson plan was thus:

Table 1. Buying a house

Activity	Teacher centered	Student participation
1. Warm-up	1. Teach vocabulary by using visual aids. (10 minutes). 2. Review verbs <i>querer</i> and <i>vivir</i> with whole class participation. Also review adjective placement.	Students will practice asking each other: <i>¿Dónde está tu casa?</i> <i>¿Cómo es tu casa?</i> <i>¿Te gusta tu casa?</i> (6 minutes)
2. La casa ideal	Model the activity: <i>¿Qué quieres en tu casa ideal?</i>	1. Students are divided into groups of three. 2. They will ask the question <i>¿Qué quiere en su casa ideal?</i> 3. Before the end of this activity, students will be given a picture of a house to describe in the next activity. They will be given 2 minutes to brainstorm/write down what they want in their ideal house. (7-8 minutes)
3. Role play	Moderator	1. The groups in activity 2 will be rearranged to create groups of two. One person will be the realtor and the other will be the buyer/renter. 2. They will greet each other. 3. The realtor will ask the buyer what he/she would like in a house. The buyer has to give at least five specific descriptions of each room in their perfect house. Examples could be: <i>Quiero una cocina grande con una estufa negra, un microondas y una nevera.</i>

		<p>4. Some questions/answers to facilitate the conversation:</p> <p><i>¿Qué quiere en su casa ideal?</i></p> <p><i>¿Cuántos cuartos quiere?</i></p> <p><i>¿Quiere un patio grande o pequeño?</i></p> <p><i>Quiero cinco cuartos con/sin alfombra.</i></p> <p>(8-10 minutes)</p>
4. Follow-up	Give students a house blueprint as a quiz.	<p>Students need to identify five things in the blueprint and write a sentence in Spanish for each item. They can use prepositions, descriptions, anything that we have studied so far.</p> <p>(7-8 minutes)</p>

When I first taught this lesson, I gave my students a paper with a house, mainly, the inside of the house. We talked about the different rooms and what is in each room. For the beginning of the class I kept the vocabulary simple, that is, I talked about the different rooms in the house but I did not explain every single item that could be in each of them. Then I described my house. Students were supposed to know simple descriptions from a previous unit; describing their house helped them recall that information. I put my students in groups of three and they described their current houses to each other. We also reviewed the verb *gustar* to explain what they liked about their houses and what they did not like.

I then introduced the verbs *querer* and *vivir*. For those verbs I only used four conjugations, *yo, tú, él*, and *nosotros*. Those were the verbs I thought they would use during the activities, especially because they were working in groups of three. This

information helped them to describe their ideal house at the end of the lesson. The students then were given a blueprint of a house to describe to another student. Something that I changed for my second time and each time after was to bring pictures of a house, not just a blueprint. My TA noticed that I needed something like that and he immediately found a picture of his house and described it to the students in Spanish in order to give them an example of the next task. When I created this lesson, it did not occur to me that some students would need extra help. They were either renting an apartment or still living at home. They had no idea what to look for in a blueprint, which surprised me.

The timing of my lesson plan did not work out as planned. I needed two class periods to complete it but the result was worth it. The students were able to narrate to each other what they wanted in their ideal house. They asked us (TA and me) questions on vocabulary that was not included in the book but they wanted to know. For example, they asked for *huerto*, *piscina*, *platos*, *marquesina*. This information helped them talk more specifically about what they wanted in their dream houses. This also allowed them to recall information previously learned such as prepositions, adjectives, verbs. They were also able to tell the other student how much they wanted to spend. I think the mark of success was that my students were able to describe their houses to their peers and they were prepared for the test, as there was a section asking them to describe their dream house and they were able to accomplish this task.

The second time I taught this lesson, I divided it over two class periods. I added more tasks to help them practice describing a house. I added more pictures to accompany the vocabulary. This allowed them to practice speaking Spanish and describing different houses. They also had to draw a blueprint and describe it to another student.

The following year I added an activity of having them look for their dream house and describing everything in it, from how many bedrooms the house has to what key furnishings they want in each room. With this activity, they were be able to describe what they really wanted and clarify their wants and needs.

As I worked on this lesson plan, my student teacher took my ideas and added more elements and more tasks for the students that I incorporated in my future lessons. For example, he asked students to describe items in the house using prepositions of place that they had learned previously. It may seem redundant to some, but I liked the idea of having my students practice what they had learned in previous units. Using what they have learned repeatedly helped them remember the material.

Lesson plan on how to ask directions in the city

For my second lesson, the goal was to help students describe where places are and what to do there. I did this lesson plan four times and each time I changed something. As I reflected on my teaching and my students' level, I was able to adjust the lesson. This in turn helped my students succeed. The original lesson was:

Table 2: Asking directions

Activity	Teacher centered	Student participation
1. Warm-up	<p>1. Students will be given a picture that matches the picture in the power point presentation. We will discuss the new vocabulary and they will write it down.</p> <p>2. Introduce the verb <i>estar</i> with the picture already given. (using <i>yo, tú, él</i>)</p> <p>3. Introduce some of the prepositions of location/position.</p>	<p>1. Listening comprehension (true or false)</p> <p>2. TPR: I will ask the students to get a pen or pencil and will do a TPR activity in which the goal is for them to remember the prepositions with action. (to the right, to the left, in front, behind, etc).</p>
2. ¿Dónde está...?	I will introduce more prepositions of location with new examples	<p>Small group activities: After modeling the activity from the previous section, students will divide into groups of two and ask <i>¿dónde está...?</i> The answer should include the verb <i>estar</i>, a preposition and another noun. For example: <i>¿Dónde está el hotel? El hotel está a la derecha del restaurante, enfrente de la iglesia.</i></p>
3. ¿Dónde está...? (part 2)		<p>Small activities: Students will be given another picture with different places. They will divide into pairs and ask the same questions <i>¿Dónde está...?</i> The answers will depend on the new picture.</p>
4. Role play	<p>I will introduce the verb <i>ir</i> and some of its uses.</p> <p>I will emphasize the use of “a” after the conjugated <i>ir</i>.</p>	Students will describe an excursion in the city. They will be able to use the verb <i>ir</i> , indicate where places are and what they are going to do while there.

5. Follow-up		As homework, students will write about their dream vacation.
---------------------	--	--

The first time I presented this was as a mini-lesson in Dr. Spicer-Escalante's class. The mini-lesson was allotted 20 minutes and I did half of the lesson plan. I taught my MSLT peers as if I were teaching my Spanish students in Spanish 1010. This mini-lesson was practice time for me. I introduced a map that had different buildings such as churches, gym, stores, park, etc. I then introduced the verb *estar* and how to use it to indicate location. My MSLT classmates seemed to understand and they followed the instructions on how to tell where places were. I received some recommendation from my peers and my professor. Some of the recommendations received were to: 1) end activities a little early to discourage side conversation; 2) make the words in my PowerPoint easier to see; 3) not correct students so much as long as it was a meaningful production; 4) remind students that they were supposed to write the vocabulary. With that information on hand, I went to teach my Spanish 1010 class the following day and I added more examples, especially in teaching the prepositions of place by using a pencil or something and have the students to act it out. I took this idea from another MSLT student when she presented her lesson. I wrote the allotted amount of time for each activity in my lesson plan. The first thing I did was to clearly state they needed to write the vocabulary words on their paper. They should have known them already as they are supposed to prepare their homework before class. With that in mind, the introduction of the vocabulary went smoothly. I corrected my students only when the mistakes seemed to be repeated several times and the mistake did change the meaning. I also tried to do the

introduction of the prepositions of place using TPR; that is, asking my students to act out the prepositions by showing with a pencil what they meant. For example, if I said *enfrente de* they were supposed to point in front of themselves.

I believe that the second time teaching the lesson went well. I did stop some of the activities early to discourage my students from using their L1 (English). I circulated the classroom to listen to my students' conversations and answered questions when asked. My own recommendation from the previous day was to remove some of the redundancy. Originally, I divided the prepositions of place into two different slides and four tasks; when teaching the lesson a second time, I condensed them into three tasks. That allowed me time for a fourth activity in which they could apply the knowledge acquired. The new task allowed them to practice their knowledge from the previous three chapters such as school items, clothing, and house. Upon further reflection, I noticed that there was still some redundancy in repeating some of the preposition but only from those students who have taken Spanish with me for two years, that is, my high school students. This year, I removed some of the repetition allowing my students to practice speaking more.

For a future class I would like to add the cultural factor. I want to ask students to research a Spanish country of their choice, places to visit and things to do. They need to pretend they are in the country and talk with a guide about places they want to go and things they want to do. With their research they should be able to tell a tourist where places are located.

Lesson plan using interrogatives

My third and final reflection is about a lesson I taught recently. At my school, I am required to teach certain topics even when those topics are grammar based. Part of my assignment teaching Spanish 1010 is to teach the interrogatives *qué, por qué, cómo, cuándo, cuál*, etc. Since I am teaching two Spanish 1010 classes and my Spanish 1 students were asking about interrogative words as well, I taught the lesson four times with mixed reviews. My lesson was:

Table 3: *Los interrogativos*

Activity	Teacher centered	Student participation
1. Warm up	I will give different examples where students will see the uses of interrogatives in Spanish. For example: <i>¿Qué te gusta comer? ¿Cómo eres?</i>	Students will practice asking personal questions with a partner. (~5 minutes)
2. ¿Qué? vs ¿Cuál?	Explain when to use <i>¿qué?</i> and <i>¿cuál?</i> through examples.	Students will practice with each other asking questions using <i>¿qué?</i> and <i>¿cuál?</i>
3. Ask for direction		Students will ask each other for directions to a restaurant. This will help them practice the following interrogatives: <i>¿cómo? ¿dónde?</i> They will also review directions vocabulary previously learned.
4. Order food		After asking directions for a restaurant, students need to practice ordering food. This will help them practice the following interrogatives: <i>¿cuánto? ¿cómo? ¿cuál?, ¿qué?</i> They will also review food

		vocabulary previously learned.
--	--	--------------------------------

First, I taught it to my high school concurrent enrollment Spanish 1010. I used the vocabulary and explained the questions using examples. I then asked my students to ask each other questions to find out basic information, such as: where do you live? How is your house (describe)? What do you like? What do you study? Etc. We did several activities that gave them practice with interrogative words in Spanish. Based on what they produced, I noticed that some students understood the concepts. However, other students seemed lost.

My second attempt was the following day with my Spanish 1010 class at the university. I did a similar lesson and this time I had a clinical student observe my class. As I saw myself teaching, I noticed again some students were clear about what was being taught but some were lost. The difference with this class is that students have 50 minutes of class versus 88 minutes for my concurrent enrollment class, therefore, they have to spend more time outside of class to prepare or ask more questions.

The third time teaching this lesson was to my Spanish 1 students in high school. I decided to teach this lesson because students kept asking me how to use those questions. They kept asking if *qué* is what, why did I say *¿Cuál es tu nombre?* and not *¿Qué es tu nombre?* The same clinical student that observed my university class observed my Spanish 1 class and gave me feedback for my two classes. Her feedback was great as it confirmed my own comments. She commented how my Spanish 1010 class was organized, able to transition from task to task effortlessly. Her comments from one of the Spanish 1 classes were that although the class was taught continually in Spanish, I had to

remind the students to be on task, this in turn made it harder to get through the material. Based on that experience I changed some activities in order to keep the other class on task and in my opinion, the lesson was better received. According to my observers, it was a better lesson than the first class mainly because of how I taught it and how prepared the students were. Of course, when I changed the lesson between classes I had not seen myself but I was able to change and redirect my teaching.

Conclusion:

Being observed and observing myself can offer a good learning opportunity to help me to improve my own teaching, based on what I thought worked or did not work and on the recommendations I received after each lesson from my peers and other observers.

RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES

LANGUAGE PAPER

Collaborative Teaching in the Secondary Classroom:

The Benefits of Co-teaching in Foreign Language Education

PURPOSE AND REFLECTION

This paper was originally written as part of an independent study class with Dr. Spicer-Escalante. The purpose of this paper was to analyze the effectiveness of co-teaching at the college level with undergraduate students. As I read the student evaluations I received at the university, I noticed that co-teaching was not widely accepted by that class. Based on their feedback, I wondered if co-teaching could be done better. Therefore, I decided to investigate the topic of co-teaching in search of best practices in education. After conducting this literature review, I was able to apply what I had learned about co-teaching when student-teachers were appointed in my foreign language classroom and as a current co-teacher in the Bridge program.

I decided to test several models of co-teaching and ask feedback from student-teachers. I learned that they perceived co-teaching as an effective way to teach a foreign language and that the teachers' dynamic helped students feel more comfortable in the classroom.

As I continued practicing co-teaching, I continued to grow professionally, which has enable me to help future educators become more effective language teachers.

Collaborative Teaching in the Secondary Classroom:
The Benefits of Co-teaching in Foreign Language Education

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to explore how cooperating teaching affects second language acquisition (SLA). It is my hypothesis that students in high school would benefit from having two teachers in the foreign language classroom, as both teachers would bring their knowledge and experiences of the language and the culture. This literature review shows the different co-teaching methods, their effectiveness, and how teachers can implement them in a secondary classroom.

Key words: *co-teaching, L1, L2.*

Introduction

In this literature review, I wanted to explore how co-teaching can affect the teaching of a foreign language (either positively or negatively), in this case Spanish. This curiosity arose from my appointments by Utah State University in the years 2014-2016 as a cooperating teacher for future teachers and from having co-taught a university-level Spanish class with a professor in Spring 2015 and in preparation for a future assignment as a co-teacher in the Bridge program. While co-teaching at the university, I received mixed feedback from students. This feedback was supplied via the questionnaire provided by the university, the IDEA survey. A comment from one student was “have only one professor teach this course, not 2”. Another student said: “Loved this class!!” Other students commented that one teacher was more passive than the other, indicating that the other teacher took time away from the teacher that was teaching at that particular

moment. On a positive note, they liked the complementary information given. That is, the instructors looked for more material in order to explain a complicated concept given in the textbook.

Based on this experience and continued requests from Utah State University to serve as a cooperating teacher at my high school, I wondered how students in high school view co-teaching. Even though Utah State University is requiring all of its student-teachers to complete their student teaching semester using the co-teaching model, most of the research performed on co-teaching has been done in the special education environment. It is important to note that although pre-service teachers are required to do co-teaching with a seasoned instructor, once they receive their first job, they are on their own without the support they can receive from a cooperating teacher. For this paper, I decided to do a literature review that would help me become a good cooperating teacher for those students or teachers that are assigned to me now and in the future. This paper was centered on best practices in education. It is my belief that most students would prefer being taught in a classroom where two teachers share the same responsibility for teaching. The rationale behind this belief is that by having two teachers available during class time and after class (during office hours), students will feel they can reach either teacher and have their questions answered.

Literature review

What is co-teaching?

Several definitions have been proposed of co-teaching (Beninhof, 2012; Wilson & Blednick, 2011; Jennings, 2012). Beninhof (2012) defined co-teaching or

collaborative teaching as “a coordinated instructional practice in which two or more educators simultaneously work with a heterogeneous group of students in a general education classroom” (p. 7). Jennings (2012), defines co-teaching as “the partnership between two or more certified professionals for the co-managing, co-planning, co-instructing, and co-assessing of a group of students with diverse needs in the same general education classroom” (p. 3). Most of the co-teaching studies performed have been in the area of special education as students are integrated in the general education classroom (Beninghof, 2012, Dieker, 2003, Jennings, 2012, Wilson, 2011). Several different models of co-teaching have been discussed in the research literature. According to Beninghof (2012), these models are:

1. Duet – two teachers share class responsibility
2. Lead and support – One teacher plans in advance, the second teacher has a support role in the classroom.
3. Speak and Add – Main teacher (general education) teaches, the second teacher (most of the time the special education teacher) adds as needed, with comments, visuals, audio, etc.
4. Skill group – Students are divided into smaller groups with similar skills and receive instruction according to their level.
5. Station – Main teacher leads the class, second teacher teaches a small group of students according to their needs.
6. Learning style – Teachers divide their assignments in class according of learning style (visual, kinesthetic, spatial, etc).

7. Parallel – Class is divided into two groups with one of the teachers at the center.
8. Complementary skills – Main teacher will teach according to the curriculum while the second teacher can complement with input, visual, etc.
9. Adapting – Main teacher teaches the lesson while the second teacher listens for input and adapts the teaching as needed.

All of these are examples of co-teaching as defined (Beninhof, 2012, pp. 52-53).

As a Spanish teacher in High School and teaching Spanish classes at the university level as well, I was invited to participate in a co-teaching experience as the cooperating teacher to four student teachers. Utah State University (USU) has a co-teaching program for its students that wish to become service teachers following completion of their education program. In the co-teaching model from USU, both teachers need to work on the planning, implementation, and assessment of what has been taught. The student-teacher will gradually increase his/her responsibilities but never be the sole instructor in the room (USU – School of Teacher Education and Leadership).

Working with four student-teachers from August 2014 to December 2016, was a rewarding experience, not only for the student teacher, but also for me as the teacher of record. Murawski and Bernhardt (2016) state “Co-teaching requires more than just learning to ‘play nicely’ together” (p. 31). Sometimes, the more experienced teacher has a hard time allowing the student-teacher to ‘take over’ the class for 20 minutes for several reasons. Among the reasons for this reluctance, we can include the need to fix what was taught, breaking the dynamic already established with the class, etc. Thus, co-teaching

requires not only playing nicely together but also recognizing each teacher's strengths. Murawski and Bernhardt (2016) state "Co-teaching shouldn't be seen as a "special education thing", but rather as a best practices in education thing" (p. 31). With this in mind, I will share my experience in co-teaching with four student-teachers at the high school level.

Co-Teaching at the secondary level with a colleague

As a Spanish as a Foreign Language (SFL) teacher at the high school level, I have the opportunity to learn and grow from other teachers even if their content areas are different than mine. I have always valued the input received from more experienced teachers; after all, I have been teaching at the time for only ten years. I was very happy when asked to become a cooperating teacher to a student-teacher mainly because I have the opportunity to share good teaching skills and techniques. It also forced me to search for current best practices from which my students will also benefit. The question was: how do I incorporate co-teaching at the secondary level? Would it really work for high school students as it works for elementary students? The answer is yes. This could be done as we become successful collaborators in the L2 classroom as we prepare lessons, teach, and assess students. The first thing that I made known to my students is that there would be two teachers responsible in the class, who are highly qualified to teach the subject. Second, I gave access of any assessment to my student-teacher in the form of grading papers both physical and electronic. When grading, we divided the task. Third, students were made aware that both teachers are teaching the class because they want to, because "we share a common interest in the subject matter and because we differ in our approach to that subject matter" (Finkel, 2000, p. 136). Olson and Williams (2015) state

“we found that having two teachers in the classroom allowed for more flexibility in our activities, more energy in our discussions, and more meaningful ways of introducing students to [topics] (p. 1).

Co-teaching has its advantages and disadvantages in foreign language instruction. It all depends on the dynamic of the class. Some classes will embrace a student-teacher immediately while others will be hesitant. In my experience, it was an advantage to have two student-teachers in a school year mainly because the students were used to having two teachers teaching from the beginning of the school year to the end. Adding a second teacher half-way through the school year, might have changed the dynamic already established. However, it is not impossible to make it a pleasant experience for all involved. Luo (2014) mentions four challenges when working together as co-teachers. They are: 1) “conceptual barriers – differences in teachers’ perceptions of their roles”, 2) “pragmatic barriers – challenges in finding time and resources to work collaboratively”, 3) “attitudinal barriers – teachers’ fear of trying something new”, and 4) “professional barriers – difficulties resulting from the lack of preparation to collaborate as an effective team.” (p. 736).

How to successfully implement co-teaching in the foreign language classroom

Based on my experiences, I have concluded that co-teaching works in the foreign language classroom under specific circumstances. It is not enough that teachers speak the target language well. It is also important to understand the structural aspects of the target language and know how to explain it to the students in a meaningful way. Most importantly, the language must be used by students in meaningful ways so that students can really start grasping content and meaning. Both teachers need to plan and assess

equally. They need to portray the same amount of authority insomuch that the students know and feel they will get the same answer from both teachers. Murawski and Dieker (2004) emphasized that a co-teacher is not a “glorified aide” (p. 52). During the two years with the student teachers, we used the following models of co-teaching: duet, lead and support, complementary skills, and adapting (Beninhof, 2012). In the elementary Spanish classroom, we started with lead and support, with me (the main teacher) leading and the student teacher supporting, followed by complementary skills. A month into the program, we used the duet model with both teachers sharing responsibilities. We finished with lead and support with the student teacher being the main teacher and I provided the support and adapted the lessons given as needed. The reason we used those models is that I am trying to help student-teachers to be prepared for the workforce. For that, they need to learn how to be the leader in the classroom. Students also liked to see the student teacher take the role of the leading teacher.

This school year (2018-2019), I have had the opportunity to implement this method in high school as part of the Bridge program. I have had the same experience as before. One of the major differences is that instead of a student teacher, a university instructor was chosen to co-teach with me. Another difference is that the university instructor comes once a week to the class while students see me every day. Students have the opportunity to work with me one on one daily while they can only do that once a week with the other teacher. Because of this, my co-teacher and I have incorporated mostly the following methods: lead and support, and speak and add (Beninhof, 2012). These methods work great in my classroom while there are two teachers. Students receive

their instruction from the other teacher and as I listen and observe, I am able to fill in the gaps.

Conclusion

Co-teaching is a topic that has been studied thoroughly in the Special Education setting but not as much in the foreign language classroom. My study questions were: 1) do students believe that co-teaching in the foreign language classroom is beneficial for their learning? and 2) what method of co-teaching should be implemented in the foreign language classroom at the high school level? The answer to the first question is “yes, absolutely”. Students have expressed their appreciation for having two teachers in the classroom, stating that it has allowed them to have different perspectives on the Spanish language and its different cultures. In regards to what type of co-teaching should be used, it depends on the group of students and the co-teaching partnership. At the university level, although I really liked it, some students were not as accepting as I hoped they would be which led to this research in the high school setting. As the implementation of the co-teaching model continues to spread in schools throughout the United States of America (Sterling, 2016), we will see an increased focus on research on co-teaching not only in the Special Education program but in every program in the schools. I would like to conduct a study implementing the models of co-teaching at the high school level for the Bridge Program and request feedback from students and parents.

LITERACY PAPER

The Spanish Dual Language Immersion in Utah:

The Development of the Bridge Program

PURPOSE AND REFLECTION

I wrote this paper for my Linguistics 6700 class with Dr. Spicer-Escalante. As an educator, dual language instruction is very interesting to me as I could use some of the teaching techniques and use them in my foreign language classroom. As a parent, learning more about dual language instruction was really important as I had a child entering first grade.

While conducting this research, Dr. Spicer-Escalante talked to me about the Bridge Project. She also mentioned that representatives of the different Utah universities would meet to discuss the implementation of the program. I was invited to accompany her to this meeting and to write this paper highlighting the Bridge Program and how it would be implemented. Since then I have been teaching a Bridge class starting August 2018.

Researching this topic helped me appreciate the process in establishing a new program in education. Although I thought the implementation of such a program could be easy and there is no need to wait, I realized that for the program to be successful, careful study and sometimes slow implementation is needed.

In this paper, I review some of the literature available on DLI and added the insights gained while I attended the Bridge meeting in Salt Lake City.

The Spanish Dual Language Immersion in Utah:

The Development of the Bridge Program

Abstract

In this paper I will present the development of dual language immersion (DLI) in the United States, specifically in Utah. I will show what steps were taken in Utah to make the DLI program a success and why it is important for the stakeholders. I found that collaboration among parents, teachers, students, local, and state-level education leaders has been essential for sustaining the program. Effective collaboration is the main reason why the state of Utah has gone into the secondary years with DLI. With Utah's unique Bridge Project, DLI is growing exponentially and students are getting ready for college-level classes.

Key words: *Dual language immersion (DLI), Bridge, one-way immersion, two-way immersion, biliteracy*

Introduction

Along with Spicer-Escalante and DeJonge-Kannan (2014), I believe that we live in a world “without communication boundaries” (p. 2437). Because of this situation, students must learn the skills required to “meet the needs and face the challenges that globalization entails” (p.2437). In this paper, I will present the four models of bilingual education and their importance in the development of the dual language immersion programs. I will then explain the Utah model established in 2009, its development and evolution, and the design and implementation of the Bridge project. My hope is that parents, educators, and students will be informed about how these programs work and can make a decision for future generations. Let me begin by discussing four models of bilingual education.

The four models of Bilingual Education and their

Importance for the development of Dual Language Immersion programs

May (2008) distinguishes four models of bilingual education: transitional, maintenance, enrichment, and heritage models. Three of these models are considered additive bilingualism and one is considered subtractive bilingualism. In additive bilingualism, the goal is to reach native-like fluency in the target language without losing the L1. The programs in question aim to achieve, foster and/or maintain students' bilingualism and biliteracy. Subtractive bilingualism aim to shift students from bilingualism eventually to monolingualism in the dominant language (Genesee, 2008; May, 2008). I will now describe each model.

Models of bilingual education

A transitional model (subtractive bilingualism) uses the L1 of minority students in the early stages of schooling but aims to shift students away from the use of their L1 as quickly as possible towards the greater use of the dominant language, in order to 'cope' academically in 'mainstream' or general education' (de Mejia, 2002; Freeman, 1998; as quoted in May 2008). These programs are meant to transition students from the L1 to the L2. The transitional model has strengths and weaknesses. May (2008) state that "the aim of moving [...] from bilingualism to monolingualism in the majority language, remains a central objective of transitional bilingual programs" (p. 22).

The second model is the maintenance approach. This approach "differs fundamentally from a transitional approach because it aims to maintain the minority language of the student, strengthen the student's sense of cultural and linguistic identity, and affirm their individual and collective ethnolinguistic rights" (May, 2008, p. 22).

The third model is enrichment programs, which are “associated with teaching majority language students through a minority language” (May, 2008, p. 23). This type of program takes the maintenance approach to a different level, with an emphasis “not just on achieving bilingualism and biliteracy for individual students but also [...] the ongoing maintenance of the minority language(s) in the wider community” (May, 2008, p. 23).

The final model is the heritage language model. This model “tends to be focused on the reclamation of a heritage language no longer spoken as an L1 – that is, the students are second language learners of the heritage language” (May, 2008, p. 23). This model is largely associated with revitalizing indigenous languages like Hawaiian, Maori, and some Native American languages. This model can also be regarded as additive as it not only adds the target language but also helps maintain the native language.

These models all have their relative strengths and weaknesses. For example, the transitional model is subtractive in nature as it helps students move towards the L2. In contrast, the maintenance, enrichment, and heritage models help the students acquire biliteracy and become bicultural. The enrichment model laid the foundation for what later became one-way and two-way dual language immersion.

What is dual language immersion? What are its benefits?

Several definitions of dual language immersion have been offered (Cloud, 2000; Collier & Thomas, 2004; Genesee, 2008; May, 2008; Swain & Lapkin, 2005). For the purpose of this paper, a school offers dual language immersion when the curriculum is taught in two languages. In the United States, the languages will be English and a second language (ESL). Fortune and Tedick (2008) identify three kinds of dual immersion, which are considered additive bilingualism. They are one-way immersion, two-way immersion,

and indigenous immersion. In one-way immersion, the student body (in the classroom) will be homogenous, that is, sharing a similar language background. This can be English as the dominant language of the students or a different language such as Spanish in the border area of Mexico and Texas. Two-way immersion requires that a third of the student body be L1 speakers of the TL. For example, two-way immersion in Chinese could be offered in some places in California where there is a significant group of Chinese speakers. Another example could be Spanish in some places in Utah, where a third of the students in the dual immersion classroom speak Spanish as their L1. Last is the indigenous immersion program where students are exposed to their heritage language along with their heritage culture. The same model could apply to other indigenous languages with even a small number of students, even if those students are not considered “indigenous.”

Dual language immersion is more than just learning a second language. It has unique benefits, some of which include: Students learn the language; they become literate in that language and become bicultural as well. DLI instruction also helps in closing the academic achievement gap (Collier & Thomas, 2004). According to Collier and Thomas (2004), a typical day in the DLI classroom has “no translation and no repeated lessons in the other language, separation of the two languages is a key component of this model” (p. 2). Collier and Thomas conducted research in which they show how students in an English/Spanish immersion school improved academically over time. The students were able to perform significantly better in English than their English-only counterparts. “Both one-way and two-way bilingual programs lead to grade-level and above grade-level achievement in second language, the only program that closes the gap” (p. 11). They go on to say that while English Language Learners (ELL) in the mainstream classrooms improve

one year each academic year, the students in the dual immersion program were able to close the gap by grade 5.

Another benefit for DLI is cognitive achievement. Students score better in the different areas as the students in monolingual classrooms. Capra and Medrano (2015) presented the results of the student achievement data from Palm Beach County, showing that both English speakers and ELL students in DLI programs scored better than their counterparts, roughly 20-35% higher in reading, writing, Math and Science. Another benefit is in terms economic benefits. Spicer-Escalante, Leite & Wade (2015) quote Dr. Myriam Met stating “the least expensive [language program] model, which ironically results in the highest level of language proficiency, is an immersion program” (p. 27). Based on the results from Capra, Medrano and Met, immersion programs in Utah would benefit children for a fraction of the cost it would cost per pupil.

Utah’s Dual language immersion program

The 50/50 model in Utah started when Poll, Wade and Hunt started researching the different models implemented around the United States in 2004 (Leite, 2013). At that time, Poll was the Assistant Superintendent of Davis School District and asked if any principal wanted to develop a language program. Principal Wade from Eagle Bay Elementary in Farmington and Principal Hunt from Sand Spring Elementary in Layton answered the call. They chose the 50/50 model for several reasons, among them being “they did not feel that their community would accept the 90/10 model because parents would be concerned about the development of English language literacy” (Leite, 2013, p. 54). There are other benefits to the 50/50 model, among being the “capacity for twice as many students for each language teacher, made for an easy and inexpensive transition

with minimal effects on the rest of the school population, displaced fewer English teachers, allowed for consistency across multiple schools” (Leite, 2013). One of the most important aspects of the 50/50 model is that it is “highly replicable and sustainable” (Spicer-Escalante, Leite & Wade, 2015). In the 50/50 model, students will be with an English teacher 50% of the day, therefore, they will develop their English language and literacy skills. The other 50% of the day, the students will be with a target language teacher. The curriculum varies by grade level in terms of what is being taught in which language. For example, in grades 1 – 3, students will receive instruction in the L2 of L2 literacy, Math, and other content areas (such as Science and Social Studies). In the L1, the instruction is of English language arts and reinforcement of Math and the other content areas. In grades 4 – 6, students will receive instruction of English Language Arts, Math, and the classes of Science and Social Studies will be reinforced in the L1, while L2 literacy and Science will be taught in the TL with reinforcement in Math. As students continue in the DLI program, they will enter in the secondary sequencing in which they can continue learning in the L2 (until eighth grade) or have the option to start a new foreign language, L3 (<http://www.utahdli.org/instructionalmodel.html>). The purpose of this program is “to see state’s students enter universities and the global workforce equipped with language skills at the Advanced Level of proficiency in all four critical language skill areas (listening, speaking, reading and writing)” (Roberts & Wade 2012, p. 10). This goal will be achieved with the 50/50 model, highly qualified teachers, and the support of parents and administration.

So far, the DLI program has been a success with 224 programs by the beginning of 2018-2019 school year in the following languages: Spanish, Chinese, French,

Portuguese, German, and Russian. As part of the DLI program, students can take the advance placement (AP) class and test in ninth grade. Once students pass the test with a 3 or higher they can continue taking classes in the L2 in high school. This is called the Bridge project.

The Bridge Project

Utah has been at the forefront of dual language immersion since 2009. In March 18, 2016, Governor Herbert, signed into law senate bill 152 called ‘Accelerated Foreign Language Course’. This bill is commonly referred to as the Bridge Project. A DLI Newsletter in September 2015 prepared by the Utah State of Education Office (USOE) explained: “the Bridge project courses create an educational bridge for DLI students to continue with appropriately challenging language study after they successfully complete the AP Language and Culture exam” (p. 1). In other words, the Bridge project was prepared for those students who enter high school after passing the advanced placement exam for the language in which they have participated. Students who have not participated in the DLI program but have taken the AP test and passed will also be allowed to take the Bridge classes. According to S.B. 152 “an accelerated foreign language student means a student who: (i) has passed a world language advance placement exam; and (ii) is in grade 10, grade 11, or grade 12” (p. 3a). While in high school, students have the option to learn a third or fourth language and/or participate in the Bridge Project. The Bridge Project offers college credit classes to high school students. These classes are different from regularly offered current concurrent enrollment classes. While traditional concurrent enrollment classes are college classes, they are at the lower undergraduate level. The classes that are part of the Bridge Project will be the

equivalent of upper level undergraduate credit that will count as electives for the language minor. These classes will count towards the language minor as electives taken at the university but they will differ in the sense that they have to be “age-appropriate” (S.B. 152, 2016, p. 3a). University instructors will use a “blended learning delivery model” in which the students will use an online component and also meet face-to-face in a class with a teacher/professor assigned for such courses (S.B. 152, 2016). With classes being considered concurrent enrollment, students will receive credit at the high school as well (<http://12trec.utah.edu/utah-dual-immersion/index.php>).

In March of 2015, I attended one of the meetings in which representatives of the seven major universities in Utah discussed the logistics of course delivery, credentials, and funding as they brainstormed and identified the three courses that would be offered in the school year 2016-2017. It was determined that the classes would be co-taught by a teacher and a university professor/instructor/adjunct who would have either a “PhD or MA in the language with experience teaching upper division university courses” (Spanish Bridge Project Team, 2015). The high school teacher must be licensed, possess a master’s degree in the language and must have an appropriate level of proficiency (advanced-mid or higher on the OPI test). As of fall 2015, it was decided that Bridge courses would be taught by university faculty and facilitated by a qualified high school language teacher (USOE, 2015). This means the university will send an instructor to the school once a week where both instructors will teach the class using a co-teaching method. The high school teacher of record will teach the other days. Another point of discussion was in regards to the classes taught under the Bridge project. The approved classes were Spanish in the Global World, Popular Culture and Media, and Spanish Film. These classes will

rotate every three years with Span 3116: Pop Culture and Media being the first class implemented in 2016. This class will be taught again in 2019-2020. Its learning outcomes would challenge students to think critically and “share their point of view in discussion on some complex cultural and historical issues” (Spanish Bridge Project Team, 2016). The other classes implemented are Span 3117: Breaking Down Walls, Building Identities (2017-2018), and Span 3118: Literature and Film, Contemporary Issues (2018-2019).

As I participated in the meeting in March 2015 and observed all the steps taken to create the Bridge Project curriculum, I realized that creating a course is more complicated than simply deciding to have it. It involves approval, in this case, from all seven major universities in Utah. It also requires approval from the state government, for which the process at the Legislative Branch, although simple, is time consuming. The process was long (over 1.5 years) but the project was approved by Utah legislators. According to the Office of Legislative Research and General Counsel (OLRGC, 2014), in order for a bill to pass and become law, the bill has to be heard three times in both the House of Representatives and the Senate and needs a minimum of 38 positive votes in the House and 15 in the Senate. Senate Bill 152 was finally passed with 67 ayes in the House and 25 ayes in the Senate. It was signed into law on March 18, 2016 and its effective date was May 10, 2016.

After the state government passed the law supporting the Bridge Project, two schools started the program in 2016-2017. Both schools belong to Granite School District, Taylorsville High and Olympus High. Both schools shared the same instructor hired by the University of Utah and she would report to the University of Utah. S.B. 152 also allows for the appropriation of \$300,000 for fiscal years 2017 and 2018. “The

Legislature intends that appropriations under this section: be used to develop foreign language concurrent enrollment for accelerated foreign language students...” (S.B. 152, 2016, p. 3). It is my understanding that this monetary appropriation is to cover the salary of the instructors hired to teach in the schools and the continuing development of the Bridge Program. At this time, the Bridge Project in Spanish is about to finish its third year with Weber State University and the University of Utah in Spring 2019 and Utah Valley University joined the program in 2018 with several schools in Alpine School District, Park City School District, and Wasatch School District. Chinese and French have also followed teaching the same sequence but with other content (Second Language Teaching and Research Center, 2018).

In addition to the Bridge program, students that have shown proficiency in a World Language apart from English will receive the Seal of Biliteracy on their high school transcript. According to R277-299, “Seal of Biliteracy means a recognition, awarded in conjunction with a student’s high school diploma, which certifies that a student is proficient in English and at Intermediate-Mid level or higher in one or more world languages” (R277-299, 2018). The requirements vary slightly from district to district. However, most districts are choosing to be consistent in how they evaluate their students’ proficiency. In my district’s case, we will grant the seal of biliteracy to students who have an AP test results of 3 or higher regardless of when it is taken to determine the foreign language proficiency. The AAPPL score, provided by ACTFL, can be used as well and it needs to be an I3 (Intermediate). The ACT result in English of at least 18 or WIDA result of 5 will be used to determine English proficiency.

**Main problems associated with bilingual/immersion education
and possible side effects in the development of more DLI programs**

So far, I have discussed the benefits of dual language immersion. I would like to mention some problems that may affect future development of dual language immersion programs. According to Genesee (2008), time is a factor that needs to be taken in consideration. As I mentioned previously, bilingualism takes time, and people need to understand this. In the DLI programs, teachers have to cover the same curriculum as in monolingual programs creating more homework for students and parents.

Another aspect is that “acquisition of competence in language takes time” (Genesee, 2008, p. 38). At the beginning, evaluations of DLI students may be lower than those of monolingual students. However, as students progress there is “no statistically significant differences between one-way immersion and control students on tests of English language proficiency” (Genesee, 2004, as quoted in Genesee, 2008, p. 38). Because of this, the effectiveness of dual language immersion can be judged only after several years (Collier & Thomas, 2004).

A commonly heard question from parents is, how can we help our children if we do not speak the language? In my personal experience as a DLI mother, in order to ease parents’ concerns, DLI teachers usually offer two orientation meetings regarding the DLI program. The first meeting is during the spring (before the beginning of the program the following school year) and the second meeting is during back-to-school night. In both instances, parents are encouraged to read to their student in their L1, and they can ask for guidance from the teacher. Something that could be of value is having a get-together with other students in the program in order to have them practice speaking the target language.

I have seen this happen in my children's school, where upper grade level students go once a week to read in Spanish with students in first grade. Unger (2001) states that "dual immersion education programs, if implemented correctly, can offer both language-minority and language-majority students an outstanding school experience" (p. 3).

Conclusion

Most people have thought that in order to be successful in America, English should be the language they must learn (Crawford, 2003). The DLI movement has proven that learning a foreign language starting in elementary schools is beneficial intellectually, socially, and economically. Although English is recognized as a business language, knowing a foreign language in addition to English will open more doors to our children than one language can. As DLI continues to expand across Utah and into the secondary level, the Bridge project will help prepare students for life after high school. Such preparation comes in terms of college education, job prospect and multi-cultural communication skills.

CULTURE PAPER

Teaching the pragmatics of *tú* and *usted* to novice-level learners of Spanish

PURPOSE AND REFLECTION

This paper was written as part of my work for Ling 6900 (Culture Teaching) class. Originally, I wrote the paper with my classmate Alexandria Adair. We are both secondary educators teaching Spanish as a foreign language and decided to research the pragmatics of the use of *tú* vs. *usted*, as we noticed that our students were having a hard time grasping the concept and use of both pronouns. As a L1 speaker of Spanish, it was easy for me to use both pronouns in a correct manner. However, having Alexandria's perspective as an L2 learner helped me look for new ways in which I can help my students understand the different uses and be successful in their Spanish communication.

I have since revised this paper and made it my own. I applied what I learned from this research into my teaching at the high school and at the university. I noticed some struggles as the students tried to use both pronouns when the L1 Spanish speakers surrounding them mostly used the pronoun *tú*. However, the more I emphasized the distinct use of both pronouns, the more students began to use them appropriately. It is important to note that this development did not happen within the first lesson or group of lesson. The change came as students continued practicing speaking Spanish

It is my hope that as they keep paying attention to the significance use of this distinction, students will be able to use the pronouns *tú* and *usted* appropriately.

Teaching the pragmatics of *tú* and *usted* to beginner learners of Spanish

Abstract

As learners of Spanish increase in number, there is a need not only to teach the language but the culture and especially pragmatics of the language. The purpose of this paper is to explore different teaching techniques in Spanish pragmatics, particularly when teaching the differences between *tú* and *usted*. While English uses the pronoun ‘you’ for both formal and informal second person singular, Spanish uses two different pronouns. This usually creates confusion for L2 students. This literature review shows the differences in how these pronouns are used and how they can be taught to L2 students. I will also include personal observations of L2 students using *tú* and *usted* in context.

Key words: *tú, usted, L1, L2, Spanish as a foreign language (SFL)*

Introduction

As a teacher of Spanish as a foreign language (SFL), I have observed difficulty in my students’ acquisition of the pronouns *tú* and *usted* (‘you’ in English). Students find it difficult to know when to use the informal pronoun *tú* versus the more formal pronoun *usted* (Hampton, 1974). This is likely because there is only one pronoun that means ‘you’ in English. Much of the literature on this topic has to do with formality and pragmatic awareness in the second language (L2).

In this paper, I will begin by reviewing the literature available that will help me develop effective techniques in teaching my students how to use *tú* and *usted* appropriately. I will focus on the history of these pronouns and their current uses based on different situations such as age, position, employment, etc.

The last section of this paper discusses techniques for teaching *tú* and *usted* in the SFL classroom. Although novice-level students may go through similar situations, I noticed that the needs of high school students are somewhat different from L2 learners in college. The techniques I discuss are based on lessons I have incorporated in my classrooms and their effectiveness.

Literature Review

While researching the literature available regarding the uses of *tú* and *usted*, I wanted to know the origins of these pronouns. We know that Spanish is the result of the evolution of spoken Latin, slowly changing from generation to generation (Hualde, Olarrea, Escobar & Travis, 2010). According to Penny (2002), “TŪ [was] used whenever a single individual was addressed, whatever his or her status ..., and VŌS used for addressing more than one person” (p. 137). As time passed and Latin continued evolving, *tú* and *vos* became one in meaning, with that meaning being informal address. During the Golden Age, “the cumbersome form [for formal] address *vuestra merced*, underwent a series of contractions, at first disallowed in cultured speech, which gave rise to *vuesarced*, *voacé*, *vucé*, *vuced*, etc., and finally *usted*” (p. 138).

Although the uses of *tú* and *usted* make sense for L1 speakers of Spanish, most of the time this distinction is difficult to grasp for L2 learners initially. In some cases, even bilingual people who have grown up speaking both Spanish and English have trouble knowing when to use *tú* and when to use *usted* (Lambert & Tucker, 1976). Jaramillo (1996) investigated the use of *tú* and *usted* among Mexican American families. The author found that most respondents used *tú* less as familiar relationships got farther away from the nuclear family. Although this suggests that the use of *usted* has stayed intact in

regards to familiarity, the author noted that the youngest group used *tú* much more than their older counterparts when addressing “ceremonial” family members (e.g., godparents) (Jaramillo, 1996).

The study found a close relationship between age and gender and educational level of the respondent. The youngest generation had received a higher level of both regular education and Spanish education (Jaramillo, 1996). This shows that education might not be the key, or only, factor in the way Spanish speakers use *tú* and *usted*. Rather, the informal pronouns that the youngest group used might be attributed to the dynamic nature of formality in Spanish. Just like in any language, each person’s speech patterns are going to be different. However, specifically in the United States, the use of *tú* is gaining more momentum than the traditional *usted* with younger generations (Jaramillo, 1996). Although Jaramillo’s research is not as recent as other research done on *tú* and *usted*, it remains relevant because the trend is continuing (Medrano, 2010). The same has happened in Chile, where *usted* is more predominantly used among the older generation while the younger generation has adopted *tú* in its every day speech (Henlicks, 2015).

In a study conducted in 2010, Gutiérrez-Rivas describes how Cubans and Cuban-Americans sometimes have difficulty using these pronouns. For her study, Gutiérrez-Rivas chose two groups: the first consisted of second-generation Spanish speakers aged 40-53 (five men and five women) who were either born in the United States or immigrated to the United States before the age of twelve. The second group (also five men and five women, aged 18-28) was considered third-generation, as it was comprised of descendants from second-generation Cuban-Americans (p. 89). In her study, both

groups had trouble choosing the appropriate pronoun. For example, one of the participants employed “*poliformismo*” which is the use of *tú* and *usted* for the same subject in the same conversation (Gutiérrez-Rivas, p. 89). Furthermore, the third generation preferred the use of *tú* in almost every setting.

Based on these studies, what should we teach novice-level learners of Spanish? Teachers using the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach (Lee & Van Patten, 2003) teach only what is needed at the moment, or what the students would most likely use if they were to be immersed in a Spanish-speaking community. If that is the case, should we teach one form first, introducing the other pronoun when the students are more advanced? Or, should we teach both simultaneously in the hope that the students will eventually catch the meaning of both pronouns and when to use them? According to Hampton (1974), we should block teaching *tú* at the beginning, as is done when teaching other Romance languages. However, he also states, while quoting Marin (1972), that *tú* is becoming more prominent especially in areas where *usted* is/was commonly used.

Another aspect to take into consideration is that, when learning Spanish at the novice-level, L2 Spanish students will mimic the same mistakes L1 Spanish children make. Depending on the culture, the pronoun of preference among the latter tends to be *tú* or *vos* (another form of *tú* found in Central America and some countries in South America). Since most children use *tú* and most of the teachers are young and use *tú* as well, chances are that the pronoun of preference will be *tú* (Soler-Espiauba, 2000). The teaching of *tú* versus *usted* will greatly depend on how the instructor talks. For example, if we normally talk to our students in Spanish using the pronoun *tú*, chances are that the students will respond in *tú* and have more difficulty using *usted*.

In fact, I was surprised when I spent a summer in Puerto Rico and heard the governor himself talking in *tú* to the whole population. Although it may have been a sign of closeness and solidarity, it shows the changes in pragmatics within the last 15 years. After some research, I realized that *tú* has been used quite predominantly in Puerto Rico instead of *usted*. The exception would be in situations that warrant the use of *usted* like talking to a professor or someone of higher status (e.g., in education, political, religious setting). Soler-Espiauba (2000) describes situations when *tú* is commonly used versus *usted*. In familiar setting, *tú* is used “*excepto en muy reducidas zonas rurales, donde aún se practica Usted con padres, abuelos, suegros y tíos*” (translation: except in some rural zones where *usted* is used with parents, grandparents, in-laws and uncles/aunts) (Soler-Espiauba, p.186). In the professional setting, the superior may use *tú* with everyone but the subordinate will use *usted*. In public settings such as stores, big warehouses and restaurants, *usted* is used by store personnel speaking to customers (Soler-Espiauba).

In regards to what we should teach, Whitley (2002) mentions “a useful rule of thumb is to adopt *tú* if ‘you’ would be addressed with a given name and *usted* if a title or title and last name would be used” (p. 326). This is an interesting and valid point, as students can recognize the need to call someone by their title rather than his/her proper name. LoCastro (2012) mentions “learning how to be polite in another language is, however, not an easy task: doing so takes time, exposure to authentic, local practices, and mindfulness in communicative contexts” (p. 136). This is true when learning a foreign language versus learning a variation of such language. As a teacher of SFL who uses a specific variety of Spanish, I need to stress the importance of such differences in my classroom.

Because the continuum of the use of *tú* and *usted* is so broad, especially if all Spanish-speaking countries are taken into account, some of this information may be considered arbitrary. However, it is important to note that because I am a teacher of SFL in the United States, studies conducted on bilinguals currently living in the U.S. are relevant and important to my research. Soler-Espiauba (2000) mentions specific situations where *tú* could be used. They are age and group association. “*Para poder tutear sin problemas, es preciso tener algo en común con el/los interlocutores: edad, sexo, trabajo, estatus social, familia, partido político, club deportivo o social, categoría profesional, casa de vecindad, lugar de vacaciones, amigos comunes, etc*” (Soler-Espiauba, p.188). This translates into ‘In order to use *tú* without problems, it is necessary to have something in common with the speaker: age, gender, job, social status, family, political affiliation, sports or social club, professional category, neighborhood, vacation destination, common friends, etc.’ This research helps me be knowledgeable in regards to the many uses of *tú* and *usted*. It is also important to have this background on which to base implementation of teaching strategies.

Techniques for teaching *tú* and *usted* in the foreign language classroom

The following literature is relevant to teaching the pragmatics of *tú* and *usted* in SFL. Although each approach is a little different, I will mention methods I feel comfortable and confident with when teaching *tú* and *usted*.

To begin, Terrell (1980) points us in an effective direction when he proposes “a radically different approach to the teaching of verb form and function” (p. 129). At the time of his publication, the audiolingual method and teacher-centered classrooms were the norm in FL teaching (Ellis, 1995). Terrell’s research was groundbreaking in that it

proposed an approach to teaching grammar, that excluded list conjugations of all forms of each verb. Rather, students learned the *meaning* of many verbs in a single form before learning needed conjugations. This aided in the acquisition of grammar in support of communication (Lee & Van Patten, 2003). Although his article does not point to specific methods for the teaching of *tú* and *usted*, Terrell's research goes hand-in-hand with the paradigm of communicative language teaching (CLT) (Lee & Van Patten, 2003) in that he proposes teaching only the verb forms that are needed for a specific communicative purpose.

Betti (2013) reports on a different approach. Instead of focusing on the grammar and conjugations of verbs at all, this study prompted teachers to take the implicit pragmatics of Spanish formality into account. Betti examined a large corpus of student writing samples and analyzed the gaps in the pragmatic development of those students, especially concerning the use of culturally appropriate forms of address and politeness. She came to the conclusion that instead of teaching students *only* the pragmatic skills of the TL, teachers should focus on a “contrastive approach” (Betti, 2013, p. 68). This means that teachers should look at the L1 of their students, and then make comparisons and contrasts between the two languages. There is merit in this approach because for many students, it is easier to observe the pragmatics of their own L1 before they can understand the pragmatics of the L2 being learned. In regards to the pragmatics of *tú* and *usted*, students might contrast the use of the English ‘you’ as an informal, formal, and plural form of address to the use of *tú*, *usted*, and *ustedes* as those same forms. They will need guidance to navigate these differences in pronouns. This can be achieved in the target language by using different activities that I will mention later. This approach,

therefore, would be less explicit and deductive than other approaches where the use of *tú* and *usted* is taught more explicitly and inductively (Shrum & Glisan, 2010).

Although research on the contrastive approach to explore pragmatics shows it to be an important and successful method, there are some important caveats to note. Whitley (2002) states that the system of language is not homogenous; rather, it is unique to each speaker; therefore, teachers must take into account not only the different dialectal pragmatic rules of a language, but also the different “idiolects” each speaker within a group uses (p. 1). This means that we may not always be able to use a contrastive approach when teaching our novice and even intermediate students when to use *tú* and when to use *usted*. It is important to explain to students that although there are specific differences between the use of the pronoun ‘you’ in English and Spanish, those comparisons and contrasts do not necessarily dictate all uses everywhere, no matter the dialect (Whitley, 2002).

Another study I found useful in the search for strategies for teaching *tú* and *usted* is Koike and Pearson (2005). The authors examined the efficacy of teaching pragmatics with using explicit or implicit pre-instruction, as well as explicit or implicit feedback. Five groups of students were studied. They were divided by instruction such as explicit pre-instruction and explicit feedback, explicit pre-instruction and implicit feedback, implicit pre-instruction and explicit feedback, implicit pre-instruction and implicit feedback, and the control group was not given either (p.485). Multiple tests were administered throughout the course. One of the tests consisted of multiple-choice questions “in which learners had to choose the most appropriate turns in a dialogue with suggestions” (p. 489). The other tests were “an open-ended task, which required learners

to write the turns of a dialogue based on a situation” (p.489). However, “the group that had implicit instruction together with implicit feedback performed significantly better in the open-ended dialogues” (p. 481). This research is relevant to me because it indicates that no matter the type of feedback (i.e., implicit or explicit), feedback itself, in any form, is helpful for the development of students’ pragmatic competence. This article motivated me to provide substantial feedback to my students regarding appropriate use of *tú* and *usted*.

Observations

Although I teach different levels of Spanish, I have observed similar uses of *tú* and *usted* in my SFL classrooms. Students in novice-level Spanish classes have a greater degree of difficulty understanding and applying the use of *tú* and *usted* appropriately compared to students with more exposure to the language. While analyzing what is happening in my classes, I realized that I talk to my students mostly in *tú*; therefore, they have much more exposure to *tú* than *usted*. However, L1 Spanish speakers (both native and heritage speakers) do use *usted* more than their L1 English speaking counterparts. Once the students move to the Spanish 2 level, both groups (L1 and L2 speakers) seem to understand the distinction between the pronouns and although they still make mistakes, they autocorrect themselves, indicating a degree of awareness. As their understanding of Spanish increases, they are able to grasp when to use *tú* and when to use *usted*.

As a native speaker of Spanish, I was taught from an early age how to address people. This depends on a person’s status: equal status as me (*tú*) or higher status (*usted*). By knowing how to address people, I have been able to avoid offending them and to

establish mutual respect. This is something natural and automatic for me and something that I want my students to acquire.

In Puerto Rico, nowadays, it is somewhat normal to use *tú* in almost all situations, even when the speaker does not know the interlocutor. However, when addressing someone in the government or at an educational institution, the form *usted* is used as a sign of respect. I find it interesting how Spanish pragmatics have changed in the last several years in the sense that most people, including government personnel, are using *tú* instead of *usted*.

Lesson Plans

The best way to teach *tú* vs. *usted* is by example. I have prepared a lesson in which students will watch a video clip of a popular Mexican show, *El Chavo del ocho* (<https://youtu.be/QWTEfloF93Q>, minute 6:16 – 7:32). The setting of this video is at a public school in Mexico. As the class progresses, my students can see and hear the teacher in the video asking his students questions using the familiar form (*tú*) and the students answering his questions in the *usted* form. This video is about 23 minutes long, although I would only show 2 minutes. Students then will answer questions related to the video such as: Why did the students answer in *usted* to the teacher? Why could the teacher talk to the students using *tú*?

A new technique I want to try came from my observation of a fellow teacher regarding the use of *tú* vs *usted*. In this activity, the teacher had some students wear neckties and others not. The students then knew to talk in *usted* to those wearing the ties

and in *tú* to those not wearing ties. This is a good way to introduce *tú* vs *usted* especially at the beginning of the school year when students lack vocabulary.

Conclusion

While reviewing books and articles regarding the pragmatics of Spanish politeness and the signaling of formality, it is important to recognize that several studies indicate the gradual change in the use of the second person singular pronouns in Spanish. This review of the literature has enlightened me in how to address these differences in my SFL teaching. Some of the findings regarding the teaching of *tú* and *usted* consist of explicit or implicit pre-instruction, as well as explicit or implicit feedback, grammar through CLT teaching, and what is needed to have a meaningful conversation with another Spanish speaker.

As I observed my students while conducting this literature review, I have been able to apply some of the teaching suggestions to the novice-level SFL students. Although students are not perfect in identifying the use of each pronoun, they have responded well after receiving corrective feedback in regards to both pronouns. It is important to teach students that perfection is not expected of anyone and that error-free production is unrealistic (Lee & VanPatten, 2003).

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHIES

INTRODUCTION

The following annotated bibliography is a review of scholarly sources on three topics I found interesting during my years in the MSLT program. As a Spanish instructor, I wanted to learn more about CLT and some misconception with this approach. I was surprised and pleased that other universities are using this approach. Researching about CLT has helped me see language learning in a different way.

My second annotated bibliography is related to my research in co-teaching and how this research prepared me to become a good co-teacher to four different student teachers. I believe that researching about this topic and applying my findings has made me a better teacher.

Finally, my third annotated bibliography is about DLI in Utah. The research highlights the benefits of biliteracy in DLI classrooms.

COMMUNICATIVE LANGUAGE TEACHING

As I started my graduate work, I learned about the Communicative Language Teaching Approach (CLT). What I have learned so far about CLT is very promising. The following sources have influenced my perspective regarding teaching language communicatively. While some provide insight into why some teachers are against CLT, however, this annotated bibliography also gives a counter-argument to most misconceptions.

I will begin with **Ballman, Linskin-Gasparro and Mandell (2001)**, which was my first exposure to a written source on the concept of communicative language teaching. Throughout my life I have believed that the best way to learn a language is by being immersed in it. But how can I teach Spanish to my students when the environment (that is, outside of the classroom) is not conducive to a lot of speaking? According to Ballman et al. (2001) “communicative, task-based activities...may contribute positively to students’ motivation to study the language” (p. 15). That statement has made me think about how many times I tried to teach communicatively and failed. Looking back, I realized that I included some communicative activities in my Spanish classes but I did not do task-based activities. While some of my students were motivated to learn the language regardless, others were not motivated, maybe because filling out worksheets is never fun and I did not give them the opportunity to practice the language in a meaningful way.

In addition, Ballman et al. (2001) argue that students who want to learn to speak the language can benefit from the experience of speaking in the classroom. This in turn brings a desire to learn more about the language (p.16). This comment goes well with what Liskin-Gasparro (1987) said regarding proficiency, “If you can’t use a language,

you don't know a language" (as quoted by Shrum and Glisan, 2015). The best way to learn a language is by being immersed in it. If the community environment does not offer that, a good communicative classroom is needed.

What makes CLT a good approach for teachers of a foreign language?

Gurunathan and Geethanjali (2016) offer several reasons why CLT is needed, key among which is that it improves communicative competence, which means, using the language for a specific purpose and specific context (p. 113-114). By using the CLT approach, students interact and negotiate in a way that a lecture will not allow. CLT helps students to collaborate and the teacher to serve as a facilitator (p.115). This in turn helps me be a better teacher by explaining linguistic details to my students in a natural context. Students will ask questions in order to understand the topics being taught. In that way, we have a classroom where everyone collaborates.

Savignon (2007) shows that "by encouraging the students to ask for information, to seek clarification, to use circumlocution and whatever other linguistic and non-linguistic resources they could muster to negotiate meaning, to stick to the communicative task at hand, teachers are invariably leading learners to take risks to speak in other than memorized patterns" (p. 209). In the last three years of trying to incorporate a more communicative classroom, I have noticed that my students are usually afraid at the beginning but as Savignon states, they begin to take risks, and they improve with each day and each lesson. Savignon (2007) also explains that "the focus [of CLT] has been the elaboration and implementation of programs and methodologies that promote the development of functional language ability through learner participation in

communicative events” (p. 209). For this, I can use task-based activities and authentic materials.

Shrum and Glisan (2015) mention another way that students can remain attentive during a foreign language class. They refer to authentic texts, which “are written and oral communications produced by members of a language and culture group for members of the same language and cultural group.” (p. 85). I noticed as I introduced authentic texts, such as videos, music, and short stories created by L1 speakers of Spanish, my students were more eager to interact in the Spanish language.

Another source that I have found to be very useful is **Lee and VanPatten’s (2003)** book *Making Communicative Language Teaching Happen*. The authors explain the need for input, not any input but meaningful input. They compare input to gasoline we can put in our cars. Some gasolines are of higher qualities than others, and the same goes for input. A key concept used by Lee and VanPatten is “comprehensible input” (p. 26). In order for input to be comprehensible, “the learner must be able to understand most of what the speaker (or writer) is saying...” (p. 26). They advocate that instructors have novice-level learners practice using the target language (TL) in familiar situations (building on background knowledge). In addition, the use of pictures and body language helps the students become familiar with the new vocabulary as input; it can also appeal to different students as they learn differently. This variety in learning styles was evident in my Spanish classes where some students understood vocabulary with using body language or descriptions but other students seemed to understand better by having visual aids.

According to Lee and VanPatten (2003), we negotiate the input we receive during communication. Sometimes, as a teacher I need to modify the input, mainly to allow the students to understand what has been said and taught. As time progresses and the students feel better in their ability to comprehend the language, the input does not have to be modified. Lee and VanPatten (2003) explain that the purpose of language and communicating is to bond socially or psychologically with others. When teaching and learning a second language, it is important to keep this in perspective as we all want to communicate and bond with others. A way that I do this is to teach about culture in my classes. By learning culture, students become aware of what is acceptable in certain Spanish-speaking communities.

Communicative Language Teaching is not just practicing the language in class but requires certain steps to make sure the students receive meaningful input. **Krashen (1992)** explains that although comprehensible input is required for second language acquisition, it is not enough. Students need “to be ‘open’ to the input” (p. 3). He explains his concept of the “affective filter hypothesis” which is sort of a “mental block that prevents the acquirers from fully utilizing the comprehensible input they receive for language acquisition” (p. 3). With this in mind, it is the job of the teacher to help students feel comfortable with the language acquisition process. This may take a while but there are activities that can help to lower the affective filter and motivate students. Task-based activities are among them.

Task-based activities are a crucial part of the CLT approach. To better understand task based activities (TBA), I needed a definition. **Ellis (2009)** explains the four criteria needed for an activity to be a ‘task’. They are: the focus is on meaning, there should be

some kind of ‘gap’ (students need to exchange information or opinion), students need to rely on their own resources, and there should be a clearly defined outcome (p. 223).

According to **Nahavandi (2012)**, TBA or Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) is an effective way for improving learners’ linguistic and communicative competence (p. 116). TBLT and CLT involve the use of several specific tasks, including information gap, opinion gap, reasoning gap, jigsaw, problem-solving, and decision-making tasks. Nahavandi claims that “if learners are provided with a series of tasks which involve both the comprehension and the production of language with a focus on meaning, language development will be increased” (p. 116). It appears to me that the more opportunities we give our students to practice the language through different tasks, the better their proficiency will become, especially if those tasks are meaningful.

Some of the task-based activities can be done using technology. As a foreign language teacher at a STEM school, I have the advantage of advanced technology in my classroom. In fact, each student has a computer provided by the school. Ever since the 1:1 computer program started, I have searched for new ways to incorporate CLT and technology. **Agbatogun (2013)** mentions in his article *Developing Learners’ Second Language Communicative Competence through Active Learning: Clickers or Communicative Approach* that the use of clickers will facilitate students’ active engagement during instruction. Since I do not have “clickers” I have decided to use similar programs that are free and my students can use at home as well. Those programs include <https://create.kahoot.it/#login?next=> (for teachers), <https://kahoot.it/#/> (for students), www.socrative.com, www.duolingo.com, Audacity (voice recording program on each computer), Flipgrid, Nearpod, and Google classroom. I have noticed a big

improvement in those students who use the programs mentioned above, at home and in the classroom, in terms of their speaking abilities and reduced fear of speaking the language, compared to those who choose not to invest time in using those resources. Some of the latter improve their speaking proficiency while others do not.

In regards to oral proficiency and oral fluency, **Rossiter, Derwing, Manimtim, and Thompson (2010)** argue that oral fluency is often neglected in the CLT curriculum. However, their study stemmed from an analysis they made of textbooks for the ESL program in Edmonton, Alberta. Those books claimed to develop oral fluency based on the authors' analysis. However, the books appeared insufficiently concerned with "developing oral fluency." Rossiter et al. state that the teacher must assess the learners and create lessons that will help students improve their oral proficiency. These lessons could and should be created using task-based activities in order to be meaningful for students. If the task and materials provided are meaningful to the students, they will likely apply the learning in their personal lives and thus will be able to develop more proficiency in the target language. While designing TBA, the teacher must create tasks that are meaningful and short, no more than ten minutes per activity. This will ensure that the students will refrain from using the L1 to chat.

During my research on CLT, I have found plenty of evidence as to why teachers should embrace this method. But, what about negative aspects? **Thompson (1996)** explains four misconceptions regarding CLT and why some teachers and students resist it. The first misconception is that CLT means not teaching grammar. I have to admit, I thought that was the case. Since I love grammar, hearing others say that CLT meant not teaching grammar scared me. However, I made the mistake of not looking for myself

until 2014. Then I learned that teaching grammar for grammar's sake is not conducive to speaking the language. The opposite, no grammar, is equally bad. The grammar taught should be the grammar needed for communication. This means that if the task requires the student to express likes and dislikes, the grammar that should be taught is first, second and third person singular. Some people want all of the grammar given at once, thinking that it is something concrete that students can take home to study (Gatbonton & Segalowitz, 2005). However, I believe that if students learn the material well during class, they can take that learning home and practice with others.

Thompson (1996) explains that with CLT, “the discussion of grammar is explicit, but it is the learners who are doing most of the discussing, working out – with guidance from the teacher – as much of their new knowledge of the language as can easily and usefully be expressed” (p. 11). This reminds me of how children learn a language. They learn by interaction, by being exposed to the language. The children understand more than they can express, yet they continue trying and thus become more proficient. The same happens in the CLT classroom. The teacher teaches the grammar implicitly by focusing students' attention and by modeling what is needed for the conversation.

Another misconception of CLT, according to Thompson (1996), is that the teacher is the only person speaking. This cannot be further from the truth. The teacher must be the facilitator, with the students doing most of the talking through task-based activities. The third misconception is that CLT means pair work which means role play. Thompson argues that “one of the constant themes of CLT is that learners need to be given some degree of control over their learning” (p. 13). Pair work helps the students to practice and advise each other in learning the material. If used appropriately by the

students and the teachers, pair work can mean that the students develop more confidence in speaking the L2 and are able to perform better. The fourth misunderstanding is that CLT means expecting too much from the teacher. That was my position until I started implementing CLT in my lessons. I have discovered that even though it may take longer to plan, my students perform the same and even better than if I would just teach them all of the conjugations available and make them fill out worksheets. The best part is that they can speak better than they were able to before CLT.

Thompson (1996) concludes that “CLT is by no means the final answer...but whatever innovations emerge, they will do so against the background of the changes brought about by CLT” (p. 14). This is an interesting claim because nine years later, **Gatbonton and Segalowitz (2005)** published an article in which they rethink CLT and propose the ACCESS Approach. ACCESS stands for Automatization in Communicative Contexts of Essential Speech Segments. The authors speculate that some teachers do not want to embrace CLT because they cannot send students home with “something concrete and tangible” (p. 327). They argue that there should be a genuinely communicative activity. This activity should have at least two participants working together to complete a task by exchanging information that one participant has and not the other. They also stipulate that their genuinely communicative activity has an information gap activity and is part of an overall goal. Again, this is TBA, which is defined as several small activities that will prepare the students to complete an ultimate task, namely, the communicative goal.

Throughout the research in Communicative Language Teaching and task-based activities, I have learned that there are always opportunities to improve how to teach a

foreign language to students. It is important to understand how we, as teachers, learned our foreign language. After careful evaluation, I have realized that I have learned an L2 best by doing small activities (tasks) with a purpose and not just filling in worksheets. Based on that experience, I can relate to my students in a different way and provide them with the same opportunity to learn the language. It is important to not only teach our students communicatively, but educate administration and parents of the communicative language teaching approach. Not everyone will embrace it but my goal is to have my students remember, practice, and use Spanish from what we do in the classroom.

THE BENEFITS OF CO-TEACHING IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING

In this annotated bibliography, I want to explore how co-teaching can affect the teaching of a foreign language (either positively or negatively). This curiosity arose from my experiences as a cooperating teacher for future teachers. Serving as a mentor and cooperating teacher (co-teacher), I have been able to incorporate several aspects of the communicative language approach (CLT).

Jennings (2012) defines co-teaching and describes its benefits to students. He also explains why a certain method of co-teaching may be better than others depending on the situation. This book is significant for my study because it not only explains what co-teaching is, it also describes the different kinds of co-teaching. It helped me see how I can implement each type in my Spanish classroom. I realized that co-teaching is not just two teachers in the classroom sharing the same responsibility of teaching. There are other functions involved as well, such as planning, grading, meeting parents, etc. This new knowledge helped me incorporate the co-teaching model required by Utah State University as they sent student teachers to my classroom. As a teacher, I see the importance of how the students view their teachers. Jennings mentions how sometimes students perceive there to be a “real teacher” versus an “aide”. This led me to think about how I wanted my students to see their student teachers (also called pre-service teachers), who are preparing to become licensed teachers. The manner in which students see their instructors may potentially help the student-teachers with their confidence in their teaching competence.

How could I help my student teachers feel like the “real teacher” without leaving them alone in the classroom? Through deliberate implementation of specific forms of co-

teaching. **Benninghof (2012)** mentions nine types of co-teaching and their benefits. These models are: duet, lead and support, speak and add, skill groups, station, learning style, parallel, complementary skills, and adapting. I have tried all of the models since becoming a co-operating teacher, and I realized that not all apply in the second language classroom. Although the emphasis of these models points toward special education, with a few adjustments, I was still able to successfully use them in my Spanish classes. The models that have worked the best in my context are duet, lead and support, adapting, and speak and add. Because I want to help my student teachers prepare for the workforce, the model I started using was lead and support. At the beginning, I led the class and my student teacher provided support. This allowed them to observe and prepare themselves to teach. After two weeks of class, we began to work on the duet model, which means that “both teachers share the entire instructional process” (p. 52-53). My main goal with this model is to have students see both of us as the “real teacher”. This is an effective method that serves as a scaffold to help my student teachers feel confident while teaching. The models I use the most after duet are speak and add, and lead and support, with the student teacher acting as the leader and me acting as the support.

As I continued researching the literature available for co-teaching, I wondered if co-teaching was useful or a waste of time. Would it really benefit my student teachers as they enter the workforce? In *Teaching with your mouth shut*, **Finkel (2000)** explains the importance of having two teachers in the classroom and the benefits that it produces. It also raises a good question: “Why would two teachers want to teach a course together?” (p. 136). To me, this is an excellent question as I reflect on my first year as a licensed teacher. Although I loved the independence, I would have loved to have the support

provided by my cooperating teacher during student teaching. While I was completing my student teaching, I had two cooperating teachers. One of my teachers was also the basketball coach and he would leave the classroom to prepare for his other lesson. I lacked experience in classroom management and having him there would have been a good opportunity to see classroom management in action. There was no transition at the beginning of the semester until I left. To this day, I do not know what happened after I left because I was teaching alone until the last day. On the other hand, my second co-operating teacher was in the classroom most of the time but she was working on her other classes. Both my cooperating teachers were present during parent, teacher, student conferences (PTSC), but they did not have a clear idea of what was happening in the classroom. I remember the day Utah State University asked me to be a co-operating teacher. I thought it was my time to do something else while the student teacher taught. However, it was the same year Utah State University implemented co-teaching. Therefore, I was in the classroom with the student teacher and while trying to grade papers for other classes, I was so enthralled with what the student-teacher was doing that I listened to what he taught. We also had weekly meetings to decide what we were going to teach. We also talked about what worked and what was not working. The experiences with the student teacher, in my opinion, made me a better teacher.

In my experience as a student teacher, it was hard to find my voice or develop my style. This was because students were used to a particular way of teaching and there was no clear transition. I was given freedom, which fostered my desire to change the way the class was taught. But the Spanish class was mainly taught in English instead of Spanish. When I tried to teach mostly in Spanish, it was hard for me, for my cooperating teachers

(although they were not present most of the time), and for the students. In *An administrator's guide to co-teaching*, **Murawski and Bernhardt (2016)** explain that Co-teaching is more than just 'playing nicely' together (p. 31). Sometimes, the more experienced teacher has a hard time allowing the student-teacher to 'take over' the class for 20 minutes for several reasons. Among those reasons we can include: need to fix what was taught ineffectively, breaking the dynamic already established with the class, etc. It is not only "playing nicely together" but recognizing each individual's strengths. Murawski and Bernhardt (2016) further state that "co-teaching shouldn't be seen as a "special education thing," but rather as a "best practices in education thing." (p. 31). Having this in mind, I have talked to my student teachers about my expectations. I still let them be themselves but in the five minutes between classes or while the students are practicing speaking, I provide recommendations on what to change. I find this helpful because it diminishes the problems of having to fix what was taught and allowing the student teacher to find his or her voice in the classroom.

In order to continue improving co-teaching in my classroom, it was useful to identify which barriers stopped my student teacher and me from having success. In *An inquiry into a collaborative model of teaching English by native English-speaking teachers and local teachers*, **Luo (2014)** mentions four challenges when working together as co-teachers. They are: 1) "conceptual barriers – differences in teachers' perceptions of their roles", 2) "pragmatic barriers – challenges in finding time and resources to work collaboratively", 3) "attitudinal barriers – teachers' fear of trying something new" and 4) "professional barriers" – difficulties resulting from the lack of preparation to collaborate as an effective team" (p. 736). By knowing of the challenges in co-teaching, I have been

able to address them with my student teachers. This has helped us examine the differences and embrace them. In my experience, it has been good to have two teachers in the classroom at all times, even with our differences.

As I contemplated those differences, I read the article *When Two Heads Really Are Better Than One* by **Olsen and Williams (2015)**. The authors confirm the benefits of having two teachers with equal authority in the classroom. This “allowed for more flexibility in our activity, more energy in our discussions, and more meaningful ways of introducing students to literary studies” (p. 1). The article confirms why co-teaching can benefit the students. It also benefits the teachers as they can rely on each other, making the process of teaching less burdensome, especially for new teachers. In the last two years, I have been able to understand co-teaching better. I have had four student teachers and each experience has been different. The best part is researching more about co-teaching and implementing new ideas. Our professionalism has grown to the point that both teachers (student teacher and cooperating teacher) are of the same mentality. The keys to our success are flexibility and acknowledgement of each other’s strengths.

Luo (2014) talked about “pragmatic barriers” and “attitudinal barriers” (p. 736) and how they can arise. During my first year of teaching, I spent a lot of time planning my lessons and assessments, and reviewing my students’ work. I believe that embracing the communicative language approach has in certain ways made planning with another teacher easier. In *Teaching in tandem: Effective co-teaching in the inclusive classroom*, **Wilson and Blednick (2011)** mention several aspects about co-teaching and planning. The nature of the partnership is very important: “with whom and how teachers are paired to co-teach is fundamental to the success of co-teaching” (p. 36). This statement helps me

to appreciate the steps Utah State University has taken to foster those relationships before placing student-teachers. All of my student-teachers have previously been either a clinical student with me or taken a Spanish class with me. I have been given the choice of accepting or declining a student teacher. This has allowed both of us to forge a relationship before we become co-teachers. Having a good relationship has helped my student teacher and me to prepare lessons effectively. When we have different schedules and we cannot meet as often, every planning second counts. Wilson and Blednick further stress the importance of co-planning as without it there is just a senior teacher and an apprentice which is not the purpose of co-teaching.

In *Tips and strategies for co-teaching at the secondary level*, **Murawski and Dieker (2004)** emphasize the importance of the co-teacher not as a “glorified aide” (p. 52) but as an equal. I have noticed when I treat my student teacher as my equal and require the same from my students, instruction goes smoothly. Students seem to ask questions to both teachers and recognize both of us as experts in our content area.

In conclusion, when I started researching the topic of co-teaching, it was because of being placed in the position as a co-operating teacher. I wanted to know more, to be able to make a smooth transition for my students and to provide a good experience for the student teachers assigned to me. Most of all, I wanted to see if co-operating teaching benefits education in a foreign language. Co-teaching has proven beneficial in the second language classroom as both teachers (co-operating teacher and student teacher) are able to help each other but most importantly, it benefits the students. Students are able to hear different dialects of the language (in my case, Spanish) and draw from the different experiences both teachers have had.

DUAL LANGUAGE IMMERSION IN UTAH

For several years, I have been curious about the dual language immersion program in Utah and how it works. In this annotated bibliography, I will show my findings on Dual Language Immersion, benefits of the Utah DLI program, and some of the challenges that it faces.

Dual language education is not new in schools across the United States of America. **Smith and Arnot-Hopffer (2010)** based their research on a magnet school established in Tucson, AZ in 1981. This school taught in two languages at the request from parents in the area who wanted their children to learn both English and Spanish. Smith and Arnot-Hopffer mention benefits for DLI indicating that “it facilitates the development of both basic and advanced literacy in Spanish and English; ... allows Spanish dominant students to gain important content knowledge that will make the English they encounter more comprehensible; ... enhances overall cognitive and social development” (p. 261). Building on these findings, DLI has become a vehicle to help students acquire literacy in both languages. It is important to note that “the distribution of languages in DL programs should be seen as a dynamic response to local conditions and as an index of school/community commitment to the minority language” (p. 265).

The Commission on Language Learning of the American Academy of Arts & Sciences (2017) recently published a report on language learning which representatives from several universities in the United States of America co-authored. The report states that “by the time dual immersion classes reached the fifth grade, they were an average of seven months ahead in English reading skills compared with their peers in nonimmersion classrooms. By the eighth grade, students were a full academic year ahead, whether their

first language was English or another language” (p. 15). It is important to note that according to research, learning a L2 from a young age helps students develop literacy in both languages and “it helps students tackle the nuances and complexities of their first language as well” (p. 15).

Utah has implemented the DLI program on a large scale since 2009. **Fortune & Tedick (2008)** mention “three types of immersion programs [...]: one-way foreign language immersion, two-way immersion, and indigenous immersion” (p.4). A two-way immersion requires a third of the students in the class to speak the target language, while a one-way immersion does not require it. An indigenous immersion program is “immersion for Native People” (p. 11). Depending on the school district, it is common in Utah to see one-way immersion or two-way immersion.

Utah has adopted the 50-50 model. According to **Leite (2013)**, “in this model, students would spend half the day in an English classroom with an English teacher and the other half of the day in a Spanish classroom with a Spanish teacher” (p. 54). This is interesting to me because as a Spanish teacher, the moment I use English I have lost my students. It is definitely a good idea to have the languages separated and requiring a level of proficiency from the target language teachers. Also, it is interesting to me that the model chosen by Utah was 50-50 when there have been other models such as complete immersion or 90-10. Leite (2013) states that Utah’s early investigators and promoters of dual immersion “did not feel that their community would accept the 90/10 model because parents would be concerned about the development of English language literacy” (p.54). As it is, some people are weary of accepting instruction in a foreign language let alone most of the day in a foreign language setting. I believe it was a smart move to do the 50-

50 model, thus ensuring instruction in both languages and developing literacy in both languages at the same time.

In most programs established in other parts of the United States of America and Canada, parents were the main force for the immersion program. In, Utah, it is a combination of parents, educators, business and government. According to **Spicer-Escalante, Wade, and Leite (2015)**, this dual language immersion program is the hard work of four different stakeholders (government, education institutions, local businesses and the community) who were involved in the creation of the DLI program in Utah. “Legislators and business leaders believe this to be a critical long-term investment in the viability and vitality of Utah’s future economic competitiveness” (Roberts and Wade, 2012). As a teacher and as a mother I am satisfied with the decision made by the government, to work with every stakeholder to make education not only the best experience for our children but also to provide the tools needed for the 21st century.

Challenges

Every new program has its benefits and its challenges. The main problem for Utah has been finding qualified teachers in the state with an advanced-mid proficiency level on the oral proficiency interview (OPI). “The demand for licensed and proficient teachers outweighed the local supply, and the state chose to bring teachers in from outside of the United States” (Leite, 2013, p. 69). It is true that a native person might be an ideal speaker of the language; however, it does not mean that the person is the ideal candidate to teach it.

A second challenge to the program arises when parents and grandparents show hesitation toward the DLI program because students must do homework in the target

language at home and they (the relatives) cannot help them because they do not speak the language. **Beeman and Urow (2013)** offer some solutions. One of these solutions is to “continue reading to your child in your primary language; maintain close communication with your child’s teacher in order for you to be able to help your child at home” (p.53).

As a parent of DLI students, I have seen that the homework sent home is mostly in English with Spanish reading. Reading in the L1 will help the students continue developing their linguistic skills in that language.

A third problem with the DLI program is attrition. While other states in the nation may see that as one of the reasons as to why their program does not continue in the secondary grades, in the Utah DLI one of the parents’ responsibilities is to “commit to long-term participation in the language immersion program.” (Utah Spanish Dual Language Immersion, 2013). While it may not be a problem for certain families, it is a growing problem when families have to move from the area.

As the DLI program continues to grow in Utah, it is important to be informed of its progress and help families overcome the challenges it may present to them.

LOOKING FORWARD

As I conclude the Master of Second Language Teaching Program, I look forward to implementing my researching in communicative language teaching and the teaching of pragmatics in my teaching. I have enjoyed teaching at the secondary level and at the college level that I have the desire to continue researching the communicative approach and its implementation for students of K-12 as well as in college. For the next five years, I will be teaching Spanish Dual Immersion in middle school, preparing students to take the AP test. I will also be teaching in the Bridge Program at the high school level. I also want to become an advocate for L2 learning for all children from a young age.

REFERENCES

- Agbatogun, A.O. (2014). Developing learners' second language communicative competence through active learning: Clickers or communicative approach? *Educational Technology & Society*, 17(2), 257-269.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (2014). *Can-Do Statements: Progress Indicators for Language Learners*. Retrieved from http://www.actfl.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/Can-Do_Statements.pdf
- Aridon TV (2012). El Chavo del ocho – Clase de higiene. Retrieved from <https://youtu.be/QWTEfloF93Q>
- Ballman, T. L., Liskin-Gasparro, J.E., & Mandell, P.B. (2001). *The communicative classroom*. American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese, Vol. 3. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Beeman, K., & Urow, C. (2013). *Teaching for biliteracy: Strengthening bridges between languages* (pp. 66–77). Philadelphia, PA: Carlson, Inc.
- Beninghof, A. M. (2011). Co-teaching that works: Structures and strategies for maximizing student learning. Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons. Retrieved from <http://www.ebrary.com>
- Betti, S. (2013). "Hola Profe!" ¿Son corteses los jóvenes en el correo electrónico? Estudio de mensajes virtuales españoles e italianos (enseñanza y aprendizaje de la pragmática de una lengua extranjera). *Revista Española De Lingüística Aplicada (RESLA)*, 26, 67-89.
- Brown, R. (1977). "Introduction". In C. Snow & C. Ferguson (Eds), *Talking to children* (p.1-27). New York: Cambridge University Press

- Capra, L., & Medrano-Arroyo, S. (2015). *Shaping a lasting culture: Secondary dual language programs in Palm Beach county*. Palm Beach, FL: Palm Beach Schools.
- Capra, L., & Medrano-Arroyo, S. (2015). *Successes and Challenges of a Dual Language Program in a Large Urban School District*. Palm Beach, FL: Palm Beach Schools.
- Collier, V. P., & Thomas, W. P. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2(1), 1-20.
- Commission on Language Learning (2017). *America's Languages: Investing in language education in the 21st century*. Cambridge, MA: American Academy of Arts & Sciences. Retrieved from <https://www.amacad.org/language>
- Crawford, J. (2003). *Hard sell: Why is bilingual education so unpopular with the American public?* Tempe, AZ: Language Policy Research Unit, Education Policy Studies Laboratory, Arizona State University.
- Dieker, L.W. (2003). Co-teaching at the secondary level: Unique issues, current trends, and suggestions for success. *High School Journal*, 86(4), 1-19.
- Ellis, R. (1995). Interpretation tasks for grammar teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 87-105.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 221-246.
- Ellis, R. (2012). *Language teaching research pedagogy*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Finkel, D. L. (2000). *Teaching with your mouth shut*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Fortune, T.W., & Tedick, D.J. (2008). (Eds) *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving*

- perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 3-21). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Gatbonton, E., & Segalowitz, N. (2005). Rethinking communicative language teaching: A focus on access to fluency. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 61(3), 325-353.
- Genesee, F. (2008). Dual language in the global village. In T. W. Fortune & D. J. Tedick (Eds.), *Pathways to multilingualism: Evolving perspectives on immersion education* (pp. 22–45). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Gurunathan, N., & Geethanjali, N. (2016). The merits of communicative language teaching method in relation to L2. *Language in India*, 16(4), p. 111-117.
- Hampton, W. (1974). On teaching "tú" and "usted" to the beginner. *Hispania*, 57(3), 478–479.
- Helincks, K. (2015). Negotiation of terms of address in a Chilean television talk show. *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 92(7), 731-752.
- Hualde, J.I., Olarrea, A., Escobar, A.M., & Travis, C. (2010). *Introducción a la lingüística hispánica*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jaramillo, J. A. (1996). Tú and usted: Address etiquette in the Mexican American family. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 18(4), 522-532.
- Jennings, M. J. (2012). Teaching for results: Best practices in integrating co-teaching and differentiated instruction. Blue Ridge Summit, PA, USA: R&L Education. Retrieved from <http://www.ebrary.com>
- Koike, D. A., & Pearson, L. (2005). The effect of instruction and feedback in

- the development of pragmatic competence. *System*, 33(3), 481-501.
- Krashen, S. (1992). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Lincolnwood, IL: Laredo Publishing.
- Lambert, W. E., & Tucker, G. R. (1976). *Tu, vous, usted. A social-psychological study of address patterns*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Lee, J. F., & Van Patten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Leite, J. L. D. (2013). *Mainstreaming Dual Language Immersion: The Utah Model for Replicable and Sustainable Language Education* (Doctoral dissertation, Utah Valley University. School of Education).
- LoCastro, V. (2013). *Pragmatics for language educators: A sociolinguistic perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Luo, W. H. (2014). An inquiry into a collaborative model of teaching English by native English-speaking teachers and local teachers. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 23(3), 735-743.
- Marin, D. (1972). El uso de “tú” y “usted” en el español actual. *Hispania*, 55(4), 904-908.
- May, S. (2008). Bilingual/immersion education: What the research tells us. In J. Cummins & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education in bilingual education* (2nd ed., Vol. 5, pp. 19–34). New York, NY: Springer.
- Medrano, J. M. (2010). Cortesía, negociación de imagen y uso de los pronombres de segunda persona singular en el español de Costa Rica. *Español Actual*, (94),

141-165.

Merritt, A. (2013). Why learn a foreign language? Benefits of bilingualism. *The*

Telegraph. Retrieved from

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/educationopinion/10126883/Why-learn-a-foreign-language-Benefits-of-bilingualism.html>

Messick, S. (1996). Validity and washback in language testing. *ETS Research Report Series*, 1996(1), pp. 1-18.

Murawski, W. W., & Bernhardt, P. (2015 December/2016 January). *An*

Administrator's Guide to Co-Teaching, (pp 31-34). www.ascd.org

Murawski, W. W., & Dieker, L. A. (2004). Tips and strategies for co-teaching at the secondary level. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 36(5), 52-58.

Nahavandi, N. (2011). The effect of task-based activities on EFL learners' reading comprehension. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 2(1), 56-69.

Olson, R. & Williams, T. (2015, June 24). When two heads really are better than one. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from

<http://chronicle.com/article/When-Two-Heads-Really-Are/231095>

Office of Legislative Research and General Counsel (2014). How a Bill Becomes a Law in Utah. Utah: Salt Lake City.

Penny, R. (2002). *A history of the Spanish language* (2nd ed). Cambridge, UK:

Cambridge University Press.

Roberts, G., & Wade, O. (2012). *Utah's quest to mainstream dual language immersion for all students*. New Mexico: Dual Language Education of New Mexico.

- Rossiter, M. J., Derwing, T. M., Manimtim, L. G., & Thomson, R. I. (2010). Oral fluency: The neglected component in the communicative language classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 66(4), 583-606.
- Rule R277-499 (2018) provided for Seal of Biliteracy.
- Savignon, S. J. (2007). Beyond communicative language teaching: What's ahead? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(1), 207-220.
- Second Language Teaching and Research Center (2018). <https://12trec.utah.edu/utah-dual-immersion/index.php>. The Bridge Program – Advanced Language Pathway.
- Senate Bill 152 (2016) provided for Accelerated Language Course.
- Shrum, J. L., & Glisan, E. W. (2010). *Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage Learning.
- Smith P. H., & Arnot-Hopffer, E. (2010). Exito bilingüe: Promoting Spanish literacy in a dual language immersion program. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 22(2-4), 261-277.
- Soler-Espiauba, D. (2000). ¿Tú o Usted? *Praxis des neusprachlichen Unterrichts*, 47(2), 182-188.
- Spanish Bridge Project Team (2015). Bridge Course Description and Learning Outcomes. Utah: The University of Utah-Second Language Teaching and Research Center.
- Spanish Bridge Project Team (2016). Bridge Course Description and Learning Outcomes. Utah: The University of Utah-Second Language Teaching and Research Center.
- Spicer-Escalante, M.L., & DeJonge-Kannan, K. (2014). Cultural mismatch in pedagogy workshops: Training non-native teachers in communicative language teaching. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4(12), 2437-2444.

- Spicer-Escalante, M. L., & DeJonge-Kannan, K. (2016). Reflective Practitioners: Foreign-Language Teachers Exploring Self-Assessment. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, 4(4), 634.
- Spicer-Escalante, M., Wade, O., & Leite, J. (2015). *It takes a village to raise multilingual-multicultural children: The story of Utah dual language immersion*. Paper presented: 44th National Association of Bilingual Education. Las Vegas, NV. March.
- Sterling, M. (2016, August 25). Co-teaching is on the rise. *How to learn.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.howtolearn.com/2016/08/co-teaching-is-on-the-rise/>
- Unger, M. (2001). Equalizing the status of both languages in a dual immersion school. *Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition*, 5(1), 1-4.
- Utah Dual Language Immersion (2014). <http://www.utahdli.org/instructionalmodel.html>. Dual Language Immersion Instructional Time.
- Utah State Office of Education (2015, September). Utah's K-12 Dual Language Immersion. *USOE*, pp. 1-2
- Utah Dual Language Immersion (2016). DLI School List. *Utah State Office of Education*. <http://www.schools.utah.gov/CURR/dualimmersion/Home/SchoolList.aspx>
- Utah Spanish Dual Language Immersion (2013). <http://utahspanishdualimmersion.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/2013-14-spanish-immersion-pamphlet-V17.pdf>
- Terrell, T. D. (1980). A natural approach to the teaching of verb forms and function in Spanish. *Foreign Language Annals*, 13(2), 129–136.
- Thompson, G. (1996). Some misconceptions about communicative language teaching. *ELT Journal*, 50(1), 9-15.

Whitley, M.S. (2002). *Spanish/English contrasts: A course in Spanish linguistics* (2nd ed). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Wilson, G. L., & Blednick, J. (2011). *Teaching in tandem: Effective co-teaching in the inclusive classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Associate for Supervision & Curriculum Development (ASCD). Retrieved from <http://www.ebrary.com>