

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Plan B and other Reports

Graduate Studies

5-2020

Journeying Into a New World: Constructing a New Identity Through Language Acquisition

Hyrum Hansen
Utah State University

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



Part of the [Applied Linguistics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hansen, Hyrum, "Journeying Into a New World: Constructing a New Identity Through Language Acquisition" (2020). *All Graduate Plan B and other Reports*. 1452.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports/1452>

This Report 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.



JOURNEYING INTO A NEW WORLD: CONSTRUCTING A NEW IDENTITY
THROUGH LANGUAGE ACQUISITION

By

Hyrum Hansen

A portfolio submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTERS OF SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING

Approved:

Dr. Joshua J. Thoms
Major Professor

Dr. Sarah Gordon
Committee Member

Dr. Abdulkafi Albirini
Committee Member

Dr. Bradford Hall
Department Head

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY

Logan, Utah

2020

Copyright © Hyrum Hansen

All rights reserved

ABSTRACT

Journeying into a New World: Constructing a New Identity through Language Acquisition

By

Hyrum Hansen: Master of Second Language Teaching
Utah State University, 2020Major Professor: Dr. Joshua J. Thoms
Department: Languages, Philosophy, and Communication Studies

The following portfolio represents the author's experiences and studies while he has participated in the Master of Second Language Teaching (MSLT) program. It is the result of the author's teaching experiences abroad and at Utah State University, his teaching observations of peers and colleagues, and insights from his studies in the MSLT program.

The portfolio is divided into three major sections, namely: teaching perspectives; research perspectives; and an annotated bibliography. The teaching perspectives demonstrate the author's beliefs in regard to communicative language teaching and identity construction and their importance in the language acquisition process. The research perspectives further deal with identity and involve two papers written on the subject during the MSLT program. The bibliography discusses the use of technology in enhancing the skill of second language (L2) listening.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to begin by expressing deep gratitude and thanks to my Heavenly Father. I came to the MSLT program to fulfill his purposes and designs although I still do not know what those are yet. I also thank my father Gerald Hansen for teaching me as a young boy to love languages and cultures, especially the French language and culture. I would not have had all the opportunities to travel and gain the education I have if it were not for him. I also express deep gratitude for my mother who has been a quiet support and strength to me throughout my life. I hope she knows that I recognize her efforts and love.

I express the utmost gratitude to Dr. Karin deJonge-Kannan. If it were not for Karin, I would not have been in this program. Her immense effort to patiently work with me as a student, her teaching and guidance, have molded me and have not only made me a better student, but a better human being. Her efforts have not gone unnoticed, and I will be forever grateful for her tireless hours of work and her wise counsel. Likewise, I also express gratitude for the immense patience of Dr. Christa Jones and Dr. Caroline Mosser and for their goodness towards me. I am sure that working with me in my first semester as a French professor was not the easiest nor most delightful experience for them. But I am grateful to them for not giving up on me and working with me and showing me where I can improve. I also express my gratitude to Dr. Sarah Gordon, who was patient with me as well during a time when I was still, in certain ways, catching up in the program. I am grateful for her kindness and friendly personality. I express my gratitude to Dr. Joshua Thoms and Dr. Bradford Hall. Dr. Hall gave me opportunities that I needed early in the program to gain confidence and improve as a teacher and to feel more welcome in the

program. Dr. Thoms has, like others, demonstrated substantial patience with me as a student and has been an amazing help. He is a good friend and I am grateful to him for his efforts and long hours on my behalf. I am also grateful to Dr. Abdulkafi Albirini who I also consider a good friend and who took extra time to speak with me after classes and entertain some of my linguistic hobbies and interests. I am grateful for his efforts in helping me become a better researcher and writer and for his friendship.

I am grateful to the friends that I have made while in the program and throughout my travels as well. Thank you to Roberto Ausin, a dear friend who, in my lowest moments in the program and my moments of greatest loneliness, was there as a friend to lift me with good Spanish humor and sarcasm. Thank you to “Número Dos” (Hyrum Checketts) who also is a dear friend and who also reached out to me in serious moments of loneliness and need. Thank you to Chuson Chang, his wife Abbey, and their friend Kuntai, all of whom I consider my Taiwanese family. Chuson, especially, demonstrated sacrifice and charity on my behalf in ways that I have not and will not forget. Thank you to Chris Capitain, my Navajo brother and friend, for dragging me all around Ft. Hall and Pocatello and trying to help me fulfill my dream of working with Native American tribes to revitalize their languages. Also, thanks to Mardel and professor Drusilla Gould of Idaho State University, my Shoshone friends, who befriended me and sought to aid me in this endeavor as well. Finally, I express my gratitude to all of my Peruvian friends whom I consider my Peruvian family, not only for trying to help me understand Peruvian culture and Spanish on a deeper level but for demonstrating towards me kindness and charity, for being examples of Christ and testaments of his doctrine (especially the doctrine of the resurrection), and for teaching me more deeply the lesson of humility. In fact, everyone

in my program for three years has been part of a long process of my Heavenly Father teaching me the lesson of humility. To any of you whom I have not named, I express gratitude to you as well for being part of this process. I am grateful for all of you who are my friends. I express my love to you and say thank you!

(105 pages)

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF ACRONYMS	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
TEACHING PERSPECTIVES.....	2
Professional Environment.....	3
Teaching Philosophy Statement.....	4
Professional Development through Teaching Observation	16
RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES	20
CULTURE PAPER.....	21
Introduction & Reflection.....	22
Indigenous Heritage Language Programs: Are They Sustainable?	24
LANGUAGE PAPER.....	51
Introduction & Reflection.....	52
Identity Construction and its Significance on Motivation and Classroom Pedagogy	54
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY	71
LOOKING FORWARD	84
REFERENCES	85

LIST OF ACRONYMS

TPS = Teaching Philosophy Statement

CLT = Communicative Language Teaching

MSLT = Masters of Second Language Teaching

DLI = Dual Language Instruction

HLI = Heritage Language Instruction

NAM HLI = Native American Heritage Language Instruction

NASC = Native American Student Counsel

CMC = Computer Mediated Communication

SCT = Sociocultural Theory

L2 = Second Language

CALL = Computer Assisted Language Learning

INTRODUCTION

This portfolio represents the accumulation of my work and studies in the MSLT program at Utah State University as well as experiences abroad. It details my beliefs and perspectives on what second language teaching (SLT) ought to include and it features subjects of interest that are important to me in my teaching and for my journey as a teacher.

The portfolio is divided into three main sections. The first section is the teaching perspectives, of which my teaching philosophy statement (TPS) is the centerpiece. In this piece, I outline the importance of communicative language teaching and its key role in the language acquisition process. I also speak about the importance of motivation and engaging students in the classroom and the importance of identity in language learning.

The second section presents research perspectives and is comprised of two papers, a culture paper and a language paper. The culture paper addresses the importance of indigenous heritage language teaching programs and why they are beneficial. The language paper addresses identity's key role in language acquisition. It specifically deals with identity construction and cross-cultural communication and the importance of the community in helping construct an L2 identity.

The third section is an annotated bibliography dealing with the enhancement of L2 listening skills through the aid of technology. It reviews a selection of existing literature on cognitive processing of information that is present mainly in aural form. It then discusses the use of technological aids, especially subtitles and captions, in promoting L2 listening skills.

TEACHING PERSPECTIVES

PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Once I finish with my program at Utah State University, I intend to go into the field of ESL and teach at a university or secondary education level. Most of my career to this point has been in the field of ESL, which I enjoy. I have tried to cover all age ranges in my teaching, so that I can be marketable and flexible in the types of jobs I will consider in the future. In the end, I hope to be teaching university or secondary-age students ESL either in the U.S. or abroad. I prefer abroad since this has been the context of my experience up to this point. As such, the majority of my portfolio's content is directed towards teaching and learning issues related to ESL learners in university and/or secondary educational contexts.

TEACHING PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

Introduction

I vividly remember my first encounter learning a second language. I was eight years old and my dad called me to the living room, sat me on the couch, popped a Pimsleur French tape into the cassette player and said, “you’re now going to learn French.” So, I did what every good, obedient eight-year-old would do and I sat on the couch for forty-five minutes, first listening to a French conversation and then breaking it down and repeating phrases and words after the instructor. Thus began my journey of language learning and acquisition. I have come a long way since being exposed to this initial method.

Throughout my time in the MSLT program, I have been able to continue this journey as I have explored, challenged myself, and grown. These experiences and training have been key in helping me form my perspective on what it means to be a skilled and effective language teacher. While I cannot detail in this teaching philosophy every effective method, principle, or scenario, I do outline and explain the most important aspects of my teaching and how I feel I can reach the minds and hearts of my students. These key aspects of my teaching include: communicative language teaching (CLT), building relationships with students to better engage them in their language learning, and helping them to find their personal identity not only in the classroom, but within the context of the new language community within which they find themselves.

Communicative Language Teaching

As a result of my teaching experiences abroad, I have been able to realize that there are some places where CLT is still not implemented and, when it is carried out, can

be badly misunderstood. This is due to CLT's multifaceted nature (Maestre, 2016). Many find it difficult to succinctly define what CLT is. Here, I discuss the three aspects that I feel are a key part of CLT. Communicative language teaching is an approach which combines teaching form with a focus on communication and making meaning (Vanpatten, Williams, & Rott, 2004), communicative competence (Savignon, 1972), and on the role of interaction in second language learning (Long, 1996). Meaning, competence, and interaction are thus central to my approach, as are form and context.

Combining Form and Meaning Making

The first component of CLT is finding the balance in teaching form and focusing on communication and meaning making. From my experience in the teaching positions I have taken, and under the administrations I have worked for and the curricula they were promoting, I have seen a heavy focus on form and very little energy dedicated to meaning making and communication. When Long first used the term "Focus on Form" he stated:

Focus on form is probably a key feature of second language instruction...I do not think, on the other hand, that there is any evidence that an instructional program built around a series (or even a sequence) of isolated *forms* is any more supportable now... than it was when Krashen and others attacked it several years ago (Long, 1988, p. 136).

Certainly, teaching form is an important component of the language teaching process (Long even suggests that it is key), and it is important that a language learner understand how to form grammatical constructions and speak correctly. However, when a focus or emphasis on making meaning is absent, I believe that a teacher has missed the mark and that a crucial part of language teaching is missing. Celik (2018) says that "the

history of ideas is full of clashes and attempts of correction of previous notions” (p. 204).

I do not believe that focus on form and a focus on meaning making should clash. I believe, like others (Long, 1991; Long, 1998; Long & Robinson, 1998; Savignon, 2018; Spada & Lightbown, 2009), that they should be integrated and complement each other.

Looking back, it is necessary to note that meaning-focused instruction developed as a reaction to a dissatisfaction with a form-focused approach. A focus on meaning in instructional methods exposes learners to the target language in context of its usage to create incidental acquisition of the target language. Its focus is to enable the learner of a second language to communicate effectively in real-world situations (Celik, 2018). This is also my goal as a second language instructor. I want my students to be able to use the language in real-world contexts. However, my approach is one that is balanced and tempered that blends both a focus on form as well as a focus on making meaning. Grammar should be taught as part of the scaffolding that enables a learner to be able to communicate, but communication is the focus (Ballman et al., 2001; Pica, 2000).

In my classroom, I use a lot of task-based activities to get my students communicating, such as roleplays, information-gap exercises, dialogues, among other activities. I also value group and pair work. For instance, when teaching ESL in Peru, I used a task to help students learn to make phone calls. We reviewed grammar and pragmatic forms of politeness on a worksheet to help scaffold their learning of how to answer calls and give information and request a callback. I then put them in pairs and gave them time to practice using what they had learned. They role played and practiced calling in and asking for their peers’ information and then leaving a message with their imaginary boss. Another activity I did with another class was restaurant orders. I took 10-

12 minutes at the beginning of class presenting grammar (i.e., modal verbs of politeness and request) and food vocabulary directly, but we then spent the rest of the class in groups writing menus and role-playing ordering food in a restaurant in the communicative part of the lesson. While grammar was taught explicitly, the point was to get students using the language in context, in a real-world situation that would be meaningful and help them function. What this means in my classroom then is that, while I may take some time to teach and practice grammatical or lexical forms explicitly, the majority of class time is dedicated to equipping students with the ability to effectively communicate in the second language via meaningful, real-world tasks.

Communicative Competence

The second component of the definition of CLT that I find particularly useful is helping my students develop communicative competence. Communicative competence entails multiple other competencies, including linguistic competence (Chomsky, 1957; 1965), discourse competence (Canale, 1983), actional competence (Celce-Murcia, 1995), pragmatic competence (Chomsky, 1980), sociolinguistic/sociocultural competence (Hymes, 1972), and strategic competence (Canale & Swain, 1980). Communicative competence entails being able to make meaningful communication where learners are “involved on their own terms and create their own meaning” instead of learning language for predicted contexts of use (Illes & Ackan, 2017, p. 4).

I agree with Moss’s (2005) suggestion that the most appropriate way to teach communicative competence is through an interactive classroom. There are a couple of ways that I go about creating an interactive classroom. First, my classrooms are student-centered. I do this by promoting choice and autonomy in my classrooms, by using open-

ended question techniques, engaging in explicit instruction, encouraging student collaboration and projects, encouraging student reflection, and getting students involved in group and community activities and projects outside of class that they can then discuss and reflect on in class. Secondly, I use technology in my classroom. I use technology like Kahoot to incorporate student input and gather live feedback. I also use technology to gamify content while also using technologies like Powtoon, Plotagon, PowerPoint, Prezi, and others to let students create and share content. In addition, I allow students to use smartphones in class and incorporate various apps like Bounceapp so that they can interact with me and others in real time. Finally, through teacher-student interaction, I initiate and sustain interaction. I am able to do this by using class discussion to help students develop and understand concepts, by giving feedback to my students, and by modeling the language for my students.

Focus on Interaction

Teacher-student interaction is important in my classrooms partly because it allows me to help my students develop their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Lev Vygotsky (1978) introduced the concept of ZPD which he defines as “the distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with a more capable peer” (p. 86). The idea behind ZPD is that learners construct the new target language through socially mediated interaction with a more experienced or capable peer or instructor. Although part of a more cognitively oriented view of second language acquisition, Long (1985) emphasized the importance of interactional modifications between learners and their instructors, learners and native

second language speakers, or between learners themselves for acquisition as these interactional modifications constitute learners negotiating meaning. Such interactions include simplifications, comprehension checks, contextual cues, elaborations, repetitions/paraphrasing, and requests for clarification. Through my interaction with my students, I am able to monitor and give feedback where needed as they interact and seek to increase their language skills.

Teacher-student interaction is not the only type of interaction in my classroom as I also emphasize peer interaction through group work and projects. Group work is part of active learning, which is also what I am seeking as a teacher; I want my students to be active learners. Working in groups and pairs, students have the opportunity to co-construct meaning, create meaningful and purposeful interaction(s) through language, and experiment with different or new ways of saying things, all of which can be part of the process of negotiation of meaning (Rich, 2016) and assisting learners with/through their ZPDs.

Engagement

On another level, group work also encourages not only increased interaction but also greater engagement in my classroom and thus helps my students to be more motivated. An important goal of mine is to have my students engaged the entire time during a class meeting. According to Paris (as cited in Philp & Duchesne, 2016), engagement is a multifaceted and multidimensional construct composed of three aspects: cognitive, behavioral, and emotional. In my classroom, I seek to engage my students in all three ways.

Cognitive engagement consists of sustained mental effort and attention that often implies self-regulation strategies (Helme & Clarke, 2001). Cognitive engagement can take the form of questioning, completing peer utterances, exchanging ideas, making evaluative comments, giving directions, explanations, or information, justifying an argument, and making gestures and facial expressions. Stobaugh (2019) discusses different aspects of the “thinking-based classroom” (p. 5) where the educational focus is on building skills rather than simply the acquisition of knowledge. This is my focus as a teacher. I am not just trying to inform my students about the languages I teach, I am there to build their language skills. They need to be able to learn how to self-regulate in order to do this. Every class period for me is a class that should be an engaging time where students know that they are not just going to come and learn something, but they are going to do something with what they learn and demonstrate that they have mastered a skill.

I focus on skill development and cognitive engagement by encouraging divergent ways of problem solving, focusing on the learning process, encouraging a learning classroom culture rather than a testing culture, encouraging student discussion and diverse ideas and solutions, and providing my students with authentic, intellectually demanding work. By encouraging divergent ways of problem solving, I am encouraging my students to take risks. I do this in class by communicating to students that it is ok to sometimes fail, helping them to defer judgement, and getting them to continue thinking outside the box. Again, by helping students put failure in perspective, I help them focus more on learning and the growing process. In this way, I help them realize that learning a language is not about testing. Tests give us an idea of where we are and what level we are

currently at, but they are not the purpose of language learning. In my classroom, I use authentic materials that push my students and I encourage student discussion. In doing this, I expose my students to real language, relate the content to my students' needs, increase their motivation, and bring cultural information to their attention (Al-Azri & Al-Rashdi, 2014; Clarke 1989; Peacock 1997; Richards, 2001).

Behavioral engagement can be defined as how students interact with the teacher, their peers, and the course content (Nguyen, Cannata, & Miller, 2016). According to research, a strong, positive relationship between student and teacher is critical for increasing student behavioral engagement (Cooper, 2014; Yazzie-Mintz & McCormick, 2012). This is again why interaction is such an important part of my classroom. The rapport that I establish with my students, in many ways, is at the heart of my teaching approach which can affect their ability to focus and succeed. Martin (2006) found that teachers who are confident and enjoy teaching demonstrate pedagogical efficacy. For example, being able to test and try out alternative courses of action when initial success is not met or an enhanced ability to deal with a problem by using cognitive and emotional processes related to the situation. Affective orientations in class can also have a positive impact on student engagement and motivation and help their students gain confidence in their abilities as well. Zepke and Leach (2010) give ten suggestions for improving student engagement, several of which I agree with and strive to implement in my classroom, including: enhancing students' self-belief, helping students to work more autonomously over time, enjoying learning relationships with others, feeling they are competent in achieving their own objectives, and creating learning that is active, collaborative, and fosters learning relationships.

Emotional engagement can be defined as students' feelings of connection, or lack thereof, with the workings of their school including the people within the school (Yazzie-Mintz, 2009). Emotional engagement can also be defined as a student's motivation to be involved during activities, such as their enthusiasm and interest in, as well as their enjoyment of, the task (Skinner, Kindermann, & Furrer, 2009), and a sense of purposefulness and autonomy (Baralt, Gurzynski-Weiss, & Kim, 2016). In order to help my students emotionally connect, I use various techniques including humor, incorporating their interests into the content/lesson, and encouraging autonomy.

Garner (2006) reviews how using humor can lead to reduced anxiety and stress, enhanced self-esteem and motivation, a shared understanding and common psychological bond between students and teachers, as well as lowering a student's defenses and improving the ability to focus and attend to information better. If I make a mistake in front of the class, I make a joke out of it and demonstrate that I know how to laugh at myself. Sometimes I will add humorous questions to tests and class assignments. Depending on the level of students I am teaching, I may come dressed up funny. Sometimes I will purposely bring jokes or gags to class or ask students to share jokes in class. When done in an appropriate manner, jokes can be a great way to help students gain greater social-cultural competence.

To help my students find interest in content, I begin by listening to them to incorporate their interests in class, ask them what they think is relevant, give them choices, and try to connect what we are learning to their lives. Zepke and Leach (2010) state that by giving students choice and promoting self-determination, it creates the conditions necessary to help students feel competent and develop self-efficacy. In Peru, I

taught an English as a Foreign Language course on writing, and at the beginning of the semester I made a list with my class of the topics they wanted to discuss and write about. I also let them tell me what kind of writing styles (e.g., writing for exams, writing for a professional career, literary writing) they thought would be applicable to their careers and life goals. In this way, I was also able to help them gain a sense of purpose for attending my class and gain autonomy. Throughout the duration of the class, this led to students being more engaged in the various activities and more successfully gaining competence because they were studying topics that mattered and were personal to them. Having students be engaged in a second language classroom is also closely tied to their identity.

The Importance of Identity in SLA

As engagement can have an impact on students' motivation, so too does identity. In fact, Oyserman and Destin (2010) discuss identity-based motivation and propose that if activities are not identity congruent, then they will be seen as too difficult by the learner and thus the learner will give up in pursuing a skill. Synthesizing previous research, Morgan and Clarke (2011) claim that identity is “the psychic, social and semiotic work necessary to sustain a sense of unity and sameness across time and space” (p. 1). McNamara, Hansen, and Liu (as cited in Norton, 2013) suggest that it is an individual's attempt to understand their relationship to the world. While it is ultimately the responsibility of my students to construct an L2 identity and move into a larger world or an L2 community, I as a teacher can play a role in this process by helping to facilitate the environment where students both in the classroom and outside the classroom are exposed to the target culture. By being exposed to the target culture they can learn to both assimilate into and differentiate themselves from others within the community thus finding their

individual identity. I can play a role in helping empower my students and give them the tools necessary to achieve self-determination and define themselves.

Noels (2009) advocates for self-determination and autonomy suggesting that in relation to one's social world, they are "central for developing the sense that a new language is one's own language and that one could become an active participant in another language community" (p. 295). Sa'd (2017) helps us understand that when an individual learns a second/foreign language, they are reconstructing their identity and Muramatsu (2013) suggests that as part of this process, "L2 learners are not passive participants in the process of learning an L2 but individuals who can make deliberate choices" (p. 44). For me, learning to be able to actively engage in a new community is one of the most exciting processes. It is also pivotal because if I can't find my identity, I lose the desire to want to be part of that community. Even worse is the horrifying feeling of being trapped in that culture or language community where I am not able to make my own independent decisions, negotiate my identity, or take care of myself independently because I can't function independently in the language. Independent decision making is a necessary aspect of individual identity. This is not only embarrassing but can be dangerous if I don't have control of my own life and decisions. While this notion is not anything new, it is important to underscore that the ability to be independent and autonomous in a new language and community is critical and it is ultimately what I seek as a second language instructor for my students: a self-determined second language speaker who can actively engage and construct their own world and identity.

Conclusion

My task as a second language teacher is to take a student on a similar journey to the one I have taken and bring them into a new world (i.e., a new language community) and help them understand what part they play in that new world. My craft of performing this task can be summarized in three parts. First, I have a focus on communication and making meaning while interacting with others and being able to competently show that one has gained a skill rather than simply performed exercises. Second, engaging my students, maintaining a positive teacher-student relationship with them, using their interests and goals in class, and finding unique and sometimes out-of-the-norm ways to engage them on all three levels of engagement (i.e., cognitive, behavioral, and emotional) is how I show that I care about my students. This engagement plays a key role in my helping them find joy in their own journey. Third, helping students take the journey of finding their new identity in this new world that they will enter, helping them come to know themselves and be able to make deliberate choices through communicative competence and understanding their relationship with this world is what my teaching is all about.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH TEACHING OBSERVATION

Introduction

Observing other teachers and how they try to improve their craft is one of the most enjoyable parts of being a teacher myself. The opportunity to see things from a different perspective is both enlightening and insightful for me. Professional development through observation helps me to see where I can grow as a teacher and improve in how I affect students' learning. Making contrasts and comparisons from my observations has allowed me to see both my strengths and weaknesses and to be able to take a self-inventory and make a plan for growth and improvement. My opportunities to observe my peers and others during my time here in the MSLT program has been richly rewarding. I have had the opportunity to observe Chinese, Spanish, and French courses and each one has allowed me to widen my perspective and see myself through a new lens.

Use of the L1

One of the first things that stood out to me was the percentage of use of the L1 in the classroom. It is an accepted notion today that a teacher will spend most of their time (90% or more) in the target language (ACTFL, 2015). Speaking in the target language 90% of the time allows a constant and steady stream of input. It also exposes students to a more real-world environment and prepares them for when they will have to deal with the real world. I have observed all of my peers stay in the L1 I would say close to 90% of the time. However, I also noticed with lower level courses there was much more use of the L1. This was helpful for me to see because my first teaching experience was in China with a British school administration that said absolutely zero L1. This was really confusing at times for my three-year-old students, who had a difficult time processing

instruction or the content being taught. The school administration would not let me give directions in Chinese. Consequently, I struggled with not only classroom management but also helping students understand certain concepts about English. Likewise, at other institutions where I have taught, I have observed the same response of zero L1 ever and I have watched other teachers again run into roadblocks in their teaching, where certain concepts are not understood and/or little interaction and conversation takes place because students are not processing what they need to be able to process.

The times when I saw my peers here at USU speak in the L1 helped me understand that under certain circumstances it is necessary to use the L1. I learned that these circumstances include: explaining more difficult concepts, giving instructions or reiterating instructions that were originally given in the L2, and explaining meanings of words or grammar points (Tang, 2002). For instance, one teacher in particular I saw teaching the difficult concept of the subjunctive mood. This teacher was able to stay mostly in the L2 by using visuals and volunteer students as models to help him discuss the invented situations of the characters that served as context for the subjunctive lesson. However, there were moments teaching the subjunctive verb form when he broke into English in order to explain that indicative verb forms state that something will happen whereas subjunctive forms state that something might happen. He used the L1 because he needed to make sure that the concept got through to the students.

Grammar

One class that I observed spent the entire class time teaching grammar. While I typically do not do this myself, it was interesting for me to see how the teacher handled this. At the beginning of class, the teacher asked students how to form the reflexive in

Spanish. They spent about five minutes explaining the grammar point and soliciting examples from students. He then put images on the screen that asked students to distinguish between whether they would use reflexive or reciprocal verbs in each situation. He then let them go and work for about ten minutes. I noticed that the teacher didn't spend more than six minutes explaining a grammar point and they skipped around to teaching superlatives and comparatives in the same lesson. What I thought was good about this teacher's technique was that they didn't spend too much time talking about the grammar explicitly, but let students get to work doing tasks and learning how to use the grammar. I did feel that teaching too much grammar and skipping around was not a wise idea. I feel there may be a danger in overloading students with too many principles at once.

Another teacher I observed teach grammar used the Present, Practice, Produce method. They presented an image of the painting Guernica and then gave the students a handout with a short story about Pablo Picasso on it and let the students discuss the story. The story was in past simple tense and when the class came together after a two or three minute pair discussion the teacher then proceeded through class discussion to point out the verbs in past tense. They worked out several examples together. I liked the guided discussion because it allowed for modeling and clarifying concepts that students needed to understand. I could also see that by starting the class off with pair discussion it immediately engaged students in interaction.

Modeling

Something that I have struggled with as a teacher is modeling. Because of anxiety I have been prone to want to jump right into an activity giving basic instructions to my

students and then just letting them go. I also feel that modeling is a highly effective technique and one of the main components that effective teachers use. Miska (2004) states that “modeling can often make the unclear clearer.” From my previous paragraph I think that this is apparent. I watched one teacher who was explaining different gestures from Spain and what they meant. Obviously, he had to model in this case but it was a very effective way of getting students engaged and involved in learning about Spanish culture. Moreover, I could see that it made processing information easier and students were quickly able to produce the same gestures and use them in conversation and interaction.

Another teacher I observed used students to model a story in the past tense. This was effective not only as a visual aid, but he had them playing characters which meant that they also had to be using the L2. The teacher included other students in the story and they also had to use dialogue after he modeled the dialogue and then prompted them with questions to use the same dialogue and grammar. This was highly effective in engaging the students and helped me realize that the more I can promote student participation, modeling, and interaction in my own teaching, the better I can engage them and help them process what they will be doing.

RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES

CULTURE PAPER

Indigenous Heritage Language Programs: Are they Sustainable?

INTRODUCTION AND REFLECTION

For the last ten years, I have had a substantial interest in indigenous languages of the Americas and have wanted the opportunity to study and learn them. Upon undertaking this endeavor, I realized very quickly how difficult it was to learn these languages, not because they are somehow more challenging than learning any other language, but rather because of the scarcity of language learning materials and the necessity to be physically present with those who speak the language. As I undertook to understand how I could learn these languages I became interested in the process of language revitalization and curriculum development. Once I entered the MSLT program this desire simply augmented. The MSLT program then opened my eyes to the importance of identity in the process of language acquisition. I became increasingly interested in how identity relates to the field of indigenous languages and cultures.

I began writing this paper in my course on Dual Language Immersion (DLI) programs. What I was learning in this course, the new ideas and concepts, were exciting for me and still are as I plan on being a part of indigenous language revitalization efforts in my future work. Because of the studies that I undertook in the DLI course and my opportunities to be involved in this field, I have come to recognize the serious importance of identity for indigenous people and its key role in language revitalization efforts, and I simply wanted to research the topic more.

Abstract

This paper reviews a selection of the literature that has been written on the subject of indigenous language revitalization. It begins by talking about the current state of indigenous languages in the United States and discusses briefly the history of why indigenous languages are in danger. It then discusses the benefits of having Native American Heritage Language programs and the challenges that they currently face which include a lack of curricular materials, a shortage of teachers, challenges with technology, and a lack of community involvement and support. The article finally uses several case studies as examples of both the challenges and the successes.

Keywords: heritage language instruction, identity, multilingualism, revitalization, language immersion

Introduction

There is a growing percentage of individuals in the United States whose first language is something other than English (Kim et al., 2015). Along with this increase in non-native English speakers, heritage language instruction has also gained considerable traction and there is a growing interest in revitalization efforts of Native American languages. As I have experienced in personal interaction in the educational context of the Shoshone tribe in Idaho, Native American Heritage Language Instruction is a complex and controversial issue. It touches on themes dealing with politics, culture, language, sociology, education, ethics, and identity. In their article on multi literacies, the New London Group (1996) states that we now live in globalized society that is becoming increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse. They discuss efforts to create the conditions for full social participation and trying to ensure that differences such as culture, gender, and language are not barriers to educational success.

The following research looks into one of the many subcultures that the New London Group discusses, namely indigenous cultures and Native American Heritage languages. It investigates the increasing critical state of these heritage languages, the sensitive issues connected with this topic, and the efforts that are being undertaken to sustain these programs.

In this review, I ask the following questions as I summarize the progress that is being made in this field: 1) what is being done to promote and revitalize languages which are in danger of dying out? 2) which programs have been the most successful and why? 3) what are the ongoing challenges as these programs look to the future? and 4) are these programs sustainable?

Current State of Native American Languages

According to the 2006-2010 U.S. Census Bureau, approximately 169 Native North American languages are spoken within the country. The speakers of these languages number less than half a million. The 20 most-spoken Native American languages have speakers numbering generally no more than 20,000 and more commonly around 2,000-3,000 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). These languages are being lost quickly as elders (i.e., generally the only people who speak the language) are dying and taking with them their language and cultural heritage. Berlin (2000) states:

Today, of the 175 indigenous languages spoken in the United States, it has been reported that only about 20, or 11%, are still being transmitted to children in the traditional way (Krauss, 1996). The remaining languages “in use” are spoken by the parental generation and up with an increasing percentage spoken by only a few elderly adults (p. 2).

What’s even more of a concern is that tribal reports suggest that fewer and fewer children are learning their indigenous languages as a first language, if at all (Adley-Santa Maria, 1997; Batchelder & Markel, 1997; McCarty, Watahomigie, & Yamamoto, 1999; McCarty & Zepeda, 1995), and data suggests that if there is no form of intervention, soon these languages will move towards becoming extinct (Crawford, 1995; Fishman, 1996a, 1996b; Hinton, 1994; Krauss, 1996; McCarty & Zepeda, 1995). Fishman (1991) introduced the idea of a Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale, likening it to earthquake activity in regards the danger that minority languages face. On one end of the scale, the language is used in most levels of society including government and media; on the other end, only a few, isolated elderly speakers speak the language. Most Native

American languages lean towards the latter side of the scale. So how did we get here? To answer this question, we have to take a brief look at the history of Native American education and the cultural clash with white European America.

Early Native American Education

The beginning of European intervention in Native American culture and education began with the impact of colonization and with European missionaries. While some European missionaries like John Eliot learned Native American languages early on in the process and used them as languages of instruction, later efforts to educate Native Americans under the legacy of assimilation sought to completely eradicate these languages and cultures (Huerta, 2007).

Early on, Spanish conquistadors arrived and implemented the *encomienda* system exploiting Native Americans in slave labor for the purpose of gaining wealth. The law of Burgos required Spaniard landowners “to provide for ‘the salvation of their souls...and the conservation of their lives’” (Heath, 1972, p. 8) and when landowners failed to look after Native American education, the responsibility fell on Catholic friars who also frequently neglected Native Americans.

As Protestant missionaries arrived on the scene, education continued to be used as a form of conversion. Missionaries like John Eliot began early on by giving instruction in the native language (L1) of the indigenous tribes, mainly using Algonquin (Ronda, 1981) for the purpose of conversion to Christianity as well as a limited education. Eleazar Wheelock and his Mohegan student Occom (the founders of Dartmouth College) are another very well-known example of missionary efforts to educate and assimilate Native Americans.

Beginning in 1879, the Carlisle Industrial School was opened as the first Native American boarding school and thus began the legacy of boarding schools in the US. Native American boarding schools represent a tragic legacy embodying victimization and loss of culture. The purpose of these institutions was to “assimilate Native people into mainstream society and eradicate Native cultures” (Davis, 2001, p. 20). It was during this period that systematic loss of Native American languages and culture began. Administrators cut Native Americans’ hair, changed their dressing habits, diets, and names, subjected them to militaristic regiments and discipline, introduced unfamiliar concepts of time and space, and suppressed tribal languages and cultural practices with an aim to replace them with English, Christianity, athletic activities, and a ritual calendar intended to further patriotic citizenship. Native Americans were taught manual labor and industrial and domestic skills following Anglo-American gender roles. Unfortunately, all of this led to confusion, alienation, homesickness, and resentment among Native Americans (Davis, 2001), not to mention a loss of identity.

Benefits and Importance of Preserving Native American Languages

The first benefit and foremost in importance for Native American Heritage Language Instruction (NAM HLI) programs is helping Native American youth and tribal members regain their identity. McNamara, Hansen, and Liu (as cited in Norton, 2013) define identity as an individual’s attempt to understand their relationship to the world, how that relationship is built across time and space, and how people see their possibilities for the future. Norton (1997) mentions that identity relates to a person’s need for recognition, their willingness to affiliate, and their desire for psycho-social security and safety. Stockton (2015) defines ‘identity’ by the following terms: culture, language,

ethnicity, social identity, race, gender, academic or literate identity, national identity, and class.

Identity is critical because it guides our choices (Oyserman, Elmore, & Smith, 2012). Language, of course, helps craft and construct our identity (Sa'd, 2017) as it is a part of our culture and heritage. When culture and heritage are lost, a piece of our identity is also lost and when that takes place, social bonds are broken which has a negative effect on our social well-being as well as our physical and mental health (Dastgoshadeh & Jalilzadeh, 2011). Tabouret-keller (1997, as cited in Kamwangamalu, 2007) states that the link between language and identity is so strong that a single feature of language use suffices to identify someone's membership in a given group. To give a personal example of this link, this was very apparent to me one day when, after being asked to substitute for a class on the Fort Hall Reservation, I had a student who was struggling with anger issues and dealing with his peers in an appropriate manner. In Shoshone language and culture, there is a word, "Deniwap," which is the Shoshone life-way concept. As this student was struggling, I took a moment to teach him what I had been taught about the concept of "Deniwap" which included a peaceful, harmonious existence with those around us and I was able to help this student calm down and learn how to treat his peers with patience, through identifying with this concept. "Deniwap" is a complex, multifaceted, and multilayered concept that the Shoshone themselves have a challenging time articulating, and it really is only within the concept of Shoshone culture and language that this concept and this word can more fully and more deeply be explored, understood, and appreciated. This concept very much plays a role in constructing and influencing Shoshone identity.

A second benefit to Native American Heritage language preservation includes cultural enrichment and the various world perspectives that different languages have to offer. “When a language is lost, a world perspective is lost too” (Dastgoshadeh & Jalilzadeh, 2011, p. 661). Native Americans have much to offer in terms of different world perspectives. Native Americans have multiple different concepts of time, space, and traditions of creation and understanding existence. For example, where we might order a sequence of pictures from left to right, speakers of an indigenous language in Australia order events from east to west. This means that the order in which they would say a sequence of images showing a person aging would depend upon the position the individual was facing. In Navajo language and culture, time is viewed as cyclical. Therefore, some Navajo people do not always stress punctuality. Because time is cyclical, events will reoccur and can be revisited. Because of this thought process, many Navajo people place greater importance on relationships and staying until something is completed.

The final benefit that I discuss here relates to the benefits of multilingualism. While some myths have circulated, such as learning a second language slows learning in a first language or code switching is a sign of incomplete language ability, research has actually shown that infants who hear more than one language develop a greater ability to discriminate between the languages that they hear and are more open to learning a new language than monolingual learners (Petitto et al., 2012). Skills acquired in one language support the acquisition of skills in another language (Barac & Bialystok, 2012), and multilingualism develops other aspects of cognition and improves learning and cognitive abilities (Marian & Shook, 2012). The cultural destruction that took place due to the

impact of colonialism and expansionism on Native Americans has created challenges today to revive the languages and cultures. The benefits that I have just outlined however substantially outweigh the challenges that I will address in the following section.

Challenges to Native American Heritage HLI

Misconceptions and Misunderstanding

As illustrated in my introduction, one of the first challenges in NAM HLI is misconceptions and faulty perspectives. The first of these misconceptions is that learning more than one language hinders or slows a child's development, which I have already addressed in the aforementioned paragraph on the benefits of multilingualism. A second misconception is the value of English or any dominant language over indigenous or minority languages. Sometimes this misperception is perpetuated because people assign monetary value to a language. For instance, elsewhere, in Peru, English is seen as a "hard-currency" cultural capital needed for technological advancement, employment opportunities, national progress and international travel (Niño-Murcia, 2003), while Quechua and Aymara are not valued and even looked down upon. Despite the disregard for indigenous languages they do need to be taught and one of the challenges that these programs still face is the type of methodology that ought to be used.

Teaching Methodology

When discussing the teaching methodologies used to teach Native American (NAM) languages, I believe it is most appropriate to place them on a spectrum with two ends; one being purely Native American approaches and the other being purely Euro-American-oriented pedagogy. The dichotomy essentially comes down to a teaching methodology that is more flexible, less structured (but not unstructured), and more open

in contrast to an approach that is more systematic, highly structured, and can potentially be less flexible and less open. Because of its focus on modes of representation and cultural context, the multiliteracies approach suggests that a different approach than what has traditionally been done by a Euro-American centered education system is in fact appropriate and needed in the changing world that we are experiencing.

NAM methodology is quite unique. During my time at USU, I took the opportunity to visit the Native American Student Council (NASC) and make friends. One day, I was talking and asking one of my Navajo friends about a particular grammar point I had been studying earlier. As I was writing on a whiteboard and explaining what I understood, he just started chuckling. I asked what was funny and he said, “we Native Americans can tell when you have learned our languages the Native American way, and when you have learned them the white man’s way.” I said I didn’t understand and asked if he could explain. He then said, “we Native Americans just sit around the council fire and listen to the elders talk.”

The aforementioned anecdote reflects the traditional grandparent method where elders are consulted, where topics like household and seasonal activities and other subjects are taught to students by tribal members primarily through oral discourse while doing an activity relative to what is being discussed. For example, tribal members may discuss seasonal topics while taking a walk in the woods with students (Pease Pretty-On-Top, 2007). This allows for greater visual modes of input and meaning making. Because this is an effective way of handing down these languages we must ask if the traditional Euro-American method of literacy is best for a culture that teaches its language through oral tradition.

While Euro-American methods are varied and are still continuing to evolve, Euro-American methods have traditionally been more rigid. That is, Euro-American methods are still heavily inundated with and influenced by textbooks and technology, where classes take place in large buildings, and where there is a structured curriculum that is followed. While the structure is more rigid, innovations in technology and constant evolution of methodology continue to loosen Euro-American educational methods in a sense, making them more flexible and adaptable. In the proceeding paragraphs, I discuss aspects of the more rigid aspects of Euro-American education, where they clash with Native American culture, and also where the two systems can, in fact, adapt, and where NAM HLI programs can end up with the best of both worlds. Some of the blending of both methods is beginning to happen already at tribal colleges, tribal language and cultural centers, and charter schools or other institutions where efforts to revitalize Native American languages are taking place.

Curriculum, Materials Development, and Literacy

One point of contention is the development of a structured curriculum and teaching materials such as textbooks. Willem Reuse (1997) expresses well Native American sentiment in this area when he states:

“We all know intuitively that books have never been efficient and sufficient aids towards language renewal... Native American cultures (with the exception of Maya culture) are not book cultures in the way Western culture is and therefore are justified in being suspicious of books as possible instruments of Western Imperialism” (p. 116).

It is difficult and sometimes can be dangerous to break with tradition. Because of the difficulty of breaking with tradition, writing down NAM languages is an awkward and foreign practice.

Western imperialism is not the only problem that textbook development faces. Another challenge is orthography. For thousands of years, these languages and sounds have been handed down by oral tradition and have been learned audibly. Many of these sounds are not found in English or other European languages. Trying to use the Latin alphabet to represent distinct sounds can be frustrating. For example, in Shoshone there are the following consonant pairs d/t, b/p, p/v, b/v, f/v, and g/k as well as a consonant that combines three sounds b/p/v, for which there is no singular literal representation using the Latin alphabet (Glanville, 2005). There is a palletized /G/ sound found in Navajo and Coptic Greek (*Encyclopedia Britannica*, n.d.), and a 'trailing' /h/ sound as well as 'trailing' vowel sounds for which the current orthographies have inadequate representation.

To make the issue more difficult, there are already three different Shoshone orthographies: the Wick Miller orthography, the Gould/ISU orthography, and an Eastern Shoshone orthography developing at Fort Washakie. Each geographical area feels that their orthography is the most appropriate. When I worked at the Chief Tahgee Elementary School, some classes used one orthography, some used another, and some used both. For kindergarten-age Shoshone children, this is confusing, to say the least. To make things more frustrating for teachers, the school was trying to standardize the use of one orthography and then didn't know which one to settle on.

Technology

Echoing similar sentiments about Western imperialism, technology is also a sensitive issue. I will again use an anecdote to illustrate. One evening, I went to the Language and Culture Center for the reservation to take lessons with one of the elders. At a certain point in the lesson, I took out my cellphone and asked the elder if I could record him while he told a story in Shoshone and he told me “no” and that I should put my cellphone away. Interestingly enough, this also happened later with a woman who was Latina who knew the elder and asked the same question and he refused. Whether or not a Native American youth or tribal member would receive the same response is not certain, but it is clear that Native Americans want others to realize that they own their language and the intellectual property that develops as these programs grow. In fact, there was concern over copyright issues that arose.

There are several reasons why Native Americans may have an aversion to technology in Native American regions. One reason may be that the elders, generally the only ones who speak the language, are part of an aging population and introducing sophisticated machinery and software may simply be overwhelming or intimidating for that generation. Native Americans may also have an aversion because Native Americans when they have adopted new technologies have done so at the peril of diluting the ancestral ways (Richardson & McLeod, 2005). Most importantly, a Native American aversion to technology comes from a desire to protect sacred information (e.g., sacred sites and rituals), from unauthorized individuals in the community and the general public. There may be other types of objections to recording or technology, as well.

Native American aversion to technology is understandable. Reuse (1997) suggests however that technology can be and has been adopted by Native Americans for their

benefit, stating that “Native American cultures... have successfully adopted and integrated foreign cultural elements to their benefit. Examples would be the pickup truck for more efficient transportation and, more recently, the computer as a possible educational tool” (p. 116).

One very important and potentially crucial benefit of using technology in Native American regions is that it can speed up the language documentation process. There is one caveat, however. In using technology and developing materials, there seems to be a dangerous attitude that technology will solve all of the problems or even most of them. Technology can never ultimately replace humans, especially not those who collect content, organize it into lessons and learning activities, and teach others. At the same time, some Native Americans, such as Richard Littlebear, who in an interview with Janine Pease-Pretty-On-Top, stated that technology can be used to give “life support” to tribal languages that are in critical condition (Littlebear, 2001).

There are also many who realize that technology can be used to engage this generation of Native American youth. Dr. Richard Littlebear recommends technology use particularly in today’s technological society and culture where Native American youth are constantly interacting with the television and computer. Various venues have been suggested, including videogames and the internet, television and movies, and radio/music. For instance, the Hawaiian language program also incorporates language course software and an interactive television system (Ka’awa & Hawkins, 1997).

One final benefit stemming from technology is computer-mediated communication. (CMC), which is an umbrella term that encompasses various forms of human communication through computer networks. This communication can be

synchronous or asynchronous and involve one-to-one, one-to-many, or many-to-many exchanges of text, audio, and/or video messages. This type of technology allows teachers to reach out to students or instructors who are not able to be physically present. This is important for isolated areas on large reservations like the Navajo Nation and it can also be useful for connecting multiple reservations at a distance who speak the same language, such as the three main Shoshone reservations (Duck Valley, Fort Hall, and Fort Washakie) in order to give access to the various dialects all at once.

Parent and Community Involvement

In order for Native American heritage language immersion programs to succeed, broad-based community and tribal involvement are needed in planning and implementing them. Designing and delivering instructional programs, as well as providing ongoing support can be difficult. When tribes decide to implement a public school model, there has to be considerable policy discussion and development on behalf of school boards and tribal governmental authorities. If tribes decide to take the private school route, extensive legal, cultural, and financial structures are still required and take considerable effort and time (Pease Pretty-On-Top, 2007).

It is important to have parental and community support because without it, the program diminishes and is threatened to die out. Alanis and Rodriguez (2008) suggest allowing parents to experience the language acquisition process alongside their students by having parents volunteer in classrooms and extend the learning process beyond school. Parents should come to realize that “program participation [is] not limited to their children but include[s] their own involvement in all aspects of the dual language education program” (Alanis & Rodriguez, 2008, p. 314). Collier and Thomas (2004)

relate how adults who are incorporated into a bilingual immersion program begin to view school in a more positive perspective. He states, “parents... tend to participate much more actively in the school because they feel welcomed, valued, and respected and included in school decision making” (p. 12).

One intriguing development that I witnessed on the Fort Hall reservation that was, in fact, detrimental to the Shoshone language program involved a conflict that had developed between the elementary school and the tribal members as well as the Tribal Language and Culture Center. Rather than promoting community involvement, some politics caused the school to shun community involvement and close the program to the public. The school did not want parent, grandparent, or community involvement in producing language and cultural artifacts to be used for the school. They were apprehensive about parent involvement in the program and developing activities where parents and community could come to the school and participate in what their children were learning.

Native American immersion programs could try to incorporate parents into the process by allowing them to participate in formal partnerships with the Native American language immersion schools. As part of this process, parents ought to be required to enroll in summer language immersion camps, attend weekend language seminars, and participate in school activities as extended family members. In a very real sense, Native American language immersion schools rely on the combined efforts, cooperation and commitment of elders, students, educators, parents, and community members.

Funding and Support for Immersion Schools

Funding presents yet another challenge for Native American language immersion schools. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Administration for Native Americans (2019) shows the following funding amounts for the fiscal year of 2019 and the following language project grantees:

Grantee: Aleutian Pribilof Islands Association, Inc. (Alaska) - \$300,000
Grantee: Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Louisiana (Louisiana) - \$244,300
Grantee: Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indian (Michigan) - \$274,526
Grantee: Minneapolis American Indian Center (Minnesota) - \$300,000
Grantee: Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe (New York) - \$297,999
Grantee: Euchee (Yuchi) Language Project Inc. (Oklahoma) - \$300,000
Grantee: Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians (Oregon) - \$232,050
Grantee: Little Wound School (South Dakota) - \$198,706
Grantee: Rural America Initiatives (South Dakota) - \$299,998
Grantee: Great Lakes Indian Fish & Wildlife Commission (Wisconsin) - \$183,632
Grantee: Oneida Nation (Wisconsin) - \$298,339
Grantee: Kulaniakea (Hawaii) - \$293,907
Grantee: Papahana Kuaola (Hawaii) - \$299,184
Grantee: Papakolea Community Development Corporation (Hawaii) - \$294,496
Grantee: San Carlos Apache Tribe (Arizona) - \$293,043
Grantee: Tuba City Regional Health Care Corporation (Arizona) - \$240,623
Grantee: Halau Hula O Kaeo (California) - \$285,451
Grantee: Crow Language Consortium (Montana) - \$204,271
Grantee: Salish Kootenai College (Montana) - \$294,991
Grantee: Fort Peck Assiniboine & Sioux Tribes (Montana) - \$194,242
Grantee: Ohkay Owingeh (New Mexico) - \$232,385
Grantee: Pueblo of Acoma (New Mexico) - \$196,115
Grantee: Turtle Mountain Community College (North Dakota) - \$177,271
Grantee: Makah Indian Tribe (Washington) - \$279,697
Grantee: Skokomish Indian Tribe (Washington) - \$234,015

Given the figures above, it is evident that there is not sufficient funding going towards these programs. The biggest hurdle that Native American language programs face is finding sufficient sources of funding to meaningfully sustain these programs. This funding is for such needs as training and hiring teachers, developing materials (books, audio materials, software, etc.), and building facilities. NAM HLI schools and language

preservation programs are funded not only through the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, but also the Department of Education, sometimes unknown sources of funding, tribal council grants, and casino funds. Finding funding in ways that are sustainable, however, and that allows for autonomous programs is still a challenge.

That said, various models for school funding do exist. The charter school structure is used by the Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibway Language Immersion School and seems to be popular with other tribes as well, including the Fort Hall Shoshone. Charter schools have been one of the fastest-growing school structure types (Berends, 2015). The charter school grant process however is competitive because grants are only given under six competitions. The first competition is a competition for State Education Agencies (SEAs), where the money is only available to SEAs in states with charter school laws. The second competition is of Non-State Education Agencies that either (1) did not participate in the SEA competition the previous year, or (2) that a grant had its application for SEA funds denied. The rest of the competitions are for funding for already existing charter schools to update and improve their programs and disseminate information about their programs (U.S. Department of Education, 2019). This makes finding funding for charter schools that much more difficult if tribes or indigenous language programs decide to choose this option.

For Native American language immersion programs, the charter structure provides a year of support for planning. However, while there are start-up funds that include support for parent and community interaction, supplies, and learning resources; start-up costs do not include the costs of building acquisition or renovation and operational funds are only granted for 3 to 5-year terms. On top of this, the local school

board must accept the concept and may place requirements on the charter school (Pease Pretty-On-Top, 2007).

Private funding has been the route of funding pursued in the Piegan Institute of Montana. Several private foundations have partnered with the institute and have proven to be long-term supporters of the Blackfoot language immersion concept. However, finding private foundation support is hard to acquire. The most imposing challenges facing Native American communities in this regard are the fact that Native communities have limited access to information about the private sector and have few able grant writers who meet the standard of foundational leadership (Elder, 2005; Pease Pretty-On-Top, 2007).

Instructional Options

Finding capable teachers who are fluent in a Native American language is yet another issue that Native Americans face. Some programs have had to search nationally or internationally for elders or teachers. Sometimes they can search among different reservations because some tribal members live on more than one reservation, but finding teachers is difficult because of the requirements. Teachers may speak the tribal language but most of these instructors are not trained in the field of language teaching and come from a variety of different backgrounds.

Revitalization Efforts Case studies

The earliest language immersion programs began to arise in the 1980s. I first discuss the case of the Fort Defiance Navajo language immersion program, then I will address the Piegan Institute efforts to revitalize Blackfoot. Next, I will discuss the Hawaiian and Maori language programs and efforts. Finally, I use my own anecdotal

knowledge and experience to discuss the Fort Hall Shoshone efforts at Chief Tahgee Elementary.

Fort Defiance Navajo Immersion

In 1984, the Navajo Tribal Council declared: “The Navajo language is an essential element of the life, culture, and identity of the Navajo people...Instruction in the Navajo language shall be made available for all grade levels in all schools serving the Navajo Nation” (Nave, 1996, p. 144). The first Navajo bilingual program then began at Fort Defiance. The program is now in its thirty-sixth year. At Fort Defiance, students are immersed in the language for the first two years of the program, with Navajo as the language of instruction and communication. The students use the language in academic and social settings. Students begin by reading Navajo in the reading awareness program in Kindergarten. In first grade, however, they then read in English.

Beginning in second and third grades, students study a half day in one language and a half day in the other. In grades four and five, students are pulled out of the regular classrooms to attend the Navajo language classes. The quantity of Navajo is decreased and limited to one hour per day, five days per week for students in fourth grade, and four times a week for fifth grade students. Students receive instruction in Navajo reading and writing at this time. The rest of their class day is all in English in the regular classrooms.

Grunewald (2015) says that the primary purpose of these types of programs is to revitalize Native American languages and “emphasize connecting children to Native values and cultural practices” (p. 8). However, Nave’s (1997) report suggests that this is still not taking place and that by the mid-1980s “the majority of the students who were enrolled at the school were dominant in the English language” and the school realized

that a transitional approach was inappropriate. **Denetclaw**, (2017) in the *Navajo Times* reported similar results in a 2017 article that featured two teachers, Rose Nofchissey and Louise Benally, who began working at Fort Defiance in the 1970s. They relate how, at that time, the focus was reading and writing because the students already spoke Navajo as their first language. Today, most students' first language is English. Benally talks about how they could do more with their students in the 70s when their students were fluent, but that they are now limited in their pedagogy because of their students' limited proficiency. She also mentions that the focus has now shifted to teaching Navajo as a second language and that it is difficult to teach Navajo because their students don't hear the language spoken when outside the school environment. Nofchissey mentions that when she grew up, she only spoke Navajo at home and only English at school, but that the boarding school program changed so that today even Navajo parents who speak Navajo will not speak it with their children because they want their children to succeed in the Euro-American world.

Unfortunately, the Navajo program demonstrates unsuccessful aspects of a language program, which include a lack of parental and community involvement and engagement with the program or the language, a misdirected focus that made learning the heritage language take a back seat, and a program that was not a true immersion program where Navajo was exclusively used.

Piegian Institute: Blackfoot Language Preservation Efforts

In 1985, a survey was conducted on the Piegan Blackfoot reservation to collect information on the current status of the Blackfoot language. The survey indicated that those who spoke the language were in their fifties and that by 2005

they would be in their eighties and well on their way to passing on. The tribal members and Piegan Institute realized that without a serious reintroduction of the language, both the language and the values within it would be lost forever (pieganinstitute.org).

The Piegan Institute was then founded in 1987 by Darrell Kipp (Miyashita & Chatsis, 2013) to “research, promote, and preserve Native American languages, in particular the Blackfoot language” (pieganinstitute.org). In 1992, the Nizi Puh Wah Sin Blackfoot Language Schools Immersion Program was established with community-based schools (U.S. Senate, 1993) focusing on K-8 education and eventually creating the following schools: Moccasin Flat, Cuts Wood, and Lost Children. The Piegan institute’s website states that “The sole purpose of the Nizi Puh Wah Sin program is to teach children to speak the Blackfoot language” (pieganinstitute.org).

In 1995, the institute realized that there was a desire by parents to have their children learn to speak the language and the institute’s staff began researching how to establish an all-day immersion school program. The program leaders decided to seek private funding for operations to assure autonomy and freedom from interference. An especially important aspect of seeking private funding assured that Blackfoot prayer would be an integral part of the language instruction. In 1995, Darrell Kipp with the help of Dorothy Still Smoking helped found Moccasin Flat; a one-room private school dedicated to all-day language instruction exclusively in the Blackfoot language. Some of the current projects that the Piegan Institute sponsors include a Blackfoot Homeschool Kit so that students can 'take their language home'

with them and study and learn the language at home, a Blackfoot headstart kit, a storyboard game, a dictionary, and a Kid's Garden Project.

This project demonstrates some very important aspects that could potentially be successful in a program including a regular, repeating, and interactive activity that children can do with elders as the elders teach them the language and speak it with them, efforts to take the language home and to the rest of the community and make it a part of everyday life, educational activities that are engaging for young learners, a true immersion program where Blackfoot is the exclusive language of instruction and communication, sources of funding other than government money, and an autonomous program that is led by Native Americans.

Hawaii

By the 1980s, the Hawaiian language was at such a low that there were fewer than 50 speakers (Kaluhiokalani, 2007). However, the Hawaiian language and culture experienced a renaissance as it heralded a resurgence of interest in various aspects of Native Hawaiian heritage including traditional chants, music, and dance, the cultivation of traditional crops and the practice of aquaculture through the use of fishponds, both by means of ancient methods, and the spiritual practices of the ancient religion (Nakata, 2017).

A few Hawaiian families were raising their children in the 1980s with Hawaiian as their first language. Their goal was simple at first; to pass on their culture and heritage to their children. However, as others noticed and caught on, the parents of those interested families soon became immersion educators. In 1984, the first Hawaiian preschool was established under the Aha Punana Leo method at Kauai'i. As the

movement grew, two more schools were built at Kalihi and O'ahu. At the same time, a state statute remained in effect from 1896 closing all public Hawaiian-medium schools (McCarty, 2013). William H. Wilson, the co-founder of the Aha Punana Leo schools, says that "When the state did not open a kindergarten in Hawaiian for our children here in Hilo, we held the children back and declared that we were opening up a public kindergarten through Hawaiian...at the Punana Leo O Hilo" (McCarty, 2013). Eventually, the Aha Punana Leo Board of Education and native Hawaiian parents testified before the state legislature and the state Board of Education convincing them to begin a Hawaiian language immersion program that began in the fall of 1987 (Kaluhiokalani, 2007). Soon after classes began, several obstacles surfaced, such as locating appropriate curriculum and materials, determining which administrators would allow Hawaiian immersion, finding qualified teachers who had a license as well as spoke Hawaiian, and knowing how to find funding.

The Aha Punana Leo Board translated materials and developed curriculum. The program found Diana Oshiro and Patrick Seely to be principals amidst considerable criticism of the program. Fortunately, the program was able to find teachers who were qualified and spoke Hawaiian. Kaluhiokalani describes what a challenging experience it was:

The first year of the Hawaiian language immersion program was probably one of the most difficult in my life. Every day I started work at 7 in the morning and stayed until 7 at night with my two small children by my side. We spent every holiday and every Saturday at Waiiau Elementary School preparing materials and translating books during the first year (Kaluhiokalani, 2007, p.192).

Challenges continued to arise as the state Board of Education did not see the same vision as those involved in the project. However, eventually in 1989, the board changed the status of the program to permanent and in 1992 extended the program through to grade 12.

As the program has continued now for the last 36 years, it has had an effect on those involved especially the students, families, and communities. One study found that this was noticeable in three ways: students gained a sense of responsibility towards transmitting the culture, the program promoted building and strengthening social connections, and the program also promoted necessity of changing perspectives in the community (Luning, 2007).

This case study emphasizes the importance of community involvement and that indigenous communities can have an impact on state education boards if they will make their voices heard. It also does, however, raise the issue that many state-run entities do not have the same vision as the indigenous communities who these language schools serve, and that education boards and councils need to be more open to hearing indigenous peoples' perspectives and allowing for innovation in these programs. One last aspect that this case study highlights is that some Native Hawaiians who became involved also became educators, demonstrating that indigenous populations can also get involved and become trained.

New Zealand

In 1985, Maori immersion began a program at Rakaumanga with an emphasis on maintaining and revitalizing Maori. Resources were scarce and so the program focused much of its efforts on translating English materials into Maori. As the program grew, it

was recognized that students needed to become well versed in their own history and culture. Instructors looked for ways to build intellectual, social, physical, spiritual, and cultural attributes in their students. Teachers instituted activities, social structures, and protocol they believed would represent the culture and that would be appropriate in the schooling environment (Harrison & Papa, 2005). The program has now grown for the last 25 years, and Maori has now been introduced at all levels of education.

Despite its growth and success, there are still several issues that the Maori language program faces today including, level of immersion, student population, other language groups, and resources and support. Full immersion has been omitted from the program and some levels of immersion are lower than the 50% needed to make a program effective. The education model using the Maori-medium is supported by a maintenance bilingual approach and its population is closer to an enrichment bilingual context. Further, English is still the predominant language and there is a lack of provision for surrounding language groups because of the dominant attitude that English needs to prevail. Finally, there is a lack of support and adequate resources in Maori for instruction (May & Hill, 2005).

While struggling in some areas this program also demonstrates some positive and innovative ideas. One successful innovative idea is to translate English texts into the heritage language. This may have to take place among other tribes as there is a lack of literature and material until there is a greater quantity of original work. This program also highlights the need for a spiritual element. Indigenous language programs might need to consider a spiritually healing aspect to them going forward because it is part of their identity.

Chief Taghee Shoshone Charter School

In 2013, Eastern Idaho's first public Native American language school opened on the Fort Hall Reservation (Cotterel, 2013). The Chief Tahgee Elementary is a Dual Immersion charter school dedicated to preserving the Shoshone language. It follows a two-way immersion program that progressively moves towards more English use with higher grades. Because it is a charter school, it is expected to follow certain standards and requirements placed on the school by the state board of education. One of those is to find state-licensed teachers. Because of this requirement, there is very little instruction in Shoshone. The progressively higher grades have almost no Shoshone teachers. Similar to the Navajo program, there is also almost no community or parental involvement; the current school administration in fact frowns upon community involvement. What this and some programs suggest is that isolating a language program from community involvement and setting rigid concepts of how dual language immersion instruction programs should work may not be realistic given the current status of Native American languages.

Suggestions

I summarize the positive aspects of these programs as well as the lessons that can be learned from them. First, I believe that Native American heritage programs should seriously implement total immersion programs to the best of their ability where the heritage language is the language of instruction and communication for the entire day. Second, these language programs need to involve parents and the community and students need to take learning, speaking, and using the language beyond the school. Third, programs need to have interactive and engaging activities where students can use

the language and that will also instill values of the heritage culture. Fourth, American government institutions, educational institutions, and Euro-American educators need to be more open to listening to Native American perspectives of how to educate their children and working with elders and tribal members. Fifth, while textbooks and curricular materials cannot ultimately create fluent L2 speakers, Native Americans, their institutions, and their programs need to understand the necessity of having such materials and should come to realize that they are an essential part the language learning process. Finally, programs need, to the best of their ability, to seek for funding beyond government aid and strive to develop autonomous programs where Native Americans take leadership roles and where their programs are independent from government and educational boards.

Conclusion

The evolution of language education among indigenous populations is a unique story of loss and rebound. In the globalized world and localized communities that we live in today it is important to begin to consider a multiliteracies approach and a more adaptable pedagogical method. In the field of dual language immersion, programs for Native American languages have a unique and rising place. These languages add value and texture to the country's linguistic fabric. However, most of these programs and languages are still in the beginning stages or are in a crucial state currently and still need substantial support financially and socially from the immediate and surrounding communities. In addition, there needs to be considerable caution in promoting educational policies that might lead to the crowding out or extinction of these languages by majority languages, such as English. In spite of the challenging history that Native

Americans with their cultures and languages have passed through, there should be an optimistic attitude towards the rebound of these languages, and communities and individuals should be getting involved and supporting the success of indigenous heritage languages.

LANGUAGE PAPER

Identity Construction and its Significance on Motivation and Classroom Pedagogy

INTRODUCTION AND REFLECTION

Constructing a new identity has always been the part of language acquisition that I have loved. Learning a new identity, understanding how to integrate into a new culture, and in many ways becoming a new person is something very appealing to me. Like many other things in the MSLT program learning about how identity affects language acquisition broadened my perspective on how critical a role identity plays in the language acquisition process.

I review in this paper the literature that has been written on identity and particularly how together with cross cultural communication they affect the motivation to integrate into a new language community. I wrote this with an interest in better understanding how I can use the principles of identity, cross cultural communication, and motivation to more effectively help my students learn to integrate into a new language community.

Abstract

This paper reviews the literature that has been written on identity construction and cross-cultural communication and how they affect the motivation to integrate into an L2 language community. Specifically, it reviews the theories of post structuralism and sociocultural theory which argues that identity is constantly shifting, multifaceted, and fluid and needs to be constructed in a social context. It reviews the importance of learning to assimilate into a new culture as well as differentiate ones' self once a part of that culture. It discusses the importance of different selves (ideal self, ought-to-self, and possible self) as they relate to motivation and their important role in learning to integrate and assimilate. Finally, after an outline of these theories, some suggestions are made for classroom practice.

Keywords: post-structuralism, sociocultural theory, assimilation, differentiation, cross-cultural communication, motivation, constructivism

IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE ON MOTIVATION AND CLASSROOM PEDAGOGY

Stockton (2015) states that language acquisition is “self-acquisition” (p. 9). We acquire that self through constant construction and reconstruction of our identities. Identity is our attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors towards others in society and the community within which we live (Festinger, 1954). By implication an L2 identity is the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that we assume as we become a part of the L2 community. Constructing an L2 identity takes time and experience and is, from my experience, a highly motivating aspect of learning a language. Because of its importance in the language acquisition process and its importance in my teaching pedagogy, I review a selection of the literature that has been written on the subject and then offer a few implications for classroom teaching.

Theoretical frameworks

Poststructuralism

Two driving perspectives behind identity and its role in L2 learning include the post-structural approach to identity and a socio-cultural approach. From a post-structural perspective, the language learner is not viewed as being an individual with fixed, static traits, but is rather portrayed as someone who is diverse, contradictory, dynamic, and changing over time and social space (Weedon, 1997). That is, a post-structural concept of identity is one that is fluid, multiple, shifting, and subject to change (Kouhpaenejad & Gholaminejad, 2014). Norton (2013) mentions that the individual is understood as a “subject,” (p. 2) meaning that the individual is both subject to relationships in various sites and settings as well as an agent that acts within these sites and settings. Identity is

regarded as something that is “socially organized, reorganized, constructed, co-constructed, and continually reconstructed through language and discourse” (Kouhpaenejad & Gholaminejad, 2014, p. 200). Identity is unstable and identity construction is ongoing and negotiated (Duff, 2007; Koven, 2007; Norton, 2000). Identity is seen as a collection of roles or subject positions and a mixture of individual agency and social influences (Omoniyi & White, 2008; Zacharias, 2010).

Several underlying theories that inform the post-structural approach include: Schieffelin and Ochs's (1986) theory of socialization, Van Lier's (2000) ecological perspective, and Ellis's (2008) framework explaining L2 acquisition. Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) explore how socialization, defined as an interactive process, is used to develop the language of the learner. They believe that “socialization begins at the moment of social contact in the life of a human being” (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986, p. 164). Language socialization considers the input of social information and how to use the language (e.g., politeness, routines, and formulaic expressions). They reiterate that through social interaction, our concepts of reality and self as well as our social roles develop.

Van Lier's (2004) perspective discusses the concept of emergence. He expresses the fact that learning a language is a non-linear development and is a series of transformative experiences and increasingly diversified practices that are punctuated by sudden bursts of development and reorganization of linguistic resources and skills. He believes that grammar is not a prerequisite for communication but a byproduct of it. He demonstrates that through meaningful activities, combined with a focus on form, learners are encouraged to “grammaticalize their language use, thus integrating form and meaning

in productive ways” (Van Lier, 2004, p. 3). In other words, he sees language learning as an integrated whole with interdependent parts. The ecological perspective views the learner as immersed in a sociocultural environment full of meanings which, “gradually become available as the learner acts and interacts within and with this environment” (Van Lier, 2009, p. 246).

Ellis’s framework on L2 acquisition deals with learner-external factors relating to the social context of language acquisition as well as the input and interaction of a learner’s experiences. It deals with learner-internal mechanisms, how acquisition takes place, and how learners use their resources in communication. Ellis suggests that social factors indirectly affect language acquisition because the learner’s attitude mediates these social factors. Ellis argues that learners acquire language through the process of learning how to communicate in it. He fits language acquisition on a continuum of learning processes versus communication processes (Ellis, 2008). In sum, many of the aforementioned perspectives reflect tenets of sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978).

Sociocultural Theory

Sociocultural theory (SCT) argues that human cognition and function is a mediated process that is organized by cultural artifacts, activities, and concepts (Ratner, 2002). Under the SCT framework, humans use existing cultural artifacts and create new ones that allow them to regulate their biological and behavioral activity. Part of this includes language (i.e., its use, organization, and structure) which is used as a means of mediation. In other words, through social interaction, using the language and participating in cultural, historical, and institutional settings, the developmental processes

necessary to acquire a language and gain autonomy, being able to control our environment and perceptions, takes place (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007).

Vygotsky (1978) is credited with SCT given that he put forth the idea that the individual is inseparable from the social context and that thinking develops under particular social and historical conditions. Cognitive functions originate in social interactions and language and culture are key elements in cognitive development and mediation as humans communicate and come to understand reality (Vygotsky, 1978). He argued that learned social speech becomes inner speech, “a use of language to regulate internal thought” (Mitchell & Myles, 1998, p. 148). From this perspective, speech precedes thought and consequently thought develops from interaction with society.

Mediation plays a central role in this interaction and is the central aspect of SCT. Mediation takes place both through means of physical objects and through psychological means. Lantolf and Thorne (2006) tell us that one of the traits that sets humans apart from other animals is their ability to select tools to perform their tasks and to plan. They help us understand that physical tools are culturally constructed objects that invest humans with more ability than natural endowments. Because of our ability to change our social and material environments, we also change ourselves and the way we live in and perceive the world. Our language helps us regulate these changes and these cultural perceptions.

The ability to regulate our interactions goes through three stages of development. The first stage is called object-regulation, where objects help children mediate activity in their environment and in their thinking (Rothbart et al., 2011). In other words, if a child is called by a mother to 'come here' and, in the action of moving towards his/her mother, a toy makes a sound, the child may become distracted and go play with the toy and forget

about the original task. The second stage is called other-regulation. This essentially means scaffolding where there is implicit and explicit mediation with the help of another person. The final stage is called self-regulation, which takes place through internalization. At this point, actions are deliberate, intentional, and volitional (Leong & Bodrova, 2006). In this stage, the individual is capable of their own mediation and performing the task with little to no help. Learning a foreign language and learning how to self-regulate includes and implies a need to adapt a learner's values, behaviors, and beliefs (Jund, 2010). As a teacher, this is one of my many goals; to help my students move through these stages of cognitive development and language acquisition and learn how to mediate their values, behaviors, and beliefs. I want my students to be autonomous, self-regulating users of the language who can influence their environments and negotiate their identity.

Identity Construction: Assimilation and Differentiation

Assimilation

Constructing one's identity takes time and requires constant identity construction and reconstruction through negotiation. The first task of an L2 learner is to learn their new identity and integrate into a new community. In general, our identity is shaped and formed by the community that we live in and Oyserman and Destin (2010) suggest that identities are dynamically constructed in these contexts.

As part of assimilation and identity construction, language learners need to be able to make connections with those in the target language community. Wenger (2000) states:

“An identity is not an abstract idea or a label, such as a title, an ethnic category, or a personality trait. It is a lived experience of belonging (or not belonging). A

strong identity involves deep connections with others through shared histories and experiences, reciprocity, affection, and mutual commitments” (p. 239).

Learning a language and using the language are essential elements to integrating into a new community and making these connections. Learning and using the language can be both a negative factor and/or decisive factor in mediating opportunities or limitations to integrate (Wang, 2018). Wang (2018) explains that networking and having social networks helps language learners settle down and “feel at home” (p. 36) through interacting with a core circle of associates, especially interacting with those of the same age.

One of the many challenges of integration is establishing trust between learners and those of the target language community and overcoming stereotypes. Trust can especially be true for learners trying to integrate into a community where the two groups have had a history of conflict based on national, political, ethnic, or other differences. Renaud and Tannenbaum (2013) indicate that intergroup conflict endures between people because they do not have the opportunity to interact personally and they rely on long-standing stereotypes. Renaud and Tannenbaum also make mention of the fact that teachers have long been involved in bringing people together in educational contexts to bridge cultural gaps and overcome conflict and help establish that trust.

The Acculturation Model of SLA put forth by Schumann (1976) argues that acculturation into the second language group and enhanced language learning take place where there is congruence between the second language group and the target language group. Where there is greater social distance, little acculturation takes place and members of the L2 group will not become proficient speakers of the target language. Therefore, it

is important for learners to use the language and learn how to navigate or close the social distance. Understanding this principle can aid in the preservation of one's identity and heritage if they learn and realize how to navigate the social distance.

Differentiation

Much of the process of discovering a role in the target language community requires learners to negotiate their identity which can be a substantial process. Sa'd (2017) acknowledges that learning is a holistic experience that involves the entire person: physically, cognitively, and emotionally and that as part of the language learning process, learners fluctuate between an understanding of themselves as speakers of their first language (L1) and their awareness of themselves as learners of an L2, and how they 'identify' themselves. The draining process of identity construction is something that is constantly taking place as the learner progresses in their acquisition of the L2 and learns multiple identities or selves (Koven, 2007).

Differentiating one's identity entails using language to manage and navigate power relations. Foucault (2002) in his research suggests that the self is not internally constructed through one's own efforts but is in fact molded externally by the multitude of social practices. Carli et al. (2003) discusses the idea that certain languages according to an ascribed degree of power are considered more 'prestigious' and as dominant languages while others are seen as 'stigmatized' and 'dominated'. These ascribed attributes placed upon one group by another group then drive social practices, reinforcing these beliefs and these socially imposed identities which then continues to generate this power play and socially imposed belief in inferiority.

Language shapes communication because it reveals power to produce intended effects (Hung Ng & Deng, 2017). Language can create influence as well as reflect the power of the language community that uses it. For example, because of the preeminence of English as a global lingua franca, English can shape communication between a native and nonnative English speaker in terms of power because of the power of the English-speaking world and not because of its innate linguistic superiority. Poststructuralists argue that the signifying practices of societies are sites of struggle, and that linguistic communities are heterogeneous arenas characterized by conflicting claims to truth and power. Examples of this in the United States would be English speaking communities versus Spanish speaking communities or Native American/indigenous language speaking communities. Typically English speaking communities have see themselves as the founders and establishers of the United States and see Spanish speaking communities and Native American communities as delinquent and inferior. English speaking communities see Spanish speaking communities as immigrants who need to learn to adapt to the English-speaking environment. Ironically Native American communities claim the same of their English-speaking counterparts. This is then where a language learner must learn to navigate the power play of different cultures and languages. Language learners must learn to differentiate themselves and craft their own individual identity and decide what they believe is true about themselves and society.

Constructivism

Progressing beyond monoculturalism towards constructivism is yet another important facet of constructing a new identity. Monoculturalism is defined here in two ways: 1) a perspective that considers the individual as an independent, free, and self-

reliant person; and 2) an ethnocentric phenomenon where one group's cultural worldview comes to be viewed as reality or the state of a situation as it actually exists (Sue, 2004). On some level, the language learner has to learn how to suspend judgement that their worldview is reality, as well as partially concede their individuality temporarily to make a transition to a second identity. The reason for this is because if a learner takes the position that their cultural worldview is reality, then other perspectives violate and threaten the “morality that is symbolically wrapped up in one’s cultural worldview” (Snyder, 2008, p. 1) and they won’t want to change their perspective or adapt. Assuming a second identity in this case will be violating a moral code. Ideally, language learners should allow constructivism to inform their development process. Constructivism is a perspective that sees society as the factor that constructs the identity of the individual, while the individual’s identity is regarded as partly individualistic and partly social.

One influential source in the field of constructivism that helps us better understand why this is important is Jean Piaget, who spoke of the cognitive development of learners as they come to know and discover the world around them. In his work, Piaget proposed that individuals construct knowledge based on their experiences through interaction with the social and physical environment and that their minds have mental structures (called schemata) that they use to organize and adapt to the environment. He argued that these schemata are used to process and identify information. These schemata change, enlarge, and become more sophisticated with mental development through the process of assimilation and accommodation (Piaget, 1952). From a constructivist perspective, society is necessary for language learners to be able to interact and learn how

to construct and reconstruct their understanding of the world around them and adapt. In general, interaction with society constructs the learner's knowledge and identity.

From a constructivist viewpoint, the real world has no inherent meaning in it except for the meaning that is imposed by people and cultures through social interaction. Those learning to integrate into society construct their own understanding and knowledge of the world through experience and reflecting on the experiences that they go through. Learning is seen as a result of fitting new knowledge with prior knowledge. In this view, learning is an active constructive process in which the learner is building an internal representation of the world and adjusts his understandings to fit his experiential world (Simina & Hamel, 2005).

Cross-Cultural Communication

Culture is a considerable part of our identity and it, too, is constantly in flux (Dumitrašković, 2014). Greater attention needs to be given in foreign language classrooms to a student's identity and culture. As decades of pedagogical research has demonstrated, when learning a foreign language, it is necessary for the student to learn the culture of the foreign language as well (Spackman, 2009, p. 2).

As part of that learning process, students need to feel comfortable in the classroom to express themselves openly and freely. Language learning is a social practice and not simply a body of knowledge to be learned (Kramsch, 1993). It is not enough to know grammar and vocabulary. Language learners need to understand how that language is used to create and represent meaning and how to engage in communication with others. Learners must develop an awareness of the nature of language and its impact on the

world (Svalberg, 2012). Social interaction is critical to the development of this awareness.

Language learners, when they are faced with the challenge of adapting to a new culture, often try to adapt the target culture via the lens of their L1's culture and identity, and this leads to confusion and a struggle to understand where they belong in the target community and culture (Dumitrašković, 2014). This is why explicit teaching of cross-cultural communication is essential. In my own classroom, like the approach of using online forums similar to MIT's *Cultura* program. I give my students cultural materials to study and homework similar like the questionnaires to be able to compare and contrast with online friends from the target culture. One great online resource for this is a website called *italki* that allows students to find a "friend" from the culture and country and speak with them online. I then use parts of class time to discuss what students have learned and guide their studies.

Gunderson (2000) suggests that language and culture cannot be separated, attempting to do so results in a loss of meaning for both. An important aspect of teaching a language and intercultural communication is helping students develop an understanding of their own culture and being able to recognize the same or similar values in other cultures as well as being able to distinguish the differences. By teaching intercultural communication, students engage with and learn to understand and interpret human communication and interaction in increasingly sophisticated ways. They learn this skill by being both participants and observers in the process, and this helps them more fully develop and construct their identity.

Identity's Influence on Motivation

Much of what I have discussed has dealt with interaction. I discuss here identity's influence on motivation because it is pertinent to a learner's identity in that it affects development of their inter-cultural competence and willingness to communicate and interact. Motivation has a powerful influence on one's willingness to persevere in the completion of a task or goal, in this case integrating into a new community. Oyserman and Destin (2010) discuss identity congruence and mention how learners "prefer identity-congruent actions over identity-incongruent ones" (p. 1001) and that they will interpret difficulties and challenges they face in the classroom based on this premise. If they encounter challenges that feel identity-incongruent, many students might be more likely to give up and say "these behaviors [are] pointless and 'not for people like me.'" (p. 1001).

Ideal Self and Possible Self

One influential aspect of the learner's identity is the ideal self. The ideal self is the belief that an individual holds about who they would like to become and how they would like to be seen by others. Öz's (2015, 2016) research on the ideal L2 self and the L2 learner's intercultural competence has established a link with the learner's L2 willingness to communicate. Recent research by Gu and Cheung (2016) has revealed that the ideal L2 self has a constructive effect on a learner's intercultural communication skills. When the ideal self feels incongruent, it can be difficult to persevere and develop intercultural communicative competence. In this way, it can make acculturation difficult and therefore lead to confusion or frustration about one's L2 identity. Dörnyei (2014) even argues that "a major source of any absence of L2 motivation is likely to be the lack of a developed ideal self" (p. 33).

An important development in the ideal L2 self is *international posture*, a perspective that tries to see the self more in international terms rather than connected necessarily to any individual culture or language community (Yashima, 2009). Because we now live in a globalized world, Yashima (2009) says that even though learners of English as a foreign language want to speak with native English speakers, they do not necessarily want to identify with them but simply want to be able to connect and communicate with other communities that speak English. Yashima makes the distinction between integrativeness and instrumentality. Integrativeness essentially means that one wants to integrate into the new community while instrumentality means that one needs to use the language as an instrument in dealing and working with the L2 community.

According to Gardner (2001) openness to foreignness or non-ethnocentric attitudes is relevant for the psychology of those who learn English as a foreign language. This openness includes being open to different perspectives, being adaptable, empathetic, tending to approach people who are different, and having a non-ethnocentric attitude. Yashima's (2009) encouragement to take an "international posture" encourages language learners to take a perspective that sees oneself as connected to the international community, having concerns for international affairs, and possessing a readiness to interact with people other than their home cultures. He says that this approach combines both the integrative and instrumental aspects of motivation. Accordingly, Yashima's (2002) research suggests that an international posture is connected to motivation to learn and willingness to communicate and leads to proficiency and self-confidence which, in turn, increases one's willingness to communicate. Yashima (2009) also suggests that an international experience such as study abroad can help a language learner develop their

possible selves and situate their possible selves in a foreign language speaking environment, thus further promoting willingness to communicate and communicative competence.

Coexistence of Ideal Self and Ought-to-Self

The ought-to-self is motivated by social pressures from the learner's environment and includes such factors as fear and competition (Dörnyei & Chan, 2013). The ought-to-self can have a negative effect on learning outcomes (Siridetkoon & Dewaele, 2017). In their research on motivation in multilingual foreign language learners and striving to understand how these different language systems operate and coexist, Siridetkoon and Dewaele (2017), found that the ideal self and ought-to-self coexist and play off of each other in a complex relationship. Multilingual learners have separate language selves (Lau, Yeung, Jin, & Low, 1999; Mercer, 2011; Yeung & Wong, 2004) and they temporarily suspend oneself in order to develop another part of themselves. As the ideal L2 self and the L2 ought-to-selves work off each other, they shape how each one works and is influenced by both internal and external elements.

Others Perspective of Ourselves

Higgins (1987) classifies self-identity into three parts: the actual self (i.e., beliefs that you and others hold about who you really are at this time), the ideal self (i.e., your beliefs about who you would like to be), and the ought to self (i.e., the beliefs that you attribute to others about who you should be). His framework suggests that included in how we feel about ourselves and what we want to be seen as, how we feel about how others perceive us contributes significantly to our acculturation and assimilation into the L2 community. Dörnyei (2006) asserts that "Human action is caused by purpose, and this

purpose has often been operationalized in terms of goals” (p. 15). If our goal is to integrate into a new community, but the citizens of that community challenge our identity and intercommunicative competence and the ability to make the transition, and if the challenge becomes identity incongruent, the transition will be difficult and may not fully take place.

Motivation is Multifaceted and in Flux

Like identity, motivation is also complex and in constant flux (Dörnyei, 2014). Motivation has been considered as an affective factor (Henter, 2014) and a cognitive factor (Murayama 2018). It is influenced by both internal factors (e.g., individual curiosity or interest) and external factors (e.g., language attitudes influenced by the relationships within language communities) (Dörnyei, 2014). Particularly in academic settings and with the element of time, motivation does not stay constant but is in fact subject to the various external and internal factors that an individual is exposed to (Dörnyei & Skehan, 2008). This fluctuation in motivation can occur on a daily basis as the many factors affecting identity interact simultaneously on a temporary or permanent basis. Dörnyei (2014) says that the only really predictable aspect of motivation is that from an experiential perspective, we know when we feel motivated and when we don't.

Agency

Recent approaches to understanding human behavior, including motivation, have turned to complexity theory (Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008). The metaphor used in complexity theory is that of a beach ball and the metaphor suggests that the behavior of the individual is a response to 'the terrain and its attractors' meaning that the individual is controlled by external factors and does not have free will (Al-Hoorie, 2015). The debate

in complexity theory as to whether an individual has free choice or is controlled by external factors is quite divided (Dornyei, 2009). I favor those who, like Bandura (1997), argue that “Agency causation involves the ability to behave differently from what environmental forces dictate rather than inevitably yield to them” (p. 7). Others (e.g., Juarrero, 1999; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008) are of a similar opinion that we are not just passive pieces controlled by our environment and external forces, that we also contribute in a real sense to our circumstances which later may then constrain us.

Identity Construction Influence on Social Participation

Identity construction is a life-long process, some of which takes place in the classroom but the majority of which takes place over time via our interactions in society and through our public participation (Hafer & Ran, 2016). Participation in society offers individuals opportunity to construct their identity. Individuals categorize themselves along socialized groups (Hafer & Ran, 2016), which is understood as their social identity. People identify themselves with these groups to enhance their self-esteem, sense of distinctiveness, feelings of certainty, and other motivations as well (Moss, 2016). Moss (2016) says that social participation as a part of identity construction fulfills six needs or motives: distinctiveness, meaning, continuity, belonging, self-esteem, and efficacy. As Oyserman and Destin (2010) state, earlier identity incongruence causes these needs not to be fulfilled and discourages a learner from striving to achieve high proficiency in a language and connect with that culture as well as participate in that society.

Conclusion and Implications

The previous review of the literature offers several implications for classroom practice. First, social interaction with the L2 language and culture is critical. Therefore,

as a language teacher, I need to allow for plentiful social interaction with the L2. I like online learning and I like the idea of an online forum. I think going forward this will be how I incorporate interaction with the L2 culture. I will use online forums and chats as part of my curriculum where my students have to choose a language partner to help them compare and contrast different cultural elements throughout the semester. I also find it helpful to include cultural artifacts and realia like movies, radio, and television, as well as giving them questionnaires like the *Cultura* program of MIT. This is in my view the most effective way to get them interacting with the culture: face to face. Second, scaffolding my students' development and helping them understand how to become autonomous mediators of their environment is key to helping them learn to regulate their belief systems. Third, it is important for me to help my students learn how to negotiate identity and navigate power play in the L2 community. Explicitly teaching language pragmatics and how the language is used to influence others in the L2 community helps my students to learn how to navigate power play in social interaction in the L2 community. For example, if I am teaching business English or a unit on work environment, I can help my students understand how different cultures respond to their bosses. In such a lesson, for instance, we could explore how in American culture the relationship with a boss is much more relaxed and the boss is much more approachable whereas in Peruvian culture if you are vocally too negative about your boss you could get fired really quickly. Again, by introducing cultural elements into the curriculum and using class time to question my students' perceptions or preconceived notions about a culture, I can begin to help them reconstruct their schemata of themselves and the culture that they are trying to integrate into.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

TECHNOLOGY-ENHANCED L2 LISTENING

When I started learning languages, one of the most challenging skills to develop was my listening ability. I wasn't deaf in one ear when I began learning languages and I can't remember if this made listening any more difficult. Having been deaf in one ear for two decades now, I do know that I have had to focus my listening and learn how to be more attentive to what people are saying. Even in English, there are times when I don't catch what they say or when I hear something completely different. When I taught English in China, I had a student who had a speech impediment and my curiosity was piqued to know if this student also had challenges with listening and hearing that affected his speech. These experiences, combined with an opportunity to take Dr. Thoms's technology class and to learn about technology that can enhance listening skills when learning a second language (L2), made me interested about this topic and I wanted to know what has been researched on the subject.

I started first by looking into how language is processed. I started with an article by **Atkinson and Shiffrin (1968)**, who frame language processing in terms of structural features and control processes, and place processing in three stages: sensory register, short-term memory store, and long-term memory store. They state that when a stimulus is presented, it is immediately registered by the appropriate sensory dimension. They state that the information gathered through the senses decays rapidly. Information that enters the short-term store or 'working memory' takes longer to decay than the sensory register but it still decays rapidly as well as completely. Information in the short-term store doesn't take the form of the sensory registry necessarily; in other words, something registered visually may be stored in aural memory. This means when coding and storing information, the senses in fact are connected or at least are challenging to separate them

completely. Finally, they mention that information stored in long-term memory does not decay and is “relatively permanent” (p. 17).

A second article I found on L2 listening processing was **Mayor (2009)** who discusses the psycholinguistic approach of emphasizing phonological decoding and argues that it is the most appropriate approach by stating that “contrary to Field's (1998) claim that misunderstanding occurs at the level of syntax, the real hurdle is the phonological one” (p. 109). She mentions in her article that intensive listening training to overcome first language (L1) influence on L2 processing is highly beneficial and should include “specific measures...when designing an L2 listening comprehension module” (p. 109), including pronunciation training materials. She suggests that sound training should be a part of any L2 program, and that such training should include automation of input.

Mayor agrees with the cognitive view of language acquisition which, according to this view, takes place through wide exposure to the language by practice and repetition. This practice and repetition may occur during hours of autonomous laboratory practice. She warns that L2 listening training is not complete without teaching the top-down and bottom-up processes. She suggests that this training and the acquisition of forms and relevant sociocultural knowledge must be made salient by an instructor through graphical medium and representation. She also makes the argument that an L2 language comprehension training program needs to include intensive training, be highly motivating, and students need to be constantly and massively exposed to L2 input. Offering a solution, Mayor recommends that computer assisted language learning (CALL) measures can fulfill these requirements.

One of the things that I became interested in understanding was whether or not

learners can use strategies and what kind of strategies they can use in aiding cognitive processing. Looking into this subject, I read **Vandergrift's (2007)** article that provides an overview of cognitive processing by discussing top-down and bottom-up processes and describing how linguistic knowledge and world knowledge interact simultaneously to help a learner form a mental representation of what they have heard. He says that the degree to which one process is used over another depends on the purpose of listening, the characteristics of the learner, and the context of the listening event.

Vandergrift reviews in this article the differences between native and non-native listeners as well as more skilled and less skilled listeners. The effectiveness and speed to which listeners can use linguistic and world knowledge to process information depends on the degree to which L2 listeners can efficiently process what is heard. He says native listeners are able to process aural input automatically and efficiently with little conscious attention to individual words as opposed to beginning listeners who, having little linguistic knowledge and because the rate of speech may be fast, may process more slowly or may not process at all the information presented in aural input because of the inability of working memory to process the information within the limited time frame. He relates how listeners use compensatory mechanisms, such as contextual, visual, or paralinguistic information, world knowledge, cultural information and common sense, etc., to make up for these limitations.

Vandergrift found that skilled listeners use more listening strategies and meta-cognitive strategies, including comprehension monitoring and question elaboration. More skilled students use a combination or coupling of meta-cognitive and cognitive strategies. Learning this helped me realize how I can work with my students and make them more

aware of compensatory techniques they can use to improve their listening. I still needed to look further into meta cognitive strategies as I began to understand how important they are in the process of improving L2 listening and I turned to an article by **Looi-Chin, Unin, and Johari (2017)**. They review the basic steps of meta cognition which include planning, monitoring, and evaluating language use and learning. They cite Thompson and Rubin (1996) who affirm that students who receive strategy instruction in listening to audio-recorded texts improved significantly in their listening skills as opposed to those who don't receive instruction. Their study found that students who are made aware of meta cognitive listening strategies are able to conduct self-learning and become more competent in their listening skills. They come to the conclusion that it would be useful for ESL teachers to enhance the use of strategies among students including: planning and evaluation strategies, direct attention, and personal knowledge.

One of the things that occurred to me in all of this is that the attention we give to information makes a difference in how it is processed and how well it sticks or is retained. Needing to better understand how engagement plays a key role in this, I looked into an article on listening engagement by **Wolvin (2010)** who talks about five different purposes for which we listen. The five functions for which we listen and give our attention include discriminative listening (which helps listeners draw a distinction between facts and opinions), comprehensive listening (which facilitates the understanding of oral input), critical listening (which allows listeners to analyze the incoming message before accepting or rejecting it), therapeutic listening (which serves as a sounding board and lacks any aspect of critique), and appreciative listening (which concerns listeners enjoyment of input and receiving emotional impressions).

Addressing the issue of active listening, Wolvin says that while in today's world faking attention may be a workable strategy, the outcome is that listening competency will not develop. He mentions that like any other communicative competency, listening skills build on the tripartite foundation of cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses. A learner has to know what they are doing, be engaged, and perform the necessary behaviors in order to develop good listening habits. This helped me become aware that there does need to be some type of interaction that takes place even when using CALL mediums.

Finally, understanding cognitive processing well enough and how to train our attention, I turned my focus to understand how technology can influence cognitive processing and what tools and techniques I can use as a teacher in my classroom pedagogy to enhance L2 listening. While taking Dr. Thoms's technology class, I was introduced to multimodal listening through the use of CALL. Many CALL applications and tools allow for multisensory input using various elements such as text, sound, pictures, video, and animation simultaneously. **Guichon and Mclornan (2009)** say that multimodality allows for sensory information to be accessible in various semiotic codes and comprehend them through different channels. They also relate how video texts provide contextual clues. They say that visual information is directly linked to oral messages and that's why using multimodal resources can be so beneficial to developing L2 listening. Having used a lot of visual aids in my own learning, and, in particular, subtitles, their conclusions on subtitles was informative. They confirm that subtitles are a determining factor in understanding the information presented visually. It was also

interesting to learn that whether or not subtitles were in the L1 or L2 did not make a difference on levels of understanding.

Exploring assessment issues, **Campoy-Cubillo and Querol-Julian (2015)** assess multimodal listening and try to provide a broader perspective, one being that students need to be trained in both linguistic and nonlinguistic features of language that co-occur and interact at the same time to create meaningful messages. They say that much of the research in this area has been done analyzing only video or only audio input. In their study, they talk about two main listening types: transactional (one-way) and interactional (two-way). They discuss how CALL sets up different types of e-learning atmospheres like online lectures or webinars and that this type of e-learning allows for more interactional listening opportunities. They also mention that this type of interactional listening has differences than interactional listening in a classroom.

They argue that in one-way transactional listening, the application of multimodal listening is particularly more important than in interactional listening. In this type of interaction, different modes may be made salient in the following ways: speaker's voice, audio text, video text, or multimedia text. When using multiple modes of input, they mention how it is the visual input that first comes to mind when using video texts and they review the assumption that user interaction with more than one mode results in more meaningful learning. Because of all this, they also argue that when assessing L2 listening skills, such assessments should include the evaluation of other skills, such as speaking skills and/or multi-skill tasks.

In the area of L2 listening comprehension, the main focus to which we lend our attention is utterances. **Gass et al. (1999)** review the significance of utterances in

processing and specifically repetition. They suggest that as utterances are repeated and as they re-enter working memory, learners can spend greater time focusing on problems localized earlier in the string of sounds. In other words, repetition of utterances allows learners to focus on other information that allows them to make connections and more deeply process the utterances helping them to be retained. This is the focus of their research: making connections between form and meaning. They say that technology can enhance this process by being able to play back and review, as many times as desired/needed, utterances that the learner is listening to.

One of the other concepts I was introduced to in Dr. Thoms's technology class was semiotic learning in an article by **Perez (2019)**. In his article, **Perez (2019)** introduces what semiotic learning is. Semiotic learning means being able to decode information from signs and visual cues like facial expressions and body language. Like others that I have previously mentioned, Perez (2019) also suggests that semiotic learning can be applied to the CALL field with such tools as on-screen text or highlighting words in subtitles. He discusses how this impacts pedagogy and how instructors can implement technology for the purpose of enhancing listening skills in their classrooms. To that end, he makes several suggestions. One such suggestion is that instructional interventions ought to be considered as they not only improve the bottom-up and top-down processes, but also help to develop listening strategies. He introduces two instructional intervention techniques; one is termed interactionist, which he suggests also includes human to computer interaction and a multimedia/dual coding perspective which states that make the case that learners learn better from pictures and words together rather than words alone. His second suggestion is to combine modalities in order to enhance the bottom-up

process and therefore improve the language acquisition process. He recommends two ways to develop bottom-up processing, including repetitive and intensive listening exercises (i.e., the ability to use video players with subtitles and capabilities to slow down the speed and play material over again), as well as combining written and auditory input and using visual advanced organizers before reading.

One of the things I need to better understand is how effective it is to combine different learning modes to enhance input and aid the listening process. **Jones and Plass** (2002) address this topic nicely in their review of how effectively multimedia learning environments can assist second language students in the process of listening comprehension and vocabulary acquisition. They begin their article by first defining what listening is. They say that listening is receiving, attending, and assigning meaning to aural stimuli and that this process involves a listener who brings prior knowledge of the topic, linguistic knowledge, and cognitive processing to the listening task, aural text, thereby involving an interactive process between the two.

Jones and Plass mention in their article that most listening comprehension exercises that come with textbooks only have the aural component, with little or no pictorial or written supportive material. They do then state that this sort of material has been in development in recent years with programs like *The Listening Tool*, *Montevidesco*, and *Atrévete*. They research whether different modes of presenting a text, including annotations, have an effect in a multimedia environment.

Jones and Plass reaffirm that today's approach to language acquisition is a cognitive and constructivist approach where students need to be able to interact with the materials that they are presented with. They favor interaction with authentic texts and

materials over pedagogically designed materials. They discuss how prior knowledge and student interaction with an aural passage are part of listening comprehension and that when prior knowledge is low, comprehension of aural material is low. When prior knowledge is low, students need to interact with an aural passage to construct meaning. They suggest that because the research shows that student interaction with written texts in a multimedia environment, where they can access multiple annotation types (i.e., both written and pictorial), allows learning to take place more readily, that this is also true with aural texts and listening exercises. Finally, they argue that written and pictorial annotations presented contiguously help learners more easily acquire new vocabulary and comprehend what they are listening to in an L2 aural passage.

Jones and Plass cited **Guillory (1998)** in their article regarding the effect of captions to authentic French videos. I therefore went to **Guillory (1998)** to see what he had to say about captions. In his research, he found that material presented through dual input forms (i.e., via dialogue and script) is more completely processed than if either form is presented alone. In his article, he discusses authentic video and that even though authentic video is not scripted nor adjusted, authentic videos can be made more accessible to learners through organizers, vocabulary lists, summaries of content in the L1, or captions in the L2.

In the study he carried out, individuals read text on a screen while listening to the audio. They mentioned that the information in the audio and visual input was almost identical, making the transfer of learning from one channel to the other easier. This confirmed a lot of what I was seeing in my French classes that I taught and what I had experienced in my own learning process. It was confusing for students when audio and

visual elements did not match up. In this case, it took students longer to process the information. I found it interesting as part of Guillory's study that he found the unusual result that L2 audio with L1 text led to the highest of test scores, but he did not expand on this finding and instead focused on bi-modal captioning in his study.

Another study that I was led to that concerns video captioning was **Winke, Gass, and Sydorenko (2010)**. In their research, they mention that captioning helps learners segment speech and identify word boundaries. Their research looks at what learners do when they are presented with captions, specifically whether they read them in full or only in part. They state that captions for lower-level learners are often a distraction. Finally, they investigate how language learners process captions that use non-Roman scripts like Arabic, Chinese, and Russian.

In their research, they found that captioned videos help learners recognize novel vocabulary and aid overall comprehension. In SLA, more input is better because it can lead to deeper processing. Learners use different input modes differently and these input modes reinforce one another. They also recognized in their research that learners may be able to process different modes better than others. They also found that when a video is shown two times (i.e., once with captioning and once without), the order of viewing has an effect on the subsequent recognition of vocabulary presented in the aural mode. As part of recognition and reviewing the literature, they mention that awareness is key for noticing and they discuss the noticing hypothesis.

Mayor (2009) cites **Perez Basanta (2000)** in confirming that digital video can enhance the development of L2 listening skills in the following ways: 1) authenticity, 2) motivation, interest, and confidence, 3) the socio-linguistic and pragmatic level of

language, 4) nonverbal features, such as gestures and body language, 5) active involvement and participation, and 6) real vocabulary acquisition.

It was interesting to me that they would bring up confidence. I had not really thought about needing to have confidence in my listening skills before. I looked into the subject to understand what that was about. **Polat and Eristi (2019)** discuss L2 listening anxiety and affect. He says that L2 listening anxiety can essentially be defined as “feelings of apprehension, restlessness, tension, uneasiness and fear...stemming from actions required before and during the listening activity as well as other various stimuli” (p. 136). He says that there is a linear relationship between the source, listening anxiety, and listening performance. He goes on and states that the quality of the teaching material and the aural source plays a role in the emergence of listening anxiety. Polat and Eristi cite **Wilson (2006)** who mentions that such aspects such as speed, diction, accents, complexity and difficulty of the material, number of unknown words in the content, syntactic difficulties and grammatical structures in which the individuals are not familiar in the listening materials, can all lead to listening anxiety. He also says that speed and length of the text, along with individuals’ familiarity with the subject of the text, influence listening anxiety.

As I investigated the L2 listening process of language acquisition, I came to discover that this is a complex process and that CALL can help by providing supplemental tools like video and captioning. It was also very informative for me as a teacher to become aware myself of meta cognitive strategies that I should be using in my own language learning and that I should be teaching my students to be aware of and use in their language learning practice. In addition, understanding all of the factors that can

affect processing like anxiety has helped me to become aware of what I can do as a teacher to help enhance my students' L2 listening skills.

LOOKING FORWARD

Language learning is a life-changing experience that opens new worlds to you. Throughout my three-year experience in the MSLT program, I have grown and learned how to help others undertake this journey and open new doors for themselves. Looking forward, I first want to become more established as a teacher and I am looking into teaching English as a second language, or Spanish, or French and taking a few years to stabilize. I am currently considering getting a Ph.D. in linguistics and Spanish texts or perhaps a doctorate in education. I am currently eyeing two programs in Arequipa, Peru although I would be happy to earn a Ph.D. in a related field of linguistics and to consider other Latin American countries. I am also looking at a few programs in Spanish in Spain including one in Barcelona. I look forward to improving my teaching and continuing my journey as both a language teacher and learner.

REFERENCES

- Adley-Santa Maria, B. (1997). White Mountain Apache language: Issues in language shift, textbook development, and native speaker-university collaboration. In J. Reyhner (Ed.), *Teaching indigenous languages* (pp. 129-143). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.
- Al-Azri, R.H., & Al-Rashdi, M.H. (2014). The effect of using authentic materials in teaching. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 3(10), 249-254.
- Al-Hoorie, A.H. (2015). Human agency: Does the beach ball have free will? In Z. Dornyei, P.D. McIntyre, & A. Henry, *Motivational Dynamics in Language Learning* (pp.55-66). New York: Multilingual Matters.
- Atkinson, R.C. & Shiffrin, R.M. (1968). Human memory: A proposed system and its control processes. *Psychology of Learning and Motivation*, 2, 89-195
- Ballman, T. L., Liskin-Gasparro, J. E., & Mandell, P. B. (2001). The role of grammar. In *The communicative classroom* (Vol. 3). Boston: Heinle.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: Freeman.
- Barac, R., & Bialystok, E. (2012). Bilingual effects on cognitive and linguistic development: Role of language, cultural background, and education. *Child Development*, 83(2), 413-422.
- Baralt, M., Gurzynski-Weiss, L., & Kim, Y. (2016). Engagement with language: How examining learners' affective and social engagement explains successful learner

- generated attention to form. In M. Sato & S. Ballinger (Eds.), *Peer interaction and second language learning: Pedagogical potential and research agenda*, (pp. 209-240). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Barr, J.M., Sadovnik, A.R., & Visconti, L. (2006). Charter schools and urban education improvement: A comparison of Newark's district and charter schools. *The Urban Review*, 38(4), 291-311.
- Batchelder, A., & Markel, S. (1997). An initial exploration of the Navajo Nation's language and culture initiative. In J. Reyhner (Ed.), *Teaching indigenous languages* (pp. 239-247). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.
- Berends, M. (2015). Sociology and school choice: What we know after two decades of charter schools. *The Annual Review of Sociology*, 41, 159-180.
- Berlin, L. N. (2000). The benefits of Second Language Acquisition and teaching for indigenous language educators. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 39(3), 1-24.
- Campoy-Cubillo, M. C. & Querol-Julian, M. (2015). Assessing multimodal listening. In B. Crawford & I. Fortanet-Gomez (Eds.) *Multimodal Analysis in Academic Settings: From Research to Teaching*. New York: Routledge, 193-212.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In Richards, J. & Schmidt, R. (Eds) *Language and communication* (pp. 2-27). Longman.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980) Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to Second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-48.

- Carli, A., Guardiano, C., Kaucic-Basa, M., Sussi, E., Tessardo, M., & Ussai, M., (2003). Asserting ethnic identity and power through language. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 29(5), 865-883.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1995). The elaboration of socio-linguistic competence: Implications for teacher education. In J.E. Alatis, C.A. Straehle, & M. Ronkin (Eds.) *46th Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics* (pp.699-710). Georgetown University Press.
- Celik, B. (2019). A comparison of form-focused and meaning-focused instruction types: A study on Ishik University students in Erbil, Iraq. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(1), 201-228.
- Cervantes-Soon, C.G., (2014). A critical look at Dual Language Immersion in the new latin@ diaspora. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 37(1), 64-82.
- Chomsky N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press
- Chomsky, N. (1980). *Rules and representations*. Columbia University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. Mouton
- Clarke, D. (1989). Communicative theory and its influence on materials production. *Language Teaching*, 22(2), 73-86.
- Collier, V., & Thomas, W. (2004). The astounding effectiveness of dual language education for all. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2(1), 1-20.
- Cooper, K. S. (2014). Eliciting engagement in the high school classroom a mixed-methods examination of teaching practices. *American Educational Research Journal*, 51, 363-402.

- Cotterell, A. (2019). Idaho's first public Native American language school works to preserve Shoshone culture.
- Crawford, J. (1995). Endangered Native American languages: What is to be done, and why? In T. L. McCarty & O. Zepeda (Eds.), *Indigenous language education and literacy* [Special ed.]. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 19(1), 17-38.
- Crawshaw, R., Callen, B., & Tusting, K. (2001). Attesting the self: Narration and identity change during periods of residence abroad. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 1(2), 101-119.
- Dastgoshadeh, A., & Jalilzadeh, K. (2011). Language loss, Identity, and English as an International Language. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 21(4).
- Davis, J. (2001). American Indian boarding school experiences: recent studies from native perspectives. *Magazine of History*, 15(2), 20-22.
- Denetclaw, P. (2017, November 16). Teachers: 'Immersion' for Diné not working. *Navajo Times*. Retrieved from <https://navajotimes.com/edu/teachers-immersion-for-dine-not-working/>
- Dörnyei, Z. (2006). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2009) Individual differences: Interplay of learner characteristics and learning environment. In N.C. Ellis and D. Larsen-Freeman (eds) *Language as a Complex Adaptive System* (pp. 230–248). Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell
- Dörnyei, Z. (2014). Motivation in second language learning. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. M. Brinton & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 518-531). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning/Cengage Learning.

- Dörnyei, Z., & Chan, L. (2013). Motivation and vision: An analysis of future L2 self images, sensory styles, and imagery capacity across two target languages. *Language Learning, 63*(3), 437-462.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Skehan, P. (2008). Individual Differences in L2 Learning. In Duff, P. (2007). Language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues. *Language Teaching, 40*, 309-319.
- Dumitrašković, T. A. (2014). Culture, identity, and foreign language teaching and learning. *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*.
- Elder, R.K. (2005). Montana's Piegan Institute crusades to keep the Blackfoot tongue -- and a culture -- from becoming extinct. *Chicago Tribune*.
<https://www.chicagotribune.com/news/ct-xpm-2005-10-06-0510050406-story.html>.
- Ellis, R. (2008). The study of second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Encyclopedia Britannica. (n.d.). Palatization. In *Encyclopedia Britannica.com encyclopedia*. Retrieved February 7, 2020, from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/palatalization>.
- Festinger, L.U. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations, 7*, 117-140. doi: 10.1177/001872675400700202
- Fishman, J. A. (1996a). What do you lose when you lose your language? In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing indigenous languages* (pp. 80-91). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.

- Fishman, J. A. (1996b). Maintaining languages: What works and what doesn't. In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing indigenous languages* (pp. 186-198). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.
- Fishman, J.A. (1991). Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages. *Multilingual matters*, 76.
- Foucault, M. (2002). The political technology of individuals. In J.D. Faubion (Ed.) *Essential works of Foucault 1954-1984* (vol. 3, pp. 403-417). London: Penguin.
- Gardner, R. C. (2001). Integrative motivation: Past, present and future. Retrieved January, 2012. from publish.uwo.ca/~gardner/docs.
- Garner, R. (2006). Humor in pedagogy: How ha-ha can lead to aha! *College Teaching*, 54, 177-180.
- Gass, S., Mackey, A., Alvarez-Torres, M. J. & Fernández-García, M. (1999). The effects of task repetition on linguistic output. *Language Learning*, 49, 549-581.
- Grunewald, R. (2015, June). Early childhood Native American language immersion programs: a promising approach to school preparation, economic opportunity and language preservation. *National Congress of American Indians 10th Annual Tribal Leader/Scholar Forum*. Talk presented at National Congress of American Indians, St. Paul, Minnesota.
- Gu, M. M., & Cheung, D. S. (2016). Ideal L2 self, acculturation, and Chinese language learning among South Asian students in Hong Kong: A structural equation modeling analysis. *System*, 57, 14-24.
- Guichon, N. & Mclornan, S. (2008). The effects of multimodality on L2 learners: Implications for CALL resource design. *System*, 36(1), pp. 85-93.

- Guillory, H.G. (1998). The effect of keyword captions to authentic French video on learner comprehension. *CALICO Journal*, 15(1-3), 89-108.
- Hafer, J. A., & Ran, B. (2016). Developing a citizen perspective of public participation: Identity construction as citizen motivation to participate. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 38, 206-222.
- Harrison, B. & Papa, R. (2005). The development of an indigenous knowledge program in a New Zealand Maori-language immersion school. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 36(1), 57- 72.
- Heath, S. B. (1972). *Telling tongues: language policy in Mexico-colony to nation*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.
- Henter, R. (2014). Affective factors involved in learning a foreign language. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 127, 373-378
- Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: A theory relating self and affect. *Psychological Review*, 94 (3), 319-340. <http://doi.org/bscmc3>
- Hinton, L. (1994). *Flutes of fire: Essays on California Indian languages*. Berkeley: Heyday Books.
- Huerta, G. (2007). *Educational foundations: Diverse histories, diverse perspectives*. Boston: Cengage.
- Hung Ng, S., & Deng, F. (2017). *Language and power*. Oxford Research Encyclopedias. <https://oxfordre.com/communication/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228613-e-436>
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings* (pp. 269-293). London: Penguin.

- Illés, E., & Akcan, S. (2017). Bringing real-life language use into EFL classrooms, *ELT Journal*, 71(1), 3-12.
- Jones, L., & Plass, J., (2002). Supporting listening comprehension and vocabulary acquisition in French with multimedia annotations. *Modern Language Journal* 86(4), p. 546 - 561. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00160>.
- Juarrero, A. (1999) *Dynamics in Action: Intentional Behavior as a Complex System*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jund, A. (2010). Toward a pedagogy of intercultural understanding in teaching English for Academic Purposes. *The Electronic Journal for English as a Second Language*, 14 (1), 1-13.
- Ka'awa, M., & Hawkins, E. (1997). Incorporating technology into a Hawaiian language curriculum. In J. Reyhner (Ed.), *Teaching indigenous languages* (pp. 151-157). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.
- Kaluhiokalani, K. (2007). Pu'a i ka olelo ola ka ohana: three generations of hawaiian language revitalization. *Hūlili*, 4(1), 183-237.
- Kamwangamalu, N. M. (2007). One language, multi-layered identities: English in a society in transition, South Africa. *World Englishes*, 26(3), 263-275.
- Kim T.K., Hutchison, L.A., & Winsler, A., (2015). Bilingual education in the United States: an historical overview and examination of two-way immersion. *Educational Review*, 67(2), 236-252.
- Kouhpaenejad, M.H., & Gholaminejad, R. (2014). Identity and language learning from post-structuralist perspective. *Journal of Language and Research*, 5(1), pp. 199-204.

- Koven, M. (2007). *Selves in two languages: Bilinguals' verbal enactments of identity in French and Portuguese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S.D. (1985). *The Input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London: Longman.
- Krauss, M. (1996). Status of Native American language endangerment. In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing indigenous languages* (pp. 16-21). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2007). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (pp. 201-224). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lantolf, J.P., & Thorne, S.L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of second language development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Cameron, L. (2008) *Complex Systems and Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leong, D.J., & Bodrova, E. (2006). Developing self-regulation: The Vygotskian view. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, 10(4).
- Long, M. (1988). Instructed interlanguage development. In L. Beebe (Ed.), *Issues in second language acquisition: Multiple perspectives* (pp.115-141). New York: Newbury House.
- Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.). *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp.413-468). Academic Press.

- Long, M. H. (1985). 'Input and second language acquisition theory'. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.) *Input and Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 268-286). New York: Newbury House.
- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Long, M., & Robinson, P. (1998). Focus on form: Theory, research and practice. In C. Doughty, & J. Williams (Eds.) *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 15-41). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Looichin, C., Unin, N., & Johari, A. (2017). Metacognitive awareness strategies for listening comprehension. *The Asian Journal of English Language & Pedagogy*, 5, p. 11-19.
- Luning, R. (2007). *The effects of Hawaiian language immersion program on student and family development* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from University of Hawaii at Manoa Digital Collections. (Accessed April 27, 2017).
- Maestre, J.L.T., (2016). Teachers' beliefs, practices and challenges in using communicative language teaching (CLT) in an ESL context in the Philippines. *2016 Asian Conference on Language Learning*. Conference conducted at Ateneo de Davao University, The Philippines.
- Marian, V., & Shook, A. (2012). *The cognitive benefits of being bilingual*. Cerebrum. <https://www.dana.org/article/the-cognitive-benefits-of-being-bilingual/>.

- Martin, A. (2006). The relationship between teachers' perceptions of student motivation and engagement and teachers' enjoyment of and confidence in teaching. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(1), 73-93.
- Mayor, M. J. B., (2009). CALL-enhanced L2 listening skills – Aiming for automatization in a multimedia environment. *Indian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 35(1).
- McCarty, T. (2013). *Language planning and policy in Native America: History, theory, praxis* (p. 131). Multilingual Matters.
- McCarty, T. L., & Zepeda, O. (Eds.) (1995). Indigenous language education and literacy [Special ed.]. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 19(1).
- McCarty, T. L., Watahomigie, L. J., & Yamamoto, A. Y. (1999). Reversing language shift in indigenous America: Collaborations and views from the field [Special ed.]. *Practicing Anthropology*, 21(2).
- Mitchell, R. And Myles, F. (1998) *Second Language Learning Theories*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Miyashita, M., & Chatsis, A. (2013). Collaborative development of Blackfoot language courses language documentation & conservation, 7, pp. 302-330
<http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/lhc> <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4597>.
- Morgan, B., & Clarke, M. (2011). Identity in second language teaching and learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2). New York: Routledge.
- Moss, C. (2005). Teaching for communicative competence: Interaction in the ESOL classroom. *Focus on Basics: Connecting Research and Practice*, 7(C).

- Moss, S. (2016). *Motivated identity construction theory*. SicoTests.
<https://www.sicotests.com/psyarticle.asp?id=437>
- Muir-Herzig, R.G. (2004). Technology and its impact in the classroom. *Computers and Education*, 42(2), 111-131
- Muramatsu, C. (2013). *Portraits of second language learners: agency, identities, and second language learning*. (Doctor of Philosophy), University of Iowa.
- Murayama, K. (2018). *The science of motivation*. American Psychological Association.
<https://www.apa.org/science/about/psa/2018/06/motivation>
- Mutluoğlu, A. (2016). The influence of ideal L2 self, academic self-concept and intercultural communicative competence on willingness to communicate in a foreign language. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(2).
- Nakata, S. (2017). Language suppression, revitalization, and native Hawaiian identity. *The Forum*, 2, 14-27.
- Narcy-Combes, J.P. (2010). L2 learning processes. In J.C. Bertin (Ed.) *Second language distance learning and teaching: Theoretical perspectives and didactic ergonomics*. IGI Global.
- Native American Languages Act Amendments: Hearing Before the Committee on Indian Affairs, Senate, 106th Cong. 1 (2000).
- Nave, L. (1996). Navajo immersion program at Fort Defiance Elementary School. In G. Cantoni (Ed.), *Stabilizing indigenous languages* (144-145). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.
- New London Group, (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66, 60-92.

- Ng, S. H., & Deng, F. (2017). *Language and Power*. Oxford Research Encyclopedias. [Oxfordre.com/communication/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228613-e-436](https://oxfordre.com/communication/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.001.0001/acrefore-9780190228613-e-436)
- Nguyen, T.D., Cannata, M., & Miller, J. (2016). Understanding student behavioral engagement: Importance of student interaction with peers and teachers. *The Journal of Educational Research*, DOI: 10.1080/00220671.2016.1220359.
- Niño-Murcia, M. 2003. English is like a dollar’: Hard currency ideology and the status of English in Peru. *World Englishes*, 22, 123-43.
- Noels, K. (2009). The internalisation of language learning into the self and social identity. In Z. Dornyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.) *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 295-313). Multilingual Matters.
- Norton, B. (1997). Language, identity, and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 409- 429.
- Norton, B. (2006). Identity as a sociocultural construct in second language education. In K. Cadman & K. O’Regan (Eds.), *Tales out of school: Special issue of TESOL in Context* (pp. 22-33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning*. UK: Short Run Press.
- Norton, B. (2013). *Identity and language learning: Extending the conversation*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Norton, B. (2014). Identity and poststructuralist theory in SLA. In S. Mercer & M Williams (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on the self in SLA* (pp. 59–74). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

- Omoniyi, T., & White, G. (2008). The Sociolinguistics of Identity. *The Modern Language Journal* 92, 645-647.
- Oyserman, D., & Destin, M. (2010). Identity-based motivation: implications for intervention. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 38(7), 1001–43.
- Oyserman, D., & Destin, M. (2010). Identity-based motivation: Implications for intervention. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 38(7), 1001–1043.
- Oyserman, D., Elmore, K., & Smith, G. (2012). Self, self-concept, and identity. In M. R. Leary & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of Self and Identity (2nd Ed.)* (69-104). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Öz, H. (2015). Ideal L2 self as a predictor of intercultural communicative competence. *Anthropologist*, 19(1), 41-53.
- Peacock, M. (1997). The effect of authentic materials on the motivation of EFL learners. *English Language Teachers Journal*, 51(2), 144-156.
- Pease Pretty-On-Top, J. (2007). *Native American language immersion: Innovative native education for children and families*. W. K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan <http://www.collegefund.org/downloads/ImmersionBook.pdf>.
- Pérez Basanta, C. (2000). Cognitive processes in L2 listening: Implications for teaching and learning. In F. J. Ruiz de Mendoza (Ed.), *Panorama Actual de la Lingüística Aplicada. Conocimiento, Procesamiento y Uso del Lenguaje* (pp. 1811-20). Logroño: Universidad de La Rioja.
- Perez, M. M. (2019). Technology-enhanced listening: How does it look and what can we expect?

- Petitto, L. A., Berens, M. S., Kovelman, I., Dubins, M. H., Jasinska, K., & Shalinsky, M. (2012). The “perceptual wedge hypothesis” as the basis for bilingual babies’ phonetic processing advantage: New insights from fNIRS brain imaging. *Brain and Language, 121*, 130–143.
- Philp, J., & Duchesne, S. (2016). Exploring engagement in tasks in the language classroom. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 36*, 50-72.
- Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children* (M. Cook, Trans.) International Universities Press, Inc.
- Pica, T. (2000). Tradition and transition in English language teaching methodology. *System, 28*, 1-18.
- Piegan Institute (n.d.). *Our history*. [pieganinstitute.org](https://www.pieganinstitute.org).
<https://www.pieganinstitute.org/our-history>.
- Polat, M. & Eristi, B. (2019). The effects of authentic video materials and foreign language listening skill development and listening anxiety at different levels of English proficiency. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research, 6*(1), 135-154.
- Price, G. (2005). Semi-consonants in detail. In *An Introduction to French Pronunciation*. Hoboken, NJ: Blackwell.
- Ratner, C. (2002). *Cultural psychology: Theory and method*. New York: Kluwer/Plenum.
- Renaud, S., & Tannenbaum, E. (2013). Making Connections: Language Activities for Creating Interpersonal Tolerance in the Classroom. *English Teaching Forum, (2)*, 24-38.

- Reuse, W. (1997) Issues in language textbook development: The case of Western Apache. In J. Reyhner, G. Cantoni, W. Gilbert, & D. Heiser (Eds.), *Teaching Indigenous Languages* (116-128). Flagstaff, AZ: Northern Arizona University.
- Rich, S. (2016). Exploring critical thinking and negotiation of meaning through minecrafteu: A case study of elementary language learners. (Doctoral dissertation) Educational Technology Boise State University.
- Richard, J.C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richardson, J. W., & McLeod, S. (2011). Technology leadership in Native American schools. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 26(7), 1-14.
- Ronda, J. P. (1981). Generations of faith: the Christian Indians of Martha's Vineyard. *William and Mary Quarterly*, 38, 369-394.
- Rothbart, M.K, Sheese, B.E., Rueda, M.R., & Posner, M.I. (2011). Developing mechanisms of self-regulation in early life. *Emotion Review*, 3(2), 207-213.
- Sa'd, S.H.T. (2017). Foreign language learning and identity reconstruction: Learners' understanding of the intersections of the self, the other and power. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 7(4), 13-36.
- Sa'd, T. S. H., & Modirkhamene, S. (2015). Examining Acculturation Model in an EFL context: Learners' attitudes towards target language accent vs. L1 accent. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 15(1), 25–38. Retrieved from [http://journalarticle.ukm.my/8257/1/5373-22053-1-PB_\(1\).pdf](http://journalarticle.ukm.my/8257/1/5373-22053-1-PB_(1).pdf)

- Sa'd, S. H. T. (2017). Foreign language learning and identity reconstruction: Learners' understanding of the intersections of the self, the other and power. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 7(4), 13-36.
- Savignon, S. (1997). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Savignon, S. (2018). Communicative competence. In J.I. Liontas, M. DelliCarpini, & H. Nassasji (Eds.) *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Savignon, S. J. (1972). *Communicative competence: An experiment in foreign language teaching*. Philadelphia: Center for Curriculum Development.
- Schieffelin, B.B. & Ochs, E. (1986). Language Socialization. *Annual review of anthropology*, 15, 163-191
- Schumann, J. (1978). The acculturation model for second-language acquisition. In R. C. Gringas, (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching* (pp. 27-50). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Shabani, K., Khatib, M., & Ebadi, S. (2010). Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development: Instructional implications and teachers' professional development. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 238.
- Shiffrin, R. M., & Schneider, W. (1984). Automatic and controlled processing revisited. *Psychological Review*, 91, 269-276.
- Simina, V., & Hamel, J.M. (2005). CASLA through a social constructivist perspective: WebQuest in project-driven language learning. *ReCALL*, 17(2), 217-228.

- Siridetkoon, P., & Dewaele, J. M. (2017) Ideal self and ought-to self of simultaneous learners of multiple foreign languages. *International Journal of Multilingualism*.
- Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., & Furrer, C. (2009). A motivational perspective on engagement and disaffection: Conceptualization and assessment of children's behavioral and emotional participation in academic activities in the classroom. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 69*, 493-525.
- Spackman, C. L., (2009). *Culture and Second Language Acquisition*. Dominican University.
- Spada, N., & Lightbown, P.M. (2009). Interaction research in second/foreign language classrooms. In A. Mackey & P. Charlene (Eds.), *Multiple perspectives on interaction* (pp. 157–175). New York: Routledge.
- Stephen May & Richard Hill (2005) Maori-medium education: Current issues and challenges. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 8*(5), 377-403.
- Stobaugh, R. (2019). *Fifty strategies to boost cognitive engagement: Creating a thinking culture in the classroom (50 teaching strategies to support cognitive development)*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press.
- Stockton, H.L. (2015). *Identity-focused Second Language Acquisition: A systematic review of classroom applications* (Publication No. 147) [Master's thesis, Hamline University]. School of Education Digital Commons.
- Stockton, H.L. (2015). *Identity-focused second language acquisition: A systematic review of classroom applications* (147) [Master's thesis, Hamline University]. DigitalCommons@Hamline.

- Sue, D.W. (2004). Whiteness and ethnocentric monoculturalism: Malting the "invisible" visible. *American Psychologist*, 761-769.
- Svalberg, A. (2012). Language Awareness in language learning and teaching: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 45(3), 376-388.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2011). Native North American languages spoken at home in the United States and Puerto Rico: 2006–2010 (U.S. Department of Commerce Economics and Statistics Administration Publication No. ACSBR/10-10).
- U.S. Department of Education (2011, March, 18). *Grants*.
<https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oii/csp/grants.html>
- U.S. Department of Health & Human Services Administration for Native Americans (2019). Active Grants in Native Languages - Preservation and Maintenance. Retrieved from <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/ana/resource/native-languages-preservation-and-maintenance>
- Van Lier, L. (2004). The ecology of language learning. UC Language Consortium Conference on Theoretical and Pedagogical Perspectives, San Diego, CA.
<http://uccllt.ucdavis.edu/events/ULCCTPP/leo.php>
- Vandergrift, L. (2007). Recent developments in second and foreign language listening comprehension research. *Language Teaching* 56, 431-462.
- VanPatten, B., Williams, J., & Rott, S. (2004). Form-Meaning Connections in Second Language Acquisition. In B. VanPatten, J. Williams, S. Rott, & M. Overstreet (Eds.), *Form-Meaning Connections in Second Language Acquisition* (p. 1–26). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wilson, J.T.S., (2006). *Anxiety in learning English as a foreign language: Its associations with students variables, with overall proficiency, and with performance in an oral test*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Spain: University of Granada.
- Winke, P., Gass, S., & Syndorenko, T. (2010). The effects of captioning videos used for foreign language listening activities. *Language Learning & Technology*, 14(1), pp. 65-86
- Wolvin, A. (2010). Listening engagement: intersecting theoretical perspectives. *Listening and Human Communication in the 21st Century* (pp. 7-30).
- Yashima, T. (2000). International posture and the ideal L2 self in the Japanese EFL context. In A. Dornyei & E. Ushioda, *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self* (pp.144-160). Multilingual Matters.
- Yashima, T. (2002). Willingness to communicate in a second language: The Japanese EFL context. *The Modern Language Journal*, 80(1), 55-66.
- Yazzie-Mintz, E. (2009). *Engaging the voices of students: A report on the 2007 & 2008 high school survey of student engagement*. Bloomington, IN: Center for Evaluation and Education Policy.

- Yazzie-Mintz, E., & McCormick, K. (2012). Finding the humanity in the data: Understanding, measuring, and strengthening student engagement. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly, & C. Wiley (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 743–761). New York: Springer.
- Zacharias, N. T. (2010). Acknowledging Learner Multiple Identities in the EFL Classroom. *k@ta*, 12(1), 26-41.
<http://puslit2.petra.ac.id/ejournal/index.php/ing/article/viewFile/17932/18022>.
- Zepke, N., & Leach, L. (2010). Improving student engagement: Ten proposals for action. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 11(3), 167-177.