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ABSTRACT

Using technology to develop a collaborative-reflective teaching practice in a world language education methods course block for teaching certification creates unique opportunities for world language education undergraduates to learn to develop syntheccultural competence for education. Such a program allows undergraduates to expand their capacity to improve their own communicative ability in the languageculture being learned, to increase their computer skills, and to make and implement curricular and on-the-spot decisions about interactions that afford optimal learning opportunities for students. Thus, a more productive fusion in the classroom occur.

The instructional model researched here was offered through a major university, in Northeastern United States, to all prospective language teachers in a 2009-2011 cohort. The curriculum included a two-year program of Methods courses for which assignments were submitted online. Principal tools utilized by the undergraduates were MacBook (wireless, laptop) computers that had Internet capability and video software allowing for annotating frames. Cohort members collaborated together and with instructors to design, teach, and reflect upon lessons for students in grades kindergarten through twelfth. Many reflections were based upon the undergraduates’ viewing and annotating audio-video footage of themselves after teaching their lessons that had been digitally recorded. Additionally, some participants enrolled in an optional course, which required them to blog with one another during study abroad from their respective countries about certain topics in order to connect their cultural-linguistic and pedagogical knowledge to practical application in furthering their own and others’ education.

Participants’ electronically submitted assignments from the four semesters were downloaded from online then reviewed several times by the principal researcher. To determine the results of this instructional model, the following major question was addressed: What evidence is there that ubiquitous access to the tools previously listed facilitates participants’ capacity to develop competence for language learning and teaching? Specifically, the study sought to determine: A.) What can this type of technology use contribute to world language teacher development? B.) Do specific uses of these tools have transformative potential for world language education? C.) How is the use of technology in education perceived by these undergraduates?

The hypothesis was that ubiquitous access to these tools would facilitate participants’ interaction with one another and with their instructors; this, in turn, would extend participants’
capacity to develop cultural-linguistic, pedagogical, and technological competences as beginning language teachers. Analysis of the aforementioned and additional data (initial survey, focus-group interviews, and exit survey) provide evidence that this kind of experience affords an environment in which prospective language teachers’ development occurs largely on their own terms. Participants articulate the meaning of competence and express the desire to increase theirs; through reflection, they pinpoint areas for improvement and envision ways to accomplish that. As their successes in those areas increase, so does their confidence. This appears to further motivate them to take risks, continuing to push their developmental limits; in turn, they are able to offer to their students some exceptional opportunities for learning as well.
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Chapter 1

Introduction to the Study

O thou teacher of experience, tell me why my pupils fail, though I strive unceasingly to make the French language penetrate their innermost cranial recesses?

-Frederick E. Hawkins, 1932, p. 306

Overview

This chapter contextualizes the current research project, about using technology to develop a collaborative-reflective teaching practice, locally and within the broader venue of undergraduate teacher education in general. It provides a status check on the state of teaching and learning world languages in the United States, a briefing on the introduction of computers, video, reflection, and the Internet as tools to help problem-solve in this area, plus background information about the researcher’s approach and the genesis of the initiative within which the project is nested. Finally, the research questions are presented.

The Problem: Teacher Preparation – in General and for Language Instruction

Teacher Preparation in General - Pedagogy

Academics, politicians, and teachers themselves report that certification candidates for teaching in the United States are unprepared to face today’s educational context with respect to many factors such as students’ various ages and socio-economic, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds (Conklin, 2007; Mulryan-Kyne, 2007; NCCTQPA, 2007; O’Neal, Ringler, & Rodriguez, 2008; Scheeler, 2008; Wilbur, 2007), and in consideration of the current international ambience, global needs, and national situation (Duncan, 2010a; Eckhout, Davis, Mickelson, & Goodburn, 2005). Teacher education programs have been described both by critics, according to Duncan (2010b), and by advocates, in terms of a practical failure to keep up with global progress
and their sometimes purposeful resistance to change (Bailey, 2006; Busch, 2010; Eckert & Neale, 1965; Joyce, 1967). The curricula are often more commensurate with a factory mentality, common to the industrial times in which they were created, with respect to focus on a goal of mass producing a singular item rather than being relevant to contemporary conditions that call for a learning environment mindful of individual differences (Duncan, 2010b; Leland, 2002; Van Duzer, 2006). A lack of prepared teachers has been a well-documented problem at least as far back as 1856 for Pennsylvania, specifically (Coley & Desmond, 1999), which contributes to the deficient status of education in this country.

World Language Teacher Preparation - Language

In the United States’ educational system, described as “economically unsustainable and morally unacceptable” (Duncan, 2010a, p.5), language instruction is one of many areas to improve (Brecht & Ingold, 2000). To begin with, teachers’ lack of language proficiency has been a concern over the past hundred years. Long ago, Johnston (1918) explained, “A serious defect in our modern language teaching is the neglect of the spoken language … often due to the fact that the teacher has an imperfect command of the foreign idiom” (p. 96). Nearly half a century later, in a study of senior-year language majors intending to become teachers of French, German, Russian, or Spanish, data from more than two hundred institutions indicated that they had “limited working proficiency” (Carroll, 1967, p. 134). The Spanish candidates’ results were equally low in speaking, listening, and writing; they were slightly better for reading (Carroll, 1967, p. 144). Now, after yet another fifty years, there is still a proficiency problem for undergraduates learning to teach languages. For example, Hamlyn, Surface, and Swender (2007) reported that despite the inclusion of native and heritage speakers in a sample of over three thousand teacher candidates in ten states, only about sixty per cent were rated at least advanced low in proficiency (Chambless, 2012, p. S151). In another recent research project involving institutions across Ohio with accredited teacher preparation programs for French and Spanish, only two out of nine certification candidates for French and eight out of twenty-four for Spanish reached what is now the state minimum requirement of proficiency by their senior year (Ball, 2010, p. 92).

To continue, the actual pedagogy itself has been a concern as well. As an example, experts in the world language arena have repeatedly attempted to address “typical” language
teaching, which is teacher-centered and textbook work oriented (Swan, 2006). Attempts at student-centered and contextualized activities that are personally relevant and incorporate communication functions for realistic purposes include Curran’s (1976) Community Language Learning, Terrell’s (1977) Natural Approach, and Savignon’s (1983) Communicative Language Teaching (Omaggio, 1993). However, the “pseudo-intensive” way persists (Swan, 2006) and is illustrated as follows:

the kind of lesson that we have all seen, and perhaps given, where the teacher uses a text as the basis for a kind of free-association fireworks display. He or she comments on one word, expression or structure after another, elicits synonyms and antonyms, pursues ideas sparked off by the text, perhaps gets the students to read aloud or translate bits ... Meanwhile the students – or at least, the conscientious ones – write down hundreds of pieces of new information in those overfilled notebooks that someone once memorably called ‘word cemeteries’. What happens next? The students answer some so-called ‘comprehension questions’ (what exactly are these for?), and then perhaps go away to write a homework on a topic distantly related (or even not at all related) to that of the text. At the end of the cycle the students have been given much too much input, have engaged with it too superficially for much of it to be assimilated, and have used (and therefore consolidated) little or none of it. They have been taught – inefficiently – one lot of language, and then asked to produce a substantially different lot. (p. 7)

These two major issues of concern, language and pedagogy, merit a substantial degree of attention as their quality contributes to competence in world language teaching (ACTFL, 1988; NBPTS, 2002; Omaggio & Shinall, 1987; Wildner, 1999). While teaching competence itself so multifaceted that it is difficult to define (So, Chen, & Tsang, 1996), a teacher’s performance with regard to both language and pedagogy largely depends upon confidence, content knowledge, and automaticity (Richards, 2010). In other words, competence in teaching, which clearly necessitates communication, can be defined as a proficiency issue (Simpson Norris Pty Ltd., 1999). In fact, citing Mulder (2001), Roelofs and Sanders (2007), point out that overall teacher quality has been defined in terms of:

Integrated action proficiencies … made up of clusters of knowledge structures; cognitive, interactive, emotional, and … psychomotor skills; and attitudes and values which are necessary for: performing tasks, solving problems, and more generally the ability to function in a particular occupation, organization, position, role. (p. 125)

The nature of teaching is that of “a decision-making process” (Freeman, 1989), as teachers choose to execute an action before actually carrying it out (Eisner, 1983). It follows that the quality of teaching, which includes decisions and performance (i.e., implementation), indeed
affects student outcomes (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Hanushek & Rivkin, 2004). Therefore it is in everyone’s interest to fortify as much as possible the matrix of knowledge, skills, and attitudes that teachers access during their decision-making and implementation.

Currently, expanding world language teachers’ capacity to improve their knowledge, skills, and attitudes is absolutely essential because outcomes for language learning, according to recent research, are not good. In fact, the Center for Applied Second Language Studies (2010) reports that in the United States for reading, writing, and speaking, “only about 15% of students reach a proficiency level near Intermediate-Mid even after approximately 720 hours of study, which is about four years in a typical high school program” (p. 1); they did not have data for the listening skill. What that means is that, at best, for reading, students have low level functioning in that they can understand only simple texts with “basic information” about familiar “personal and social topics,” and “some misunderstandings may occur” (ACTFL, 2012, p. 23). Their writing at this level is characterized by “little evidence of deliberate organization” and may not be understood by native speakers who are not accustomed to interpreting the writing of language learners (p. 13). And Intermediate-Mid speakers can only “handle successfully a variety of uncomplicated communicative tasks … generally limited to those predictable and concrete exchanges necessary for survival in the target culture” (p. 7). Thus, it is a considerably minimal standard that 85% of students are still unable to attain in demonstrating communicative ability as a result of school-based instruction for learning a language other than English.

With regard to such language learning and teaching, Nancy Rhodes, co-author of national survey results published by the Center for Applied Linguistics, says, “We are at the bottom of the barrel now” (Beale, 2010, n.p.). And the situation is not improving to any noticeable degree. Compared to what it was before the turn of the century, “[T]he overall picture of foreign language instruction in 2008 was no better – and in some areas worse” (Rhodes & Pufhal, 2009, p. 7). Therefore, expanding world language teachers’ capacity to improve their knowledge, skills, and attitudes is key to achieving better outcomes.

Leaders in the United States, centuries ago (Harkavy & Hartley, 2008), and currently (Duncan, 2010a), have expressed concern about the impact that a lack of positive educational outcomes will have on the future of society. Beale (2010) reports that in the United States there is a “sense of cultural chauvinism” (n.p.). He quotes Dr. Shuhan Wang, Deputy Director of the National Foreign Language Center, who comments, “[O]ther countries recognize that language is a tool for economic competitiveness and national security … People understand us, but we don’t comprehend them. We are losing so much and are not aware of it” (Beale, 2010, n.p.). The
enduring question has been how to help potential teachers improve in both language and pedagogy, and educators have looked into how computers may play a role in doing that.

**Suggestion some Solutions**

**The Teaching Machine (Computer)**

To afford teachers the opportunity to prepare themselves and their students to meet the challenges of the current global context, many believe that technology should have a central role because it can facilitate teaching and learning (Hill, 1998; NEGP, 1996; Roth, 1992; Saury, 2001; U.S. Dept. of Ed., 2010). In fact, the intended use of computers was made clear by Stolurow (1961), who introduced computers to the education field as “the teaching machine” (p. 3), which was expected to alleviate tensions arising from the impossibility but utmost necessity of teachers’ continuous communicative interaction with each and every student at one time (p. 5). (See Figure 1-1, below). Moreover, it was designed for a learning cycle of

... examination of the learner’s errors ... sources of errors must be detected and misunderstandings must be corrected by means of established principles, laws, and relationships ... There are at least three critical system functions: (a) The cue function ... i.e., the stimulus to which each criterion response is attached; (b) the motivation function, i.e., eliciting the desired performance; and (c) the feedback function, i.e., providing immediate knowledge of results. (p. 6)

---

![Figure 1-1](image_url)

Figure 1-1: The teaching machine from Stolurow (1961, p.7).
In reference to Figure 1-1, above, the machine’s simulation function, including a displayed sensory stimulus followed by an input and output cycle, was to help learners in their decision processes related to certain subject matter, one of them being languages (p. 7).

**Online Interaction Potentials**

Computer use in education has evolved into the concept of “Connected teaching,” enabled by technology; it was suggested a decade and a half ago (NEGP, 1996) to help teachers find “resources … that improve their own instructional practices, continually add to their competencies and expertise, and guide them in becoming facilitators and collaborators in their students’ increasingly self-directed learning” (U.S. Dept. of Ed., 2010, p. 40). Its highest goal is to empower “a generation of young people who are capable of navigating an interdependent world and collaborating across borders and cultures to address today’s great problems” (p. 4). In striving to provide better language instruction, teachers have engaged in reflective self-analysis and collaborative reflection, which can be done on computer at present, not just by digitally archiving journals or reactions to lessons but also by video recording and annotating particular frames on computer, then uploading it to the Internet for others to view and comment upon. Engaging in educational online interaction is a potential catalyst for changing the dynamic in language teaching and learning (Thorne, 2004). However, the small amount of data available so far suggests that it has not been fully employed as such. That situation is discussed below.

**Realities of Technology’s Current Role in Education**

According to the United States Department of Education’s Office of Educational Technology, “very little information of how technology is actually used to support teaching, learning, and assessment is collected and communicated systematically” in general (NETP, 2010, p. 67), let alone for languages in particular. What evidence there is suggests that paper and pencil exercises and evaluations, and lecture-style lessons abound on many levels in multiple areas of the K-16 arena (Clarke-Midura & Dede, 2010; Gordon, 2011; Heath & Judd, 2009). In fact, a very recent and substantial survey by Gray & Lewis (2010) indicates that, when computers are used even by the newest generations of teachers in schools in the United States, it is mostly for
simple broadcasting, digital worksheets, and automatic scoring. Over 4,100 teachers in 2,000 public schools representing each state and the District of Columbia reported having students prepare written text, do drill and practice, and complete tests on computers with far more frequency than asking them to participate in communicatively interactive and meaningful activities like contributing to blogs or wikis and engaging in instant messaging (Gray & Lewis, 2010). Furthermore, only about half of teachers with three or fewer years of experience in the above mentioned survey claimed that their undergraduate programs adequately prepared them “to make effective use of educational technology for instruction” (p. 27).

Lack of teacher preparation for using technology appropriately for teaching and learning has been a trend according to the work of Kay (2006), who lists a number of studies yielding news similar to that in the previous paragraph. Moreover, the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future (2002) cites inadequate teacher preparation as one of four major contributors to the problem of teacher attrition, which it describes as “debilitating” in the broadest sense (p. 3). So, furnishing relevant data, at least to the field of world language teacher education, is significant in that teacher educators can build on it and capacitate beginning teachers to leverage digital devices in order to improve their knowledge and pedagogy.

**Purpose**

In light of solution-bearing potentials of using computers and interacting online for learning and teaching languages, the current project is an attempt to inform the field by methodically gathering, analyzing, and reporting information about technology’s role in a particular teacher preparation context. The purpose of this study is to narrate what happens when world language education instructors and their undergraduates are required to use MacBooks (laptop computers) with video software that has annotation capability and have access to wireless Internet access at any time, from anywhere, as they engage in teacher preparation. The computers were given to the students by the College of Education at XXU to borrow for the duration of their certification block, which lasted two years. Stewards of the hardware, software, and Methods curriculum included the director of EDUCATE\(^1\), the acting World Language Education chairperson, and instructors of the Methods courses.

---

\(^1\) Exploring Directions in Ubiquitous Computing and Teacher Education
The Initiative

EDUCATE’s original ideals included transforming in-class interactions, sharing multimedia projects and collaborative pieces of work for broader benefit, and extending the support that the teacher preparation program could offer to world language education undergraduates, mentor teachers, and the cooperating school districts (Murray & Zembal-Saul, 2008). Facilitating joint endeavors between the institutions has been top priority, and the intern program has expanded from existing only at the elementary level to being in Secondary level, and potentially to World Language as well. EDUCATE’s principles have manifested themselves in avoidance of ineffective instructional technology implementation demonstrated elsewhere (Warschauer & Matuchniak, 2010). The plan was to generate evolutionary practices instead of replacement and / or add-on approaches less grounded in established theory and resulting in little or no gain for students (Murray & Zembal-Saul, 2008; Wildner 1999).

Researcher’s Stance

The principal researcher considered the EDUCATE situation from an experiential perspective. She thought that the situation lent itself to a unique sort of “learning expedition,” an interventional treatment that had been brought to her attention years earlier (Burke, 2005; Burke, 2012; Warschauer, Grant, Del Real, & Rousseau, 2004). However, as an outsider, the researcher was to observe the participants virtually rather than to influence the program conceptually. This meant that EDUCATE’s cohort members’ treatment, so to speak, was access to, and intensive use of, the aforementioned digital tools (MacBook with access to wireless Internet at any time from anywhere, and video software that has annotation capability) for assignments predetermined by instructors.

Hypothesis

The predicted outcome of the program was that there would be some type of evidence, whatever it may be, that the world language education undergraduates would use the digital tools to develop themselves professionally and / or to help their students develop linguistically in ways
promoted by theorists of global language learning and that there would be transformational potential. The undergraduates’ potentially transformational professional self-development was expected to be cultivated through digitally facilitated collaborative reflection. It was predicted that following the collaborative-reflective online interaction, these prospective language teachers might create and implement alternatives to contrived textbook activities, fill in the blank, and multiple choice exercises; and that they would attempt to carve out space and time in their lessons for students to actually communicate with one another in the languaculture (Agar, 1994) being learned (LBL). This would give their students an opportunity to gain some tools they may need to improve global language interactions. The counter hypothesis was that the participants would simply repeat past educational patterns out of habit (i.e., “apprenticeship of observation” (Lortie, 1975)), and due to conditions in their working environment (Calderhead, 1993), instead of taking advantage of the tools to try something novel for language learning and teaching (Burke, 2011).

Research Questions

To understand what happened with this pilot cohort, the overarching question was, “What evidence is there (if any) that ubiquitous access to modern digital tools enhances students’ abilities to develop competences in world language education?” To find out, the following research questions and sub-questions were posed:

A. What can the use of laptops with video software that has annotation capability and wireless Internet access at any time, from anywhere contribute to world language education undergraduates’ teacher development?
   1. Where were these tools used to facilitate collaborative reflective discourse in a way that may be difficult if not impossible to accomplish by other means?
   2. What else did participants do with the tools for themselves and each other?
      a. Did they engage in other novel activities with the tools?
         (1) If so, to what extent if any, can these activities be expected to contribute to evolution of competences?
      3. In what situations were these tools used to solve problems?

B. Do specific uses of these tools have transformative potential for language education?
   1. Was there development of skills involving use of these tools?
   2. What did participants do with the tools for / or with their students?
a. Did they engage in novel activities with the tools?

(1) If so, to what extent if any, can these activities be expected to contribute to evolution of competences?

C. How is the use of laptops (with video software that is annotatable, and Internet access) for language teaching and learning perceived by participants?

1. How often did they broach such computer use without direct prompting?

2. What did they say about it, whether prompted or not?

   a. Was there a change in attitudes toward this type of computer use?

3. Did participants credit their experience with this type of computer use for any changes in attitude that they thought were pertinent to becoming a better teacher?

**Summary**

If evidence could be found that use of the aforementioned technological tools indeed afforded unique opportunities for world language education undergraduates to increase competences, then this research would contribute to investigations whose purpose was to suggest mitigations for problems with regard to language teaching that have been specified in this chapter. Once again, these issues are that teachers are unprepared to use the language they are teaching to instruct a diverse student body, and that teachers are not able to effectively leverage computers with online interaction potentials to substantially amplify learning opportunities for themselves and for their students. In this report, an undergraduate’s performance of strategies that she learned for overcoming these issues is considered a demonstration of what will be called increased “synthecultural competence for education.” (See Figure 1-2, below, the matrix of synthecultural competence for Spanish teaching as an example.) If, on the other hand, evidence supported the counter hypothesis, this project could be employed to recommend a course of action in world language teacher preparation programs that may be more likely to yield desired results.
Chapter Two of this document is a review of competence-related literature pertinent to language and teaching. It will also present philosophical roots and definitions of reflection, language learner autobiography, and video-based teacher performance critique. Technology use for language learning and teacher education will be explored there as well. Following that, Chapter Three more thoroughly explains background information about the circumstances of the investigation, research design, protocol for data collection, and methods of analysis. Data, which directly addresses the above questions, is presented in Chapters Four, Five, and Six. Chapter Seven is a discussion of findings and their implications, concluding results, recommendations for collaborative reflective online work in teacher education program design, and comments about areas that are ripe for research in the near future.
Chapter 2

Review of Literature

The instructor ceases and the teacher begins at the point where communicated matter stimulates into fuller and more significant life that which has entered by strait and narrow gate of sense-perception and motor activity. Genuine communication involves contagion; its name should not be taken in vain by terming communication that which produces no community of thought and purpose between the child and the race of which he is the heir. – John Dewey, 1910, p. 224

Overview

In this chapter is a statement about the communicative nature of teaching and learning, and the necessity for reflection and risk taking in the pursuit of knowledge. Here, communication is suggested to be the primary competence needed to demonstrate teaching ability. Thus, this research project is focused on world language education undergraduates’ improving their communicative competence for pedagogy and especially in the languaculture being learned; in question is whether or not laptops with Internet access and video software with the annotation feature facilitate their development in these areas.

For the reasons listed above, this chapter includes a definition of communicative competence, an account of how writing and reflecting with the help of video technology can be used to mediate the development of confidence as a skill-building foundation for communication in language pedagogy, a description of what a communicatively competent performance entails, and an explanation of how teachers’ communicative competence in its broadest sense contributes to synthecultural competence that is conducive to language students’ learning. Then, a point is made about strategic competence as it pertains to not just communicative competence but to overall pedagogy as well. This is followed by a comment about fluency, too, and about the role that reflecting in writing, and with video, can have in increasing that fluency. A discussion of how attitudes relate to development of skills comes next. Also provided is a selective literature review of projects noting the competence-building affordances of reflective blogging, and those
that address using annotatable video in collaborative online reflection toward better pedagogical practice, especially for world language teaching and learning. And finally, there is a description of an educational model of instructional methods that comprises using technology to systematically help undergraduate world language teachers in developing a collaborative-reflective practice toward improvement of their synthecultural competence. The topics listed are discussed here in order to establish the significance of technology’s role in collaborative-reflective discourse, to contribute to understanding participants’ perceptions of the value of that process, and to elucidate which skills and competences are of interest here and why. Attending to all of those issues and threading together the literature that expounds upon them leads to a conceptual framework by which the instructional program’s results may be evaluated.

Communication, Reflection, and Risk-Taking in Teaching and Learning

There is an inextricable link between communication, education, and maintenance of civilized society (Dewey, 1916, pp. 4-5). Dewey (1916) asserts that “… all communication (and hence all genuine social life) is educative” (p. 6); he qualifies that by saying, “Only when it becomes cast in a mold and runs in a routine way does it lose its educative power” (p. 7). An innovative educator takes initiative, dependent upon learners’ responses, to combine established principles of procedure with methods in trial and error fashion to achieve a particular end (Dewey, 1916). Interpreting learners’ responses, determining next steps, and inciting further appropriate action from students, call for some measure of reflection in decision-making and some type of communication.

To reflect in teaching and learning for the purpose of knowing, Dewey (1916) explains, the teacher “ … studies the progress of his own attempts to see what succeeds and what fails” (p. 200) in guiding the student “to employ his own powers in activities that have meaning” (p. 203). The aim of reflective procedure according to Dewey (1910) [probem-setting, means/end analysis, and generalisation] is to gain knowledge, to arrive “at belief about facts or in truths” (p. 3). Dewey’s (1916) “… features of the method of knowing … are the features of the reflective situation: Problem, collection and analysis of data, projection and elaboration of suggestions or ideas, experimental application and testing; the resulting conclusion or judgment” (p. 203).

While Dewey’s (1910) description of reflection, as a process in which a person considers the basis of his belief and determines whether there is adequate evidence to support it, may seem
simple and straightforward, he indicates that actually engaging in the process may not be so easy. Dewey (1910) clarifies, “Reflective thinking, in short, means judgment suspended during further inquiry” and “it involves willingness to endure a condition of mental unrest and disturbance” (p. 13). He adds, “Where there is reflection there is suspense” (1916, p. 173) and that “suspense is likely to be somewhat painful (1910, p.13); thus, this type of “… thinking involves a risk. Certainty cannot be guaranteed in advance” (1916, p. 174). From this, one may understand how a certain disposition is prerequisite to the risk-taking that is necessary to achieve the educative goal of gaining new knowledge.

In order to deal with the ambiguity required for reflective thinking to be effective, the would-be knower must approach education with certain attitudes; he must be direct, open-minded, whole-hearted, and responsible (Dewey, 1916, p. 204-209). Directness signifies a type of straightforwardness as the kind of “confidence” that allows one to rise “to the needs of the situation” with “unconscious faith in the possibilities of the situation” (p. 205). “Openness of mind means accessibility of mind to any and every consideration that would throw light upon the situation that needs to be cleared up, and that will help determine the consequences of acting this way or that” (p. 206). Wholeheartedness “is completeness of interest … equivalent to mental integrity. Absorption, engrossment, full concern with subject matter for its own sake, nurture it” (p. 207). And, responsibility is also known as “intellectual thoroughness … seeing a thing through” (p. 210); it is considering “in advance the probable consequences of any projected step and deliberately accept[ing] them … in the sense of taking them into account, acknowledging them in action, not yielding a mere verbal assent.” (p. 209-210). It is with this mindset, and with the idea of communication as a constant give and take not limited to audibles, that a teacher should face the challenge of education.

Communicative Competence and Performance in Language Teaching

Given that teaching is indeed communicative (Victoria, 1970), it follows logically that national certification requires language teachers to both communicate effectively and to offer opportunities for their students to do so in the language they are learning (NBPTS, 2010). Working as much as possible on increasing communication skills is especially important for language teachers for practical purposes, and on the state level it is required. Part of certification
candidates’ evaluation outcome in Pennsylvania, for example, is determined by their ability to communicate ‘in action’ (PA Dept. of Ed., 2010).

The ability to communicate, commonly referred to as communicative competence, has been defined by Hymes’ (1965). Hymes’ (1965) rendering of communicative competence highlights a person’s knowledge that an articulable concept exists in language, and awareness of whether or not it would be both possible and appropriate at the moment to say or write something in an attempt to convey the concept. According to Hymes, quality of performance could be judged partly in terms of grammaticality (1965, p. 63). Performance quality, though, may not be up to par with the actual level of communicative competence, as linguist Chomsky (1965) aptly pointed out. Performance indicators, and the competence / performance relationship, continue to be explored by researchers and theorists.

**Pedagogical Performance Problems: Culture, Language, Confidence, and Being Overwhelmed**

For language teachers, successful communicative performance may be especially difficult to achieve during lessons for a combination of reasons. For example, Yam (1986) emphasizes, “Communication within the teaching-learning process is further complicated by the fact that the teacher, as a person, is in many respects different from the student” (p. 41). Krumm (1973) adds that even greater complexity is imposed by the fact that “language is at the same time medium and subject of teaching” (p. 163), and that teachers are instructing students in a language different from that of the language community they were born into (p. 168). Having to be conscious of so many things at once can overwhelm a student teacher (Wolfe, 1970, p. 90). Dewey (1916) explains that when energy is so diverted, there is “loss of power and confusion of ideas” (p. 204). So, if a teacher were to have greater communicative competence, it could conceivably reduce his feeling of being overwhelmed; then, he would be less confused and more confident in empowering students. Therefore, to have optimal pedagogical functioning, teachers should develop communication skills as fully as possible, not just for vocalizations in the languaculture being learned but also for nonverbal behaviors in general (Smith, 1979).
Confidence-Building Strategies for Improvement of Pedagogy

That language teachers first should have communicative competence in the language they intend to teach in order to then perform well pedagogically is an idea that makes sense to some people. This assertion is affirmed by Chambless (2012), for example, who reviews a number of studies indicating that prospective teachers reported that their success in student teaching was negatively affected by their having little confidence in being able to function in the language they were teaching during lessons (p. s154). Again, without confidence or directness, a person may become self-conscious, embarrassed, and constrained, “partly thinking about his problem and partly about what other think of his performances” (Dewey, 1916, p. 204). Long ago, Giduz (1939) asserted in a discussion about French teaching that “We must have confidence in our ability to do good teaching or else we shall be hopelessly lost from the outset” (p. 508). Both before and after Giduz (1939) made his statement, there were many writing-related endeavors to avoid being at a loss and to gain confidence for teaching and for using languages while teaching. Some major confidence building strategies for this context are summarized in the section below.

Keeping Written Records

Drafting lesson plans is a writing routine that was recommended by Warshaw (1921), who believed that doing so would build teachers’ confidence and stimulate inquiry. Journaling is an additional form of written record that has contributed to improvements in both pedagogy (Colesworthy, 1887; Jackson, 1969) and language learning (Le Fant, 1949). Progoff (1975), considered journal keeping a catalyst for change in behavior. Meanwhile, Lortie (1975) insisted that teacher preparation programs should incorporate writing learner autobiographies especially to help teachers in resisting the default adoption of educational methods that were used on them by their teachers in the past.

There has been explicit advice about writing for the purpose of increasing confidence and competence for language learners and teachers. Hills (1923), for example, suggested having language students journal outside of class because in-class time could be used to practice speaking. He quoted certification candidates who were upset that their university courses were conducted in English and who were strongly against teachers’ habit of commanding students to translate so much and labor over exposition. The pupil-teachers felt that those teaching and
learning methods limited their time for free composition and undermined their confidence to speak.

Writing a language learner autobiography (Schumann & Schumann, 1977), and sharing and discussing it with others (Bailey et al., 1996), has been conducive to language teachers’ reflecting in order to continue professional development as well. Brock, Yu, and Wong (1992) published a 3-teacher diary study in which each person wrote entries, read and responded to those of others, discussed them regularly, and analyzed transcripts of those audio-taped conversations. Participants in that research reported not only improved confidence but also an assuaged sense of isolation, exploration of altering their teaching behaviors based upon ‘consequences of actions,’ and pedagogical insight and cultural knowledge (Brock, Yu, & Wong, 1992). One subject artfully narrated how he was being affected: “I hope that by reflecting further on my teaching I can polish up my mirror and see myself clearly … I probably won’t like some of what I see … with that vision [I] have before me then some possibility of change” (p. 301).

**Reviewing Video Recordings**

Another way to gain confidence in teaching and to affect positive change, according to Huber and Ward (1969) is the Microteaching experience, in which participants reported that they experienced an increased sense of confidence after watching video of lessons they conducted. One participant of Microteaching remarked “that she never could have faced student teaching without microteaching” (p. 22). An additional research subject stated, “It has made me realize my strong and weak points so I know definitely what to work on” (p. 27).

Microteaching was based on work by Fortune, Cooper, and Allen (1965) [in Allen (1967)], who witnessed certification candidates attending more to goals, organization, content, and materials in addition to communicating and evaluating during lessons once they reviewed and reflected about video of their teaching. Other significant findings were that 85% of the candidates participating found the exercise to be valuable, and their self-perception became more accurate over time. Those who engaged in video critique of their own and peers’ teaching improved more than a similar group of their colleagues who engaged in a conventional program instead. Development of candidates having participated in a video reflection course based upon Microteaching was found to have endured years after the course was completed; Borg (1972) followed up by video recording and analyzing the lessons of 24 of those teachers, whose skills
turned out to be “still significantly superior to their pre-course performance on 8 of the 10 behaviors that were scored” (p. 572).

Participating in analytic cycles can lead to an upward spiral of achievement, as engaging oneself and others to define and resolve problems is part of a high-quality educational experience (Hokanson & Hooper, 2004). And, the type of critiquing offered by analytic cycles can be connected with a concept from Clifford’s (1991) research indicating that “given informational feedback and a clearly specified future opportunity to demonstrate learning, students are likely to take near-moderate risks” (p. 284). These ideas are illustrated in a study done by Wolfe (1970), who focused on similar technology use for language teaching, specifically. He found that world language education students value collaborative video reflection and report that it can:

- lower their anxiety and raise their confidence about language teaching
- further their comprehension of rationale for utilizing unfamiliar and less “traditional” methods in lessons
- increase their understanding of how to perform some targeted teaching activities, and
- improve their ability to determine if teaching / learning goals were met

Furthermore, student teachers who participated in collaborative video reflection in his study were found to have more student talk and more peer communication during their lessons than student teachers who did not.

**Components of Communicative Competence and Assessment of Language Instruction**

Assessing communicative performance can be facilitated by a more-detailed breakdown of communicative competence provided by Savignon (1972), who characterized it as “the ability to function in a truly communicative setting – that is, in a dynamic exchange in which linguistic competence must adapt itself to the total informational input, both linguistic and paralinguistic, of one or more interlocutors” (p. 8). She measured communicative competence with several criteria including: “comprehensibility and suitability … naturalness and poise … amount of communication …,” plus the number of repetitions required before a native speaker understood the person being tested under certain time pressure (p. 45), and fluency as rated by the native speaker (p. 46). Subsequently, Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983) suggested that the essence of communicative competence be depicted in components of grammatical, sociolinguistic, strategic, and discourse skills. It may be interpreted that ‘grammatical’ mirrors
Savignon’s (1972, p. 9) discussion of “linguistic accuracy in terms of pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary,” that ‘sociolinguistic’ pertains to the ‘suitability’ that she mentions, and that ‘strategic’ is aligned with the “coping or survival strategies” identified by Savignon (1972; 1983, p. 40). Discourse competence, according to Canale (1983) and Savignon (1983), has to do with unity of a text through use of cohesive devices that contribute to its coherence as a whole. All of these components provide areas for prospective language teachers to target for further development in expanding their pedagogical-linguistic capacities and thereby extending their ability to provide more learning opportunity for their students.

Using communicative competence as a foundation for designing curriculum and carrying out classroom processes has been commonly referred to as Communicative Language Teaching and has been recommended by theorists such as Canale and Swain (1980), Canale (1983), Savignon (1983, 1997), and Burke (2005). The Communicative Language Teaching ideal is that teachers and learners use the world language not just during classroom learning tasks, but before and after as well; some pre-service teachers are able to demonstrate successful achievement of this (Burke, 2006). Communicative Language Teaching, according to Savignon (1991), involves “encouraging learners to take risks, to speak in other than memorized patterns” (p. 265). For language learners especially, functioning without a script requires sophisticated brainwork and therefore has potential of impactful results (Hokanson & Hooper, 2004). However, success of this type of teaching largely depends upon students’ interest and motivation; thus, it is imperative to have students engage in communicative learning activities whose purpose is clear and whose connection with students relates to their hobbies and concerns (Burke, 2005, p. 112).

Adding ‘Intercultural’ to Communicative Competence in Language Education

Burke’s (2005) point about interest and motivation, Savignon’s (1972, 1983) commentary on sociolinguistic suitability, and Yam’s aforementioned work that considers the student as ‘other’ (Yam, 1982) and features attitudes, knowledge, skills, and norms (Yam, 1986), all are relevant to a cultural-linguistic performance assessment model by Byram (1997), who adds ‘Intercultural’ to the term ‘Communicative Competence’ and describes the phrase in detail. First, Byram (1997) speaks of intercultural competence without the word ‘communicative.’ Then, he acknowledges that “the phrase deliberately maintains a link with recent traditions in foreign
language teaching, but expands the concept of ‘communicative competence’ in significant ways” (p. 3).

Byram (1997) first explains that using the term “intercultural competence, omitting reference to communication … indicate(s) the emphasis on skills, knowledge, and attitudes other than those which are primarily linguistic” (p. 49). These are “transferable to situations both within and beyond national frontiers where cultural awareness and sensitivity is required” (p. 28-29). It is acquired through certain experience, such as residing in the environment of the ‘other,’ which requires one to centre (Byram, Gribkova, & Starkey, 2002). Experiences that add to one’s Intercultural Competence, particularly in the areas of coping and adapting, are likely to happen when people are “fully engaged with their environment rather then live almost encapsulated in the links with home [sic]” (Byram, 1997, p. 50). Again, Byram (1997) stresses the distinction between this attitude of engagement, including curiously observing while wondering, questioning, and improvising, plus “willingness to try anything new rather than cling to the familiar,” in comparison with the tourist or commercial approaches (p. 50). Moreover, he and colleagues point out that new experiences in a new environment may shock a person who will then need “to adjust … it is never a completed process” (Byram et al., 2002, p. 11). Adjustment comprises adapting in terms of acceptance and rejection, and coping with reactions that are common to people who are functioning in a culture that is different from their own. The continuum of reactions ranges from enthusiasm to withdrawal (Byram, 1997, p. 58), to include euphoria, physical and mental discomfort, and homesickness (Byram, 2000, p. 6). The latter can overwhelm a person and negatively affect his or her engagement with the learning environment (Byram et al., 2002, p. 19).

Risager (2000) clarifies that the value of intercultural competence for a language teacher is that “in actually using it, we create culture, i.e. in the classroom” (p. 3); doing so can “contribute to developing the global vision and involvement of their students …” in world citizenry (p. 4). In a discussion of intercultural citizenship, Byram (2009) further defines how intercultural competence relates to the role of a language teacher and goals of education:

As gatekeepers to the cultures of subjects, teachers act as mediators… by making the language of the discipline accessible to learners. Teachers of foreign and second languages are more aware of this role than other teachers because it is explicitly part of their training and the definition of their subject: to introduce learners to the cultures of other groups who speak the language in question. (p. 9)

Byram (2009) adds that the purpose of such instruction is an approach to ‘other’ ways of life with tolerance, enduring and accepting “the fact that others believe and live differently within a


particular society, or in the wider world . . . ” (p. 8). This is fundamental to “mutual understanding” and “fostering a sense of inclusion where no individual or group is marginalised . . . ” (p. 8) for achieving a “social cohesion” that ensures “the welfare of all” members of a society (p. 7).

Upon rejoining the word ‘communicative’ with the phrase ‘intercultural competence,’ Byram (1997) includes attitudes, knowledge, skills, and awarenesses in his explanation; and, his words are similar to those of Dewey (1916), Savignon (1972, 1983), and Yam (1982, 1986). Byram (1997) says,

> Even the exchange of information is dependent upon understanding how what one says or writes will be perceived and interpreted in another cultural context; it depends on the ability to decentre and take up the perspective of the listener or reader . . . successful ‘communication’ is not judged solely in terms of the efficiency of information exchange. It is focused on establishing and maintaining relationships. (p. 3)

The rapport that Byram (1997) indicates appears to parallel Yam’s (1982, p. 50) view of how “communication skills, knowledge, socio-cultural norms and attitudes” relate to teaching. Yam (1982) emphasizes, “a student-centered approach is crucial when facilitating learning activities” (p. 50), and later (Yam, 1986) notes that from a teacher’s perspective, students are ‘other,’ so both the attitude and knowledge of each person (student and teacher) must be bridged by the teacher’s careful evaluation of - and planning around - the student’s socio-cultural background (p. 41). Thus, Savignon’s (1983) statement that sociolinguistic competence “requires an understanding of the social context in which language is used: the roles of the participants, the information they share, and the function of the interaction” (p. 37) and Burke’s (2005) concern about students’ heightened interest and motivation for best results in language education, are especially relevant for a type of teaching that is necessarily sensitive to the cultures of both the student and source communities of the languaculture being learned.

**Intercultural Communicative Competence, Student Behavior, and Assessment of Teacher Performance**

As teaching is one among many contexts that call for ongoing rapport (Victoria, 1970; PA Dept. of Ed, 2010) like that described above, it makes sense for language teachers to demonstrate and help their learners to develop intercultural communicative competence that supports maintaining relationships. Maxfield (2009) observed teachers who engaged in dialogue
with students about behavior problems and determined that such a rapport-building communicative strategy is a coping skill used by educators to persevere in environments that have been shown to overwhelm their colleagues. Horn & Little (2010) noted that forming relationships that facilitate students’ appropriate participation and full investment in learning is a core problem of practice. Relationship-maintaining communicative acts are important teacher performance indicators, as illustrated by the fact that in Pennsylvania, certification candidates are evaluated on “appropriate interaction between teacher and students and among students” and on “the management of student behavior” (PA Dept. of Ed., 2010). Behavior problems in schools have been tied to educational authorities’ decision-making processes and communication (Howard & Jenkins, 1970). Teachers’ being aware of that, and functioning accordingly, matters because it is generally agreed that an improvement in discipline is more conducive to learning (Ediger, 1973). Adults’ attitudes can help reduce students’ withdrawal, hostility, or other functional disorientation in school settings (Sparks, 1972).

Behavior management as a communication issue intersects with intercultural communicative competence because both cover the act of overcoming potential incompatibilities and “managing dysfunctions” (Byram, 1997, p. 38) through politenesses known to be valued by the other person based on their cultural background, rather than assuming that the other is “(almost) like us” (p. 4). In fact, pedagogy in general intersects with intercultural communicative competence on at least fifteen points when one compares the wording of the “Pennsylvania Statewide Evaluation Form for Student Professional Knowledge and Practice” (PA Dept. of Ed., 2010) with Byram’s (1997) description of assessment points for intercultural communicative competence. This makes sense when it is considered that “pedagogical skills” listed on Pennsylvania’s form for assessment of teacher performance include communication, which Byram (1997) says is what he means by “interaction” (p. 47).

Considering the parallels between Byram’s (1997) assessment matrix for intercultural communicative competence and the Pennsylvania Department of Education’s (2010) student-teacher assessment, teaching can be viewed as an endeavor requiring intercultural communicative competence, and pedagogy may be perceived as a type of languaculture in and of itself. (See Table 2-1, below, for words matching between the Pennsylvania Department of Education’s 430 evaluation form for pre-service teachers (PA Dept. of Ed., 2010) and Byram’s (1997) descriptors for assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence: knowledge of students / social group; knowledge of schools, events / knowledge of institutions; (re)sources; use of knowledge; engage; expectations; adapt; equitable / equality; appropriate interaction; procedures / processes; maintain
rapport / maintain contact; questioning; formal / informal; assess / evaluate). Pedagogy has been expressed as somewhat of a comparison with a languaculture being learned in academic literature. In the United States, reference has been made to new teachers’ experiencing “culture shock” upon entering the profession (Mungo, 1983), and in Europe there are articles about “Praxisshock … the assimilation of a complex reality which forces itself incessantly upon the beginning teacher … must be mastered continually [sic].” (Veenman, 1984, p. 144).

Table 2-1. Words matching between the evaluation rubric for pre-service teachers (PA Dept. of Ed., 2010) and Byram’s (1997) descriptors of assessing intercultural communicative competence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PA Rubric</th>
<th>Words Matching in Communication as Interaction</th>
<th>Byram’s Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of students, schools and events</td>
<td>Engage</td>
<td>Of social groups, institutions and products, processes of interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use knowledge to function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(re)sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adapt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equitable / Equality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures / Processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formal / Informal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess</td>
<td>(Appraise)</td>
<td>Evaluate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adams (2007, p. 139) speaks directly about faculty members’ “entering a new community of practice (a ‘culture shock’)” in terms of “challenges consistently encountered and strategies employed … risks involved in stepping away beyond the boundaries” of their comfort zones coupled with their obligation to promote reflection in pedagogical practice for investigation “of student learning outcomes and transform[ation of] findings into actionable improvements” (p. 137). Looking at the quality of a teacher’s functioning from the perspective of pedagogy as akin to engaging with a new languaculture being learned may grant to assessors a more informed view
of professional progress and afford a more clear vision of potential next steps for further instructional development toward synthecultural competence.

**Developing Pedagogical Competences as Language Competences toward Synthecultural Competence: Strategy, Fluency, and the Role of Modern Digital Devices**

Mastering pedagogy as akin to a languaculture being learned may be considered similar to what Sercu (1998) calls “intercultural language teaching” (p. 261), if one connects the idea with Byram’s (1997) statement that someone who is able to be so diplomatic and to “mediate between people of different origins and identities” is an ‘intercultural speaker” (p. 38). Intercultural language teaching (ILT) was a focus of Myers’ (2006) intercultural online English as a Foreign Language project that resulted in his advice about digital technologies’ potential in providing a unique and previously unavailable space for “authentic communicative events” (p. 8). Citing Sercu (1998, p. 261), Myers (2006) expresses that fostering these skills toward building global citizens is increasingly necessary in the modern era and points out that this “critical understanding of otherness” is a goal of intercultural language teaching (p. 8).

While world language education undergraduates may not be charged with becoming intercultural language teachers per se, their teacher preparation course activities may implicitly require them to build skills that are related to intercultural language teaching by engaging their students and one another in meaningful dialogues that are to result in demonstration of new understandings or increased competences. These understandings and competences could be related to either the languaculture being learned, to pedagogy, and / or to technology for the purpose of promoting educative interaction in the “other’s” native environment. Achievement of such a productive fusion in the classroom for teaching and learning is referred to in the present report as “synthecultural competence for education.” The phrase combines the aforementioned ideas offered by Risager (2000), and Byram (2009), with regard to the classroom culture that can be thought of as somewhat synthetic in its temporary and manufactured nature, and the synthesis of people within it; operating in conjunction with those combined concepts are the synergism of technology-facilitated global communication suggested by Myers (2006), and the teacher’s attempt to constructively blend with the professional environment - all while functioning through use of the languaculture being learned. Supporting successful interplay among these cultural facets (refer to Figure 1-2 to review areas darkened on the image to show intersection of facets) is
synthecultural competence for education, which implies rapport among students as well as rapport between teacher and students, and denotes that the computer with Internet plus not only the teacher but all persons present may serve as resources for learning that can happen for every individual in the room.

Teachers’ educative interaction in class includes what is commonly referred to as management of student behavior, which involves skills that can be considered strategic to preventing students’ failure to participate appropriately in classroom activities; there are also coping strategies involved in reacting to such dysfunction should it occur. And although discussions of aforementioned (grammatical, sociocultural, and discourse) competences have been relegated to language learning itself, Shulman (1986) lists strategic knowledge as a form of general teacher knowledge that brings together other types of teacher knowledge “as the teacher confronts particular situations or problems, whether theoretical, practical, or moral, where principles collide and no simple solution is possible” (p. 13). Achieving success with students’ appropriate participation in lessons is just one of those complex situations in which a teacher may employ strategic competences.

Like the term ‘strategic,’ the word ‘fluency’ in connection with competence can be expanded to characterize not just linguistic performance as in Savignon’s (1972) work but also pedagogical performance. Language researchers Segalowitz and Gatbonton (1995), for example, explain fluency in terms of appropriate behaviors reliably manifesting themselves when needed, due to extensive practice leading to a less inhibited and more streamlined thought process called automaticity. Functioning more automatically can be advantageous because “consumption of attentional resources” is reduced so that a person can “focus on the integration of information, the planning of future utterances, the processing of sociolinguistic and paralinguistic cues, etc.” (p. 135). In other words, the person will be less overwhelmed. The result is more “efficient” performance, which by definition can be considered to mean increased proficiency or competence (Atherton, 2011). Automaticity in teaching skills works much like it does in language skills in that it guards teachers against cognitive overload and is essential for maximal performance (Feldon, 2007). For improving performance, and “bridging the gap between theoretical studies and practical training” (Krumm, 1973, p. 168), or the ideal with the real so to speak, educational programs have married reflective writing and reviewing video recorded lessons in the form of annotation on specific film frames or clips to increase competence in teaching and learning.
Annotating Video Clips for Reflection

Since Frederiksen, Sipusic, Sherin, & Wolfe (1998) first described a special “process of annotating videotapes of [math] teaching” documented in a project by Roschelle & Sibley (1992), Rich & Hannafin (2009) state that there are “New methods of annotation [that] have emerged that afford an even greater power and utility for examining and improving instructional decision-making … Yet few have been implemented in teacher education with widespread impact” (p. 66). The delay in educators’ taking advantage of such tools is astounding when one considers that Dewey (1897) encouraged the use of visuals for learning well over a hundred years ago. It was not until more than half a century later that Butts (1956, p. 10), acting upon Newhall’s (1952) expressed notion that for general purposes the “narrative caption … acts as a bridge” between an image and its surrounding text, published evidence suggesting that “students’ retention of information learned … was statistically superior” (p. 82) when captions were declarative or imperative versus interrogative, and that ‘realistic’ images “resulted in more learning than ‘symbolic’ sets” (p. 83). Finally combining those concepts on computer by attaching textual feedback from instructors to video recorded student performances of American Sign Language, Miller, Hooper, and Rose (2008, p. 28) reported a system for student reflection toward “maturing communicative abilities” and transformation of instruction in American Sign Language (p. 30). Captioning video clips for reflection and improvement was done as well with audio-visual recordings of student teachers’ lessons for science instruction in a context where both students and student teacher sometimes spoke Spanish (Bryan & Recesso, 2006). Having investigated student teachers’ use of self-recorded and annotated video that could be uploaded and commented upon by instructors, Rich and Hannafin, (2009) said, “Allowing teachers to relate their beliefs with actions during video analysis may provide a more explicit link among beliefs, thoughts, and actions than previously available” (p. 87).

One’s use of technology to reflect on his own practice can be advantageous in a unique way according to Byram (1997, p. 67), who resolves that interpreting and relating an event via technology such as video and telecommunication controls the time factor, slowing down interaction; thus, the pressure on someone reflecting for the purpose of gaining skill and knowledge is neutralized. That person, then, has opportunity to rehearse before ensuing communicative performance (Byram, 1997, p. 68, referencing Hawkins, 1987). Byram (1997) elaborates:
This critical reflection is particularly important and can focus on the efficacy of the skills learned in the classroom, and the need for further development. It can also focus on learners’ affective responses to learning outside the classroom, for example, in response to media representations of otherness or in response to the complex experience of visiting or residing in another country or culture. (p. 67)

The efficacy of which Byram (1997) speaks can be related back to fluency and confidence when considering a definition of ‘self-efficacy’ from Colbeck, Cabrera, and Terenzini (2001) and remembering what Segalowitz and Gatbonton (1995) said about fluency. Colbeck et al. (2001, p. 177) explain self-efficacy as a synonym for confidence, which is “the expectation that one can accomplish specific behaviors necessary to produce a desired outcome” (p. 174) and connects it with learners’ persistence and performance. Segalowitz and Gatbonton (1995) represent fluency as “referring to those aspects of performance that, as a result of extensive practice, become faster, more reliable and which seem to the performer (and perhaps to observers) … effortless” (p. 135); they clarify that it “involves more than just automaticity. There are questions of accuracy and appropriateness as well (including, for example, consideration of sociolinguistic competence).”

Colbeck et al. (2001) claim that learners’ confidence can be increased “by frequent interaction with and feedback from the instructor, by opportunities to work collaboratively with peers” (p. 186). These two conditions can be met in online environments, but it is a relatively recent development that cyber communication for language learning, and technology facilitated collaborative reflection about audio-video recorded lessons for improved pedagogy, have taken place within the affordance-rich digital environment for world language education itself.

**Intercultural Writing Exchanges via Internet**

Elola and Oskoz (2008) connected blogging with Byram’s (1997) work regarding Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC), and charted blog interaction between at-home and study-abroad undergraduate students of Spanish for the purpose of gaining Intercultural Competence (IC). Byram’s (1997) explanation of IC pertains to functioning with and among native speakers, and ICC is doing that while using the native speakers’ language as well (p. 70).

Elola and Oskoz (2008) said, “there is no doubt that blogs allow students to share and increase their understandings of cross-cultural information and perspectives,” and that there was “a positive impact on students’ intercultural competence” (p. 472). Furthermore, they claimed that “the questions asked by blog partners prompted many of the study abroad students to further
reflect upon cultural aspects that they had encountered,” and the interaction thus facilitated improving the blog partners’ attitudes and understandings; what is more, participants “perceived benefits from the blog interactions” (p. 471). Specifically, “Both groups developed ways to resolve misunderstandings and ways to acquire new knowledge” (p. 470).

Earlier blog studies associated with language education, but not directly addressing world language teacher education undergraduates, are not specific as to whether or not participants had intended to become teachers. Ducate & Lomicka (2005), for example, described two types of reflective blog exercises for college students of French and German. In the first, at-home participants blogged about culture with both peers and native speakers located in various source countries of the languacultures being learned. In the second, participants engaging in short study abroad exchanges with native speakers blogged about the experience with their exchange partners, peers, and even families; and afterwards they talked in class about posts they had made. The researchers concluded that blogging as a student-controlled context is beneficial because within it students “become more skilled critical thinkers when reading and writing,” and in the languaculture being learned they have opportunity to “create and exchange their own meanings … reflect and analyze what they have learned and how their proficiency, both communicative and cultural, has improved … ” (p. 419). Furthermore, citing Ferdig & Trammell (2004), Ducate & Lomicka (2005) noted that within the online environment, “The opportunities for scaffolding also allow students to build on one another’s knowledge to construct together new understandings …” (p. 419).

Prior to that, Godwin-Jones (2003) promoted blogging for language learners, and Stiler & Philleo (2003) reported formal academic blogging to promote reflective practice in undergraduate teacher education for Multicultural Education and Technology in Education classes. For their situation, in which subject matter areas were unspecified, students intending to become teachers used blogs as journals to write reactions about “course readings, activities, discussions, instructor and student presentations, and guest speakers” (p. 793). The main audience was the instructor. Overall, participants were satisfied with blogging as it pertained to their learning, and they recommended it for future use. However, very few planned to utilize it in their own teaching. Nevertheless, “depth and breadth of student reflectivity appeared to be positively affected by the use” of blogs (p. 795).

O’Dowd (2006) has noted that the asynchronous quality of this online interaction indeed “gives students the opportunity to reflect carefully on what they want to explain, to search for factual and statistical information to support their ideas, and to phrase what they mean more
An advantage of asynchronous discourse was increased confidence for language learners who participated in e-mail discussions using the languaculture being learned (Cononelos & Oliva, 1993; Kelm, 1992). When confidence is central to the ability to demonstrate competence, prior practice in communication via certain uses of technology can result in stronger face-to-face, synchronous performance in the languaculture being learned. A case in point was made by Hammadou Sullivan (2011), who found that out of over seven hundred teacher candidates, about fifty per cent of those who actually scored well on a widely-recognized standardized speaking test (advanced low or higher on the Oral Proficiency Interview, designed by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) said that part of their preparation included e-mailing or texting with native speakers at least once a week whereas only twenty-five per cent of those who scored below the threshold engaged in such interaction (p. 247). After the test, in addressing a survey question about “the greatest impediment to success” during the exam, the “most common response” from lower-scoring candidates was “personal shyness, nervousness, or lack of confidence” (p. 250).

Attitudes Toward Reflection and Technology

Whether or not he intended to echo Dewey’s (1910, p. 13) ideas about “judgment suspended during further inquiry” and attitudes of directness, open-mindedness, whole-heartedness, and responsibility (1916, p. 204), Byram (1997) elaborates about intercultural communicative competence in a way that matches Dewey’s (1910, 1916) words regarding reflection. Byram (1997) says,

Attitudes which are the pre-condition for successful intercultural interaction need to be not simply positive, since even positive prejudice can hinder mutual understanding. They need to be attitudes of curiosity and openness, of readiness to suspend disbelief and judgment with respect to other meanings, beliefs, and behaviors. There also needs to be a willingness to suspend one’s belief in one’s own meanings and behaviors, and to analyze them from the viewpoint of the others with whom one is engaging. This is an ability to ‘decentre’ which Kohlberg et al. (1983) have argued is an advanced stage of psychological development and which Melde (1987) suggests is fundamental to understanding other cultures (c.f. Byram et al., 1994: 20-24). In an extreme case it can lead to a ‘re-socialization’, which Berger and Luckmann call ‘alternation’ (1966: 176), where individuals dismantle their preceding structure of subjective reality and reconstruct it according to new norms. (p. 34)
Being open and impartial are prerequisites to being reflective according to both Dewey (1910, 1916) and Byram, (1997, 2000); however, other theorists and researchers from the past and present, such as Giroux (1985) and Dyment and O’Connell (2011), charge that certification candidates graduating from teacher education programs are rarely reflective in actuality. A possible source of this problem is indicated by Birch (1992), who likens teacher reflectivity to language learning in the threatening discomfort and resulting resistance that can occur when it is attempted:

It involves the possible deconstruction of a belief system with which one has become familiar and its replacement with an alternative … In this it is analogous to the learning of another language, where an habitual system is discarded, to be replaced by an alien system of equal complexity, for which attempts at mastery may be traumatic. The temptation to abandon the necessary effort is great and the desire to return to the familiar, be it a language or a belief system, is sometimes irresistible. (p. 90)

In seeking solutions regarding resistance to reflection in education, researchers have found that certain types of digitally facilitated dialogue like those afforded by blogs can promote deeper reflection for those learning to teach (Harland & Wondra, 2011), and support development of intercultural competence during study abroad (Lee, 2011). Moreover, transformation through reflecting via technology is treated by Slaouti and Motteram (2006), who talk about language teachers’ using information and communication technologies in association with “adjusting schemata to take on new ideas” as they ‘reconstruct’ practice through written articulation of self-interrogation (p. 86). But perhaps being resistant to change in a similar way, language teachers have been reticent about using computers in their endeavors (Fernand, 1981), despite the CALL [Computer Assisted Language Learning] movement (Fox, 1972; Eastment, 1986; Markee, 1993).

Language teachers’ resistance to technology use has been a documented issue for approximately a century; again, confidence seems to be a central issue in that. Audio technologies were brought into education in the United States around 1893, when the Cortina Company’s language-phone learning method, sporting what is now called notional-functional vocabulary categories (i.e., months-making a reservation), was acclaimed at the World’s Fair in Chicago (Kunze, 1929). Shortly thereafter, Clarke (1918) praised the supplemental use of “talking machines” for language education because they offered systematic series that helped people to improve pronunciation through imitation of native speakers, but he admitted that they were awkward. He worried about the diffusion of this innovation because of initial complications and lack of teacher confidence: “Very probably some teachers will find the handling of a mechanism troublesome; some will decide that attention is distracted by the presence of a
phonograph … it takes too much time, or that its use raises too many points requiring discussion” (p. 122). It was not long before audio and visual were combined and foreign films were incorporated into language instruction and the advantages of that were explored (Ginsburg, 1935). Finally, audio, video, and text were brought together via digital tools including computers. Since then, academic use of computers has contributed positively to teacher education, for world languages specifically, in a variety of initiatives (Scott, 1998; Fuchs, 2004; Arnold & Ducate, 2006; Luke & Britten, 2007; Wang et al., 2010). But the current attitude of pre-service language teachers about computers for teaching and learning is not very clear and there is need for more research into how technology may be beneficial in that realm.

Addressing all participators in education generally, Jay (1981) claims that negative attitudes about computers are detrimental to the learning that is supposed to happen with them. And Koohang (1987) found that “Computer experience was significantly related to computer attitudes – subjects with more computer experience showed more positive attitudes toward the use of computers” (p. 147). Dwyer, Ringstaff, and Sandholtz (1991) regard teachers’ competence with using computers in terms of an ability continuum that includes ‘integration’ and ‘transformation,’ and Hooper and Rieber (1995) use those same two words to describe stages that teachers may progress through in reference to their use of technology. Success in building undergraduate teacher education students’ competence with technology and having them use computers to support their teaching practice was based upon “the view of technology as a culture, not a subject” at Michigan State University (Topper, 1998, p. 37).

While teacher education programs are to incorporate modern digital technologies as part of professional culture, use of the tools should include facets of integration, situation, reflection, and nurturing (Hubbard, 2008). The term ‘integrated’ means that “…the use of technology appears in multiple places during the teacher candidate’s coursework rather than in a single, stand-alone class…technology in language teaching would come up in all classes in situations where technology options make sense” (p. 182). The word ‘situated’ refers to learning that occurs in a setting similar to one in which resulting knowledge will be applied (p. 183). Prior publications, such as those by Wenger (1990) and Hooper and Rieber (1995), specified provision of ‘nurturing’ as it applies to the existence of a supportive community of practice; this includes intentional guidance by mentors (Meskill, 2002). Hubbard (2008) does not include a definition of ‘reflection’ in his article, but Laboskey (1993) followed by Bain, Ballantyne, Packer, and Mills (1999) incorporated Dewey’s (1910) definition of it into evaluating the quality of pre-service teachers’ reflection by articulating descriptors for levels of depth in reflectivity.
Confidence and Competence Building toward Educational Transformation through Collaborative Reflective Blogging with Video Reflection

The aforementioned elements (integration, situation, reflection, and nurturing) are inherent components of using technology to develop a collaborative-reflective teaching practice in the EDUCATE initiative, and this project is meant to show what happens when all of those are put together for world language education undergraduates’ environment of professional growth. Skeptics may be concerned that it is just an empty fad to use computers with wireless Internet and annotatable video software for language learning and world language teacher development; but, on the contrary, it seems a natural evolution of the innovative tools and rich ideas that society has created for education over the centuries. Congress advocated amending the Higher Education Act of 1965 to support the development of teachers who will implement modern digital tools to “improve student learning, assessment, and learning management; and … transform teacher education …” (PTDAL Act, H.R. 5848, 2008, pp. 2-3, my emphasis). Citing Levin (1994), Gillingham and Topper (1999) say that teacher preparation resulting in new teachers’ “having the skill and dispositions to use technology in flexible and adaptive ways for the purposes of classroom instruction and professional development” honors guidelines articulated by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (pp. 304-305).

Collaborative reflective online written exchanges based upon audio-video recorded educative activities was tried by Bower, Cavanagh, Moloney, and Dao (2011). They found that sharing their own video reflections on blog and commenting upon those of others resulted in development of confidence and communicative competence for undergraduate pre-service teachers of not just languages but also math. Furthermore, participants “mentioned that while they had been unwilling to use technology as a teaching tool in the past, their experiences in the Video Reflection process had opened their minds to the possibilities of using technology in their own classrooms” (p. 324).

Since online work can combine collaborative and reflective video annotating in a single space and a systematic way while including classic teacher preparation techniques like those listed by Richards (1991) such as peer observation, self-reports, autobiographies, journal writing, and collaborative diary keeping, participating in this comprehensive process may help to increase prospective teachers’ confidence and skills related to the languaculture being learned and to pedagogy. Whether or not it does for EDUCATE participants should be revealed by research results presented here. It is to be hoped that research on using digital tools for such systematic,
socially constructive teacher preparation expands to inform future decisions for all areas of the educational field, not just for language teachers.

Summary

This chapter related how developing practitioners’ interaction on blog with regard to reflection including annotated video may contribute to increasing their intercultural communicative competence; this intercultural communicative competence is useful especially in language learning and teaching, not just in face-to-face situations but also in digital environments. As the only mechanism able to combine collaborative and reflective video-enhanced journaling on blog, the laptop with annotatable video capability and wireless Internet access may help provide certification candidates with a profound professional growth experience. World language education undergraduates’ online collaborative reflective dialogue about self-recorded and annotated video can bring together successful practices for development of language learning and teaching in an environment that is unique in its constant accessibility and vastness of affordances.

If one can agree that a major purpose of teacher preparation is to help the world language education student in making the wisest possible curricular and in-the-moment decisions and implementing them well, then it follows that collaborative reflection on blogs combined with annotated video is a logical place to start the process. Undergraduate teacher education students in related venues have developed communicative and pedagogical competences, including those related to technology, through the use of similar tools. In light of the questions posed in Chapter One, where the EDUCATE initiative’s process leads for the cohort members remains to be seen. The following Chapter (Three) introduces the methodology of longitudinal ethnographic case study employed in this research project.
Chapter 3

Methodology

What knowledge informs practice? How does this knowledge become ensconced in a practitioner’s repertoire? How can new knowledge change practice? To many academics and scientists, the answer to these questions lies in getting practitioners to pay attention to and use current research. To practitioners, research-informed pressure for changes in practice often seems unrelated to what is needed in day-to-day and minute-by-minute interactions. To educational reformers, these questions are critical because understanding what teachers do, how they do it, and why they do it is central to any effort at reshaping education policy around teacher education, teacher professional development, and school reform. Any effort to bring researchers, practitioners, and policy makers together in order to influence practice is what Shonkoff (2000) described as a “true cross-cultural experience” (p. 182) in that it “requires respect for their differences as well as a commitment to their shared mission.” -Rust, 2009, p. 1882

Overview

Details are explained here about the context, participants, data and procedure for collecting it, and analysis, as they all relate to the overarching research question and sub-questions. Also, an abbreviated timeline of the project is given. Again, any evidence that ubiquitous access to modern digital tools enhances world language education undergraduates’ abilities to develop linguistic and pedagogical competences in world language education would be of interest and would be presented thematically as qualitative research from a longitudinal ethnographic case study. The hypothesis was that ubiquitous access to a specific set of modern digital tools (i.e., notebook computers with Internet capability, video cameras, and video analysis software) would enhance both what language teacher educators would do with their undergraduates and what these prospective language teachers will be capable of doing with students in primary and secondary schools. However, the possibility existed that there would be very little evidence that such access to these tools would enhance the undergraduates’ abilities to develop competencies in world language education, or that the evidence would be unconvincing.
Program

This study comprises data collected from a cohort of undergraduates who studied world language education at XXU over a two-year time period divided into four semesters (S1-S4). At the start, there were twenty-four (24) students in three areas of language certification, Spanish, French, and German, enrolled together in the World Language Methods Curriculum courses described below. In the fall of their Junior year, these undergraduates consented for researchers to collect and view assignments submitted electronically for their methods courses throughout the duration of their world language teacher education undergraduate curriculum. Methods courses included an elementary school block during Semester One, study abroad during Semester Two, a secondary school block during Semester Three, and full time student teaching during Semester Four.

Methods course instructors cooperated in requiring the language learner autobiography (LLAB) as the first assignment for the undergraduates, to be posted online for peer review and comment. Instructors planned to follow through with a theme of reflection (Dewey, 1910) for the duration of the two-year Methods block, requiring that all other assignments be submitted electronically as well. Workshops and support resources would be offered regularly to these prospective teachers and their instructors. Effectively, the undergraduates were to be fully engrossed in sustained technology-facilitated communication and reflection with peers and instructors during pre-service teaching practices and study abroad for the two-year block regarding language education. See Figure 3-1, below.

![Figure 3-1](image.png)

Figure 3-1. Context: online interaction to develop a collaborative-reflective teaching practice.
The assumption that each participant’s teaching performance could be improved, through the use of collaborative reflective online dialogue facilitated by MacBook computers with Internet access and video recording software with capability for annotating clips, would be either confirmed or denied in part by video evidence uploaded to the Web. Participants posted reactions to what they saw on the videos that they annotated themselves, and they posted comments on the blog entries of other participants.

**Participants**

Initially, certification areas included Spanish (n=21), French (n=4), and German (n=1), as shown in Table 3-1 below. The Spanish category was the only one partially populated by males (n=2). Although study abroad is a requirement for language teaching certification at this institution, enrollment in the pilot blogging course for the pilot cohort in this research was optional in Spring 2010; therefore, the number of participants listed at that time (n=8) is reduced despite the fact that nobody actually dropped out of the study. Table 3-1 also indicates that the number of participants is restored after all students have returned from overseas, with the exception of three students who discontinued the certification program and opted to focus on the language major itself. The cohort is reduced further during the graduation semester, when three more of the participants chose to delay their student teaching for personal reasons. Thus, no males remained in the group.

Table 3-1. Number of participants by language over time (All female unless otherwise noted).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Starting</th>
<th>Studying Abroad</th>
<th>Finishing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>19 Female</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case – Jane

The research context emphasized immersion of world language education undergraduates in teaching, reflection, and the languaculture being learned, all of which were purposefully connected through and with technology to a great degree; therefore, data from participants who had blogged continuously over the two years without interruption (i.e., they blogged while abroad in addition to participating in online work during the other three semesters) was of greatest interest. Since the volume of text that would need to be extracted from data and placed in this dissertation in an effort to answer the research questions would be too much if all assignments from all participants who blogged from abroad were included, the pool of candidates for a case study was narrowed to five (n=5) study abroad participants who were able to participate in a focus group interview at the end of the two years; and then a case study was started with examination of one participant’s data, as it related to parts of the others’ data that was interwoven with hers, from the beginning of Semester One through the end of Semester Four.

Jane², whose study abroad location was Alicante, Spain, was used as the case to illustrate findings. When some instructors had requested a number of assignments to be submitted in person instead of entered into the online system during Semesters Three and Four, which meant that those assignments would be missing from the data, Jane’s work was the first to be made accessible to the researcher. Since analysis could be started immediately on Jane’s work, she was the case used in this report.

To get a sense of how actively involved Jane was and how much she seemed to want to be online compared to her peers, the principal researcher used the analysis technique to which Chun (1994) referred, noting the “number and length of turns or entries by each student” (p. 21). Also recorded were dates of postings and persons with whom Jane exchanged comments online. In this manner, it could be ascertained whether Jane was typical of the cohort rather than extraordinary in any way with regard to online engagement and interactivity (Pawan, Paulus, Yalcin, & Chang, 2003; Russo & Benson, 2005; Ushida, 2005). (See Appendix A).

² Names of participants, and names of people mentioned by participants, are pseudonyms.
Data

Assignments

The main body of data is made up of participants’ completed assignments with respect to the courses in the world language education undergraduate curriculum. The Semester One block, which involved teaching elementary school aged children, was comprised of both seminar and field experience, called WLED 411 and WLED495B respectively. The courses functioned together with a focus on teaching world languages in grades 1-5. Details about goals, objectives, procedures, and grading for this block are in Appendix B, as are descriptions of their assignments such as the language learner autobiography, wonderings, reading responses, blog responses, article presentation, method test drive, critical review of instructional materials for Seminar and lesson plans, reflections, and videos of Field Experience.

Next in the Methods block came study abroad. During this Semester Two, eight cohort members enrolled in an elective course called CI497C, which has now become required for world language education certification candidates. It is a class in which cohort members communicate regularly from their host countries on the course blog amongst themselves and with their instructor. In this case they blogged from Argentina, Ecuador, France, Germany, or Spain (See Figure 3-2, below). The purpose of the exercise is for world language education students to connect cultural-linguistic and pedagogical knowledge to practical application in furthering their own and others’ education. Graded assignments are blog entries, participatory observation, and interview. Again, descriptions of those are given apart from this narrative, in Appendix C.

Figure 3-2. The blogging context for semester two – study abroad.
After study abroad in Semester Two, the cohort members engaged in the Secondary Methods Block, teaching in middle- or high schools on certain days a number of times as they finished other coursework during Semester Three. Like the Elementary Block, the Secondary one includes a seminar and field experience. Graded assignments listed on the syllabus for Seminar were blog, group teaching experiment, unit development project, and classroom discourse paper. Blog topics were: first impressions, classroom interactions, anatomy of a lesson, classroom management, instructional materials, assessment, and final reflections. Once more, an appendix (Appendix D) offers a more thorough explanation of assignments and other course-related details. For Field Experience, lesson plans and reflections were submitted along with other assignments whose specifications are listed in the Appendices with the aforementioned ones.

Finally, the cohort members did full-time student teaching to complete their two-year Methods block curriculum in Semester Four. Lesson plans, reflections, and other assignments, which are clarified in yet another appendix (Appendix E), were required for that as well.

Additional Sources

Apart from the completed assignments with respect to the courses in the World Language Education undergraduate curriculum, there were surveys, focus groups, and a final reflection.

Initial Participant Survey

The initial participant survey (see Appendix F) was intended to quantitatively and qualitatively document the following for Semester One:

- cohort members’ perceptions of their own teaching skills (both with and without the use of digital tools)
- the duration of time and type of activities in which they engaged on their notebook computers (both in the past and at the time of the survey) for either social or academic purposes
- their present familiarity with and use of certain applications on the computers
- where they learned to use the applications
• how they would learn to use other applications if necessary and / or desirable, their nascent thoughts about seeing themselves teaching on video

• their fledgling opinions about academic blogging

• their crediting (or lack thereof) the use of the notebook computer for what they were learning about teaching and learning

• how their attitudes about using the computer was affected, if at all, by trouble shooting issues (if present), and by the fact that they were able to borrow the computer rather than purchase it

**Instructor Focus Group**

Although they were not subjects of the research project at hand but rather listed on the research application submitted to the Institutional Review Board at XXU, the people who instructed 411, 495B, and 497C (Methods courses during Semesters One and Two, including both Seminar and Field Experiences plus study abroad) agreed to discuss, in focus group format, their experience teaching the cohort using MacBook computers. An additional person listed on the application approved by the Institutional Review Board sat in to observe and interjected a number of times during the fifty-five minute session. See Appendix G for topics broached.

**Participant Focus Group**

Five cohort members who had blogged from abroad during the 497C elective agreed to later attend a twenty-minute session in which the principal researcher followed a self-designed script of ten questions to glean additional information. Jane participated as part of this focus group that addressed the following topics:

• effects of knowing that peers were accessible online, whether the online interaction had affected post-study-abroad relationships with peers

• whether participants read and / or commented on blog posts even when they were not required to do so

• whether the tone of online interaction during Semester Two was different from that of Semester One and if so, what were the effects on learning (if any)
The researcher ended the session by asking for any random comments that they wanted to add. See Appendix H for questions verbatim.

Language Learner Autobiography Reflection

By Semester Four (Spring, 2011), cohort members were no longer under the supervision of the Methods instructors from 411, 495B, and 497C, so a reflection about their initial language learner autobiography was optional. The principal researcher went to their seminar and took approximately thirty seconds to say that she would send them a copy of their original language learner autobiography with their peers’ and instructors’ associated comments from the online work they had done semesters ago; they could email to the researcher any thoughts they had upon seeing what was there from Fall of 2009. See Appendices I & J for researcher’s scripts requesting this information in person and via e-mail.

Participant Exit Survey

The final survey that participants took mirrored their initial survey with a few minor exceptions. The gender demographic question was eliminated because there were no males remaining in the cohort. Also, the certification area question was subtracted because researchers already knew that information, which would not change from the previous survey. To detect any change in attitudes that researchers thought may be pertinent to world language education undergraduates’ improving instruction, three questions were added in order to recast in Semester
Four the initial (from Semester One) questions related to the language learner autobiography: the importance of teachers’ methods versus personality; whether the teacher or student is most responsible for making sure that learning happens; and how important it is to use the languaculture being learned while teaching. A bit of wording for a couple questions was altered as well to make them pertinent to the present rather than to Fall of 2009.

A summary of the data from these assignments and these other sources is presented below in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2. Summary of data sources by semester, from semesters one through four (S1-S4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start</th>
<th>Study Abroad</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=24)</td>
<td>(n=8)</td>
<td>(n=21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Study Abroad</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLAB &amp; Questions</td>
<td>Entries</td>
<td>Entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Reflections</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog Responses</td>
<td>LBL Interview</td>
<td>Lesson Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonderings</td>
<td>LBL Observation</td>
<td>Reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Responses</td>
<td>(Grp. Teach Exper)</td>
<td>Final Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Plans</td>
<td>(Class Discourse P)</td>
<td>(Other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Reflections</td>
<td>(Unit Devpt. Plan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method Test Drive</td>
<td>[Web-portfolio]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Review of Material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Article Review]</td>
<td>Researcher’s Interview of Instructors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
only, and brackets denote information that was not analyzed. Each of the indicated assignments and additional data sources was to be analyzed for this study.

Data was collected with minimum disturbance to cohort members. Upon participants’ consent, the principal researcher assigned each one a random pseudonym to protect privacy and confidentiality. As participants submitted surveys and assignments on blogs or through the university’s online course management system for their classes, the researchers, having been given access to these digital environments, simply made Portable Document Formats (pdf) of all blog posts and comments as they appeared in the virtual environment, downloaded any videos that participants had uploaded to the site, and extracted the assignments that had been sent to the courses’ in-boxes on the online course management system.

The online diagnostic and exit surveys were sent to participants via XXU’s email as a link on Qualtrics®. For the first survey, the primary researcher met with the cohort during their regular seminar class time when their instructor was not present for approximately fifteen minutes. During this time, participants were allowed to complete the survey and ask clarification questions if needed. There were no significant questions about the survey, and some participants elected to do it later outside of class. One participant chose not to fill it out. The exit survey procedure was similar: during the cohort’s regular meeting time for their final seminar, they were given the opportunity to complete it while the aforementioned researcher was present and their instructor was not. This took place at this researcher’s house, where she provided paella and refreshments, and a few participants brought desserts and other food and beverage items to share. Some participants waited until later to fill out the survey, three chose not to do it all, and one completed a portion of it and stopped. Results were downloaded to a file format of Comma Separated Values (csv). At the end of each semester, the researcher did a preliminary read of all data and filed it in two different arrangements for subsequent reviews: by student, and by assignment, as shown in Table 3-3 below.
Table 3-3. Data arrangements A and B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment 1</td>
<td>Pseudonym 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym 2</td>
<td>Assignment 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym 3</td>
<td>Assignment 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym 4</td>
<td>Assignment 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym 5</td>
<td>Assignment 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym 6</td>
<td>Assignment 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym 7</td>
<td>Assignment 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym 8</td>
<td>Assignment 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym 9</td>
<td>Assignment 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym 10</td>
<td>Assignment 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudonym etc.</td>
<td>Assignment etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment 2, etc.</td>
<td>Pseudonym 1, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Semester One, eleven assignments and associated comments from twenty-four participants were to be collected, as well as the initial survey. Some assignments carried a requirement of multiple entries separated by certain periods of time, while the requisite number of wonderings was reduced by the instructors from five to four. During study abroad in Semester Two, one on-going assignment (with ten entries) and two shorter-term pieces of work and associated comments from eight participants were to be retrieved; additionally, as stated previously, the cohort’s two instructors took part in a focus group discussion with two researchers. In Semester Three, researchers intended to collect another longitudinal assignment (thirteen entries with comments), three shorter-term tasks, and at least six lesson plans with reflections from twenty-one remaining participants. From the final semester, Four, all lesson plans with reflections along with any other pertinent assignments were to be collected from participants in the full time practicum; additionally, the eighteen remaining participants were asked to take a final survey and to do a reflection regarding their original language learner autobiography as a credited alternative assignment. Again, as mentioned before, the eight participants who had blogged from abroad were invited to take part in a focus group interview, also. Table 3-4, below, shows an inventory of data sources by participant.
Table 3-4. Inventory of data sources by participant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>97</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kira</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lourdes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candice</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandie</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>\</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lina</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerri</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayleigh</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annika</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunice</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charline</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brianna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x = all parts of assignment were collected  
0 = was not collected  
\ = narrative was not available  
/ = video was not available  
1-5 = number of narratives collected  
p = only the narrative was made available  
v = only the video was made available  
L = only the lesson plan was made available  
R = only the reflections were made available

Table 3-4 above shows what researchers were actually able to collect from each participant out of all assignments over the two-year project. Abbreviations on the chart for work submitted are consistent with the capitalized letters, underlined numbers, and symbols in the following list: Method test drive with video, language learner Autobiography and answers to its related questions (?), two Individual reflections with video, three Blog responses, four Wonderings, two Reading responses, six Lesson plans from Semester One (x = all six (6) while a
number represents fewer), the initial Survey, three Group reflections with video, Critical review of instructional materials, blog assignments from 497C of study abroad, assignments from 412 to include lesson plans with reflections (L2 and R2), group Teaching experiment with video, classroom Discourse paper, Unit development plan, student teaching lesson plans with reflections (L3), a reflection about the original autobiography (A2), and the exit survey (X). The instructors requiring the article presentation and the professor requiring the group teaching experiment assignment chose to have students submit those assignments physically rather than online; therefore, the researchers’ ability to access data for these pieces was severely limited, so they are not featured in data analysis. Additionally, the web-based portfolio is listed to help demonstrate that cohort members were required to constantly utilize digital means as a self-development aid, but given the probable redundancy of projects submitted as assignments being also uploaded to the portfolios, researchers did not request access to analyze the contents of the portfolios.

To reiterate procedures for data sources that are not noted on Table 3-4 above, at the end of the Semester Two as study abroad was coming to a close for participants, the researcher audio recorded and transcribed a focus group discussion with the two instructors who had taught 411, 495C, and 497C. In this way, the researcher could ascertain their perspective about sustained engagement in online interaction to develop a collaborative-reflective teaching practice. The conversation occurred at the primary researcher’s house, where the instructors were provided food and drink.

Similar to the instructor focus group discussion, the focus group interview with participants that occurred much nearer to graduation time in Semester Four a year later, took place at a convenient location - at the primary researcher’s house (visible from the site of their closing ceremony hosted by XXU) where beverages were provided, and at a convenient time for them (directly after that ceremony marking the end of practicum, where everyone was to gather). Jane, Jill, Kira, Natalie, and Sherry participated and Mary sat in to observe because she was interested. The researcher audio recorded the discussion involving the five participants who agreed to be interviewed together and voluntarily answer questions in person, listened several times to it, and noted answers to questions. And, as stated in the paragraph above, many participants voluntarily submitted an exit survey. Some sent to the principal researcher via email a reflection on their original language learner autobiography near the end of the project.
Analysis

As indicated previously, data arrangement A from Table 3-3 above was used to become familiar with each assignment and general themes that arose within it from the corpus altogether, and data arrangement B to look at how each individual responded personally to each assignment (Blair, 1996). The primary researcher re-reviewed data by participant, first starting with those who had agreed to complete 497C during study abroad because they would yield uninterrupted data, then proceeded randomly through the rest of the participants’ files. Physical evidence in the form of video and / or self-reports in assignments, surveys, or interviews would serve as qualitative and quantitative data used in checking for any possible development in participants’ demonstration of technology use for the purposes of supporting teaching and learning. “Demonstration” meant use of computers to communicate between participants and their instructors, amongst themselves, between participants and their students, amongst participants’ students themselves, and / or between any of the learning community members and the ‘outside world’ (see Figure 3-3, Technology Enhanced Education Analysis Tool, below).

![Figure 3-3. Technology enhanced education analysis tool for interactivity.](image)

Online Interactivity

Using the conceptual framework in Figure 3-3, above, the primary researcher looked for physical evidence of participants’ demonstration of technology use for the purposes of supporting
teaching and learning. She noticed that participants wrote a lot about students’ behavior. This topic was associated with the classroom management issue and means of reflection that the cohort members were required to address during Elementary Block in the first semester at the start of Junior year, and these undergraduates were required to use the computer to do the reflection. Therefore, reflection, especially through the use of technology and with respect to students’ behavior in particular, became a focus of the research. This line of inquiry pertains directly to question B: Do specific uses of these tools have transformative potential; and to what extent, if any, can these activities contribute to evolution of competences? In other words, the principal researcher wanted to see if there was evidence indicating that reflection involving annotation of video clips illustrating incidences of behavioral dysfunction can contribute to improved communication, rapport, interactions, and / or management of student behavior, all of which is now referred to as synthe-cultural competence. Whether or not participants seemed to use such interactivity with digital tools to reconsider their own attitudes and behavior was also documented.

**Reflection**

To see improvement in decision-making, the world language education undergraduates’ records pertinent to methodological choices and professionalism were used. As shown in Table 3-5 below, the level of reflection is determined by using the scale adapted from work by Bain et al. (1999). Bain et al. (1999) used Dewey’s (1910) reflective procedure [problem-setting, means/end analysis, and generalisation] as a guide to make specifications indicating depth of reflection. Quality increases with level number.
Table 3-5. Levels of reflection adapted from Bain et al. (1999).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Describes, reports, and / or re-tells; does not add insights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Responding</td>
<td>Observes, judges, and / or expresses sentiment; does not add reasons or seek answers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3     | Relating | Identifies data of personal significance or connected with own experience; this may include what was learned, strengths, weakness, and / or mistakes  
Seek to understand relationships  
Explains why something occurred “or identifies something they need or plan to do or change”  (p. 60) |
| 4     | Reasoning | Integrates the data into an appropriate relationship, e.g. with theoretical concepts  
Questions, seeks answers and alternatives, hypothesizes  
Explores the theory / practice relationship in depth |
| 5     | Reconstructing | “Displays a high level of abstract thinking to generalise and / or apply learning”  (p. 60)  
Formulates a personal theory  
Plans further learning |

In formulating the descriptors listed in Table 3-5 above, Bain et al., (1999) also cite Laboskey (1993), whose conceptual framework for reflection in pre-service teacher education includes Dewey’s (1910) attitudes of directness, openmindedness, responsibility, and wholeheartedness. Laboskey (1993) explains that changes in reflective abilities, beliefs, values and attitudes, and / or emotional states are potentially transformative and can facilitate solving problems of practice.

Levels of Reflection examples:

1. This happened.
2. This happened and that’s good / bad, etc.
3. This happened and that’s good / bad, etc. because …
4. This happened and that’s good / bad, etc. because _________ and the reason it matters is …
5. This happened and that’s good / bad, etc. because _________ and the reason it matters is _____________, so …

Levels of Reflection Illustrations: Entering buildings behind someone else.

1. People hold open the door for one another here.
2. People hold open the door for one another here and that’s good.
3. People hold open the door for one another here and that’s good because it’s polite.
4. People hold open the door for one another here and that’s good because it’s polite; otherwise, somebody could get hurt by getting their fingers pinched, etc.
5. People hold open the door for one another here and that’s good because it’s polite; otherwise, somebody could get hurt by getting their fingers pinched, etc. So, next time I pass through a door while entering a building, I’ll look behind me to see if somebody else is coming; if they are, I’ll hold open the door for them so they don’t get hurt, etc., to do a good and polite deed. (I wonder if there are other reasons for / histories of door-holding, particular door-holding behavioral and speech-related etiquettes for people of different genders, ages, traditions … (who holds open the door for whom, what they say, why, etc.)).

One must remember that relating successfully with the ‘other’ (Yam, 1986) is an outcome of having intercultural communicative competence (Byram, 1997), which is necessary for competence in teaching, and has attitudes in common with Dewey’s (1916) description of what is needed for effectiveness of the method of knowing. Using words similar to Dewey’s (1916), Byram (1997, p. 50) speaks of “openness, readiness to suspend disbelief … and belief… interest in discovering other perspectives on interpretation of familiar and unfamiliar phenomena … readiness to experience … readiness to engage …” So, not only physical evidence of the mechanics of the collaborative reflection involving the annotation of video but also evidence of participants’ attitudes was noted. A focus here is on the words “confidence,” “open-mindedness,” “whole-hearted,” and “responsibility,” as well as other terms said by Dewey (1916) and Byram (1997) to be related to these attitudes. This line of inquiry directly pertains to question C: How is the use of technology in education perceived by world language education undergraduates; how often did they broach the topic without direct prompting, what did they say about it, and was there a change in attitude?

**Intercultural Communicative Competence**

To see growth in communicative capacity, participants’ comments were categorized according to what they said in their online dialogue, plus what they could be seen and heard doing on video. Progress of the case study individual (Jane) is plotted on the intercultural communicative competence chart (adapted from Byram (1997) - see Table 3-6 below).
Table 3-6. Chart of intercultural communicative competence adapted from Byram (1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity, openness, suspends disbelief about other and belief of own culture</td>
<td>Of social groups, products, practices, processes of interaction in own and other culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tries to engage with others equally and personally, not to profit, aggrandize, mainstream, or glorify the exotic</td>
<td>Significant current and past political and economic figures and events between cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tries to discover perspectives of ‘other’ regarding phenomena from both cultures</td>
<td>How to access ‘others,’ their environment, institutions of mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions mores and assumptions inherent in customs of the ‘other’s’ environment, compares and contrasts with one’s own</td>
<td>Alternative interpretations of concepts, rituals; effects of behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copes with states of adaptation (enthused, withdrawn) and experiences of being foreign (acceptance, rejection) while residing in ‘other’s’ environment</td>
<td>Portrayal of events and identity of culture through socialization, how perceived by ‘others’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts; engages with rites and conventions of verbal and non-verbal communication; attends to expectations</td>
<td>Borders, regions, dialects, identities, landmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Socialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of social groups, products, practices, processes of interaction in own and other culture</td>
<td>National education system, religion, rites marking life cycle stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>Distinctions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant current and past political and economic figures and events between cultures</td>
<td>Clothing, food, language, and / or tradition differences between groups delineated by class, ethnicity, creed, gender, profession, age, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to access ‘others,’ their environment, institutions of mediation</td>
<td>Public / Private health, recreation, financial, media, education organizations affecting daily life within and between countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misunderstanding</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative interpretations of concepts, rituals; effects of behavior</td>
<td>Formality; taboos, norms of public / private meetings, use of transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>Interpreting and Relating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portrayal of events and identity of culture through socialization, how perceived by ‘others’</td>
<td>Location ethnocentrism, explain origins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>Dysfunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borders, regions, dialects, identities, landmarks</td>
<td>Explain breakdown in terms of errors re: nuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization</td>
<td>Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National education system, religion, rites marking life cycle stages</td>
<td>Identify common ground, facilitate resolving conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctions</td>
<td>Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing, food, language, and / or tradition differences between groups delineated by class, ethnicity, creed, gender, profession, age, etc.</td>
<td>Notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>Notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public / Private health, recreation, financial, media, education organizations affecting daily life within and between countries</td>
<td>Indicate implicit reference to shared meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality; taboos, norms of public / private meetings, use of transport</td>
<td>Elicit allusions from informant, establish hierarchical links and cause / effect, test generalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting and Relating</td>
<td>Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice</td>
<td>Navigate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate implicit reference to shared meaning</td>
<td>Use venue-appropriate genre, avoid offending, utilize resources to find out more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Negotiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicit allusions from informant, establish hierarchical links and cause / effect, test generalization</td>
<td>Intervene to mutual satisfaction of people involved; diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>Maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically evaluate with explicit criteria</td>
<td>Continue acquaintance over time and distance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As examples, various colors can be used to represent developmentally related postings from each semester. Growth is shown by the number of areas in the charts addressed by the end of two years for Jane.

Categories in Table 3-6 above will appear throughout Chapters Four, Five, and Six with regard to explanations of Jane’s development. Evaluation of the program’s results, illustrated by examples from Jane, is mostly qualitative in the form of a descriptive case study (Yin, 1994, 2003). Quotes from Jane’s work were copied and pasted under each pertinent descriptor in Table 3-6 on a separate document to determine topics that would be analyzed; then, topics that endured over several semesters were pulled as themes to be reported here. Analyzing in this way would help determine the outcome of sustained online interaction to develop a collaborative-reflective teaching practice, and documenting and reporting results in this way should help clarify the outcome.

Once more, this descriptive case study research was approached with a longitudinal ethnographic perspective within which is “a very careful description of categories of people, events, and things and the relationship between those categories in varying situations” (Tindall, 1975); there were multiple sources of data from a two-year time span, which involved “multiple social situations” (Frank, 1999, p. 56). For many ethnographies, it is a given that the researcher participates as a member of the community being studied; however, the principal researcher for this project was an insider only to the extent that she is a language teacher, has studied abroad, has mentored twenty preservice teachers, and has used technology for development of intercultural communicative competence related to both the languaculture being learned and to pedagogy. She neither participated in the participants’ online dialogue nor had a visible online presence in their digital learning environment.

The primary researcher wanted to know if there were any other situations, besides collaborative reflection with annotating video, in which participants seemed to grow through their use of the technological tools. By Semester Two, participants were getting ready for study abroad semester, during which some of them would complete 497C. Looking at data from study abroad pertained directly to question A: What can technology use contribute to world language teacher development that would be difficult if not impossible to achieve without it; where was it used to facilitate discourse in a way that was not able to be accomplished by other means, and – to put it bluntly – so what? In other words, how would the tools help participants reflect together in ways that may not otherwise be possible while they were located in various countries of
drastically different time zones, and what was the value of that discourse in terms of competences?

The instructor focus group recording was transcribed in an effort to confirm or deny whatever impressions had been drawn thus far. Seeing that the purpose of 497C blogging was for cohort members to realize a connection between real-world experience and classroom instruction, to help one another and their future students with that as well, and to eventually function as an ambassador or intermediary between the target culture and the culture of their future students, the primary researcher looked for discourse related to elements of intercultural communicative competence – attitudes, knowledge, skills, and awarenesses that enable constructive “contact with people in other groups,” which is allowed and encouraged by the world’s current condition (Byram, 1997, p. 1), especially in the languaculture being learned.

**Technology Integration**

By Semester Three, while still working with data arrangements A and B and “demonstration” as illustrated by Figure 3-3 above, the primary researcher looked at physical evidence in the form of video and / or self-reports in assignments for any possible development in participants’ demonstration of technology use for the purposes of supporting teaching and learning in terms of ‘integration’ as per Dwyer et al. (1991) plus Hooper and Rieber (1995). She also watched attitude as per Dewey (1910, 1916) plus Byram (1997). But, this time, reflection was inspected more closely to see if participants had progressed in terms of levels described by Bain et al. (1999): reporting, responding, relating, reasoning and reconstructing. Keeping this in mind, the primary researcher made a completion chart for comparison, logging who responded to whom and when, and looking at all cohort members’ work. Analysis was reported almost exclusively for work of those who had blogged from abroad, with special attention to how it intersected with Jane’s work. Estimating Jane’s computer skills was done by examining the content of her postings in all four semesters, and by observing and analyzing digital artifacts she used and / or submitted during this two-year Methods Block. Also considered were a comparison of initial and post-experience survey results, and an overview of online behavior, or interactivity of communicative computer use for teaching and / or learning of languaculture. Finally, the participant focus group interview recording was analyzed in search of answers to questions that
the primary researcher had posed to the participants, and the reflection about the initial language learner autobiography was analyzed in terms of the original one.

Reliability and Subjectivity

Utilizing the particular vocabulary written by Dewey (1910, 1916), Bain et al. (1999), and Byram (1997), and Dwyer et al. (1991) plus Hooper and Rieber (1995) as standards to match words that were used by the world language education undergraduates in articulating their thoughts was a strategy intended to reduce the use of interpretation and therefore minimize subjectivity. Since discourse is defined by (van Djik, 1997) as being language use between people attempting to communicate cognition (p. 2), the minimum linguistic unit for analysis in this study consisted of an initial post with a response from a peer; the ideal units were comprised of not just the post and response but also the initiating person’s acknowledgement of her partner’s response. By default, the mere broadcasting of thoughts with no evidence of them having been observed by peers was not enough to be analyzed. Using this definition of discourse and these instruments of data analysis was meant to increase reliability as was application of the measurement tool initiated in Semester One (See Figure 3-2, above, for technology enhanced education analysis tool for communicative computer use for teaching / learning); it is based upon physical evidence that is not so arguable as an interpretation may be.

Personally, the primary researcher is experienced with academic blogging with students for teaching and learning Spanish and it has gone well for her. However, it is significantly different from the context of this project since it was at secondary rather than undergraduate level and it was not for preparing certification candidates for world language education. Therefore, potential bias is lower than it could have been otherwise. The only influence this researcher had over assignments was suggesting the language learner autobiography and topics for blogging from abroad in 497C.

Validity and Role of the Researcher

To maximize validity, the primary researcher used multiple sources of data in triangulation (Denzin, 1970). Where there was video to corroborate events described in written
reflection, both the video and the commensurate printed text were examined for confirmation of accuracy in the self-report. Likewise, where there was more than one mention of a concept of concern in an individual’s work, both consistency and inconsistency over time and variety of contexts was investigated. Finally where certain impressions had been formed about what was interpreted to be happening on the blogs and why, the researcher worked in questions during focus groups to ascertain if the impression was accurate.

Another measure to increase validity was a review of the largest number of participants that was feasible. Also, from each participant, every piece of work that was visible online was collected and analyzed. But this is not to say that outcomes would be generalizable to other undergraduate world language education students in other cohorts at the same or other institutions and / or programs.

It should be made clear that coercion was not an issue because before signing on, participants were informed that there would be neither rewards for participation nor would they suffer penalties for refusing to participate. They were made aware that the research would not affect their grades in any way because the researchers were not their instructors, and would tell their instructors neither who participated and who did not, nor offer opinion about participants’ performance. After consenting, participants went without seeing researchers or hearing from them for about a year, and most participants seemed to have forgotten about the research altogether until they were asked to respond to the researcher’s inquiries in Semester Four.

**Summary**

The language methods prototype being investigated, for use of sustained online interaction to develop a collaborative-reflective teaching practice, has been thoroughly described here and in appendices. An outline of the participants, data, and analyses over four semesters, as they relate to all but one of the research questions, has been provided as well. The remaining research question, about where technology was used to solve a problem in a way that would be difficult if not impossible to accomplish by other means, was left to envelop the project as a whole rather than to target a particular area of it.

In attempting to shed light upon what the use of MacBooks with video software that has annotation capability, and wireless Internet access at any time, from anywhere, can contribute to world language education undergraduates’ linguistic and pedagogical development that may not
be attainable without the technology, insight may be gained by determining quality of reflection and characterization of online interaction especially as it applies to instances of intercultural communicative competence (Byram, 1997). The data items most relevant to those two concerns are: the language learner autobiography and questions and comments from Semester One, all individual and group reflections including annotated video (from Semesters One, Three, Four), blog responses, wonderings, blog entries and comments from semester Two during study abroad, the focus group discussion with instructors, the focus group interview of participants, and the final language learner autobiography reflection. Crucial points about those items are not only what communications were exchanged but also from where and at what times. Also of interest is what students said about how access to the tools affected the quality of their work. Therefore, said data will be coded as per Bain et al. (1999) for reflection, Byram (1997) for intercultural communicative competence, and Dwyer et al. (1991) plus Hooper and Rieber (1995) for technology use. This coding will be triangulated with information gleaned from instructors during focus group discussion and with participants’ artifacts harvested from online. This should indicate in what situations these tools were used to facilitate collaborative reflective discourse toward increased competences in the languaculture and / or in pedagogy in a way that would be difficult if not impossible to accomplish by other means.

What else participants did with the tools for themselves and each other (besides collaborative reflective discourse) may be demonstrated through any and all lesson plans (from Semesters One, Three, Four) triangulated with all individual and group reflections including annotated video (from Semesters One, Three, Four), the final video from Semester One, and the focus group interview. Self-reports and researcher observation will inform the profession of how these tools are useful for language teaching and learning in general, and especially for problem solving. Any possible evolution of participants’ changing attitudes and / or engaging in activities with the tools in ways that were not done before will be displayed in a comparison of the initial and final survey responses, as information given through assignments posted, and self-reports in the focus group. The significance of this is that such development is potentially transformative in that theoretically participants would have more strategies and different strategies in their repertoire to aid themselves, their students, and others with these tools especially for teaching and learning languages.

Kramsch (1983) suggests that engaging in a multitude of student / student interactions for language learning is what helps students be able to communicate naturally. Furthermore, Hokanson and Hooper (2004) suggest that for teaching languages and other subjects, effective
teachers provide students with opportunities to generate unscripted conversation. They note that in contrast, novice teachers tend to stay on low levels of instruction on their five-point taxonomy, merely delivering information or having students do repetitive exercises. With respect to these concepts about language learning, a summary of data analyses will discuss to what extent, if any, world language education undergraduates’ lessons can be expected to contribute to the growth of their students’ competences with regard to intercultural communicative competence and/or the languaculture being learned.

The next several chapters will be a presentation and discussion of results of analyses as they pertain to the research questions. Each chapter covers a theme that extends throughout all four semesters of the two-year Methods Block. Chapter Four is about how Jane uses the MacBook with Internet access and video software with annotation capability to engage in collaborative reflective discourse about learning to use more Spanish versus English while she is teaching. Chapter Five covers Jane’s use of digital applications for learning and teaching Spanish, and Chapter Six narrates Jane’s use of the technological tools for problem solving toward increasing intercultural competence not just for teaching but in general. The final chapter, Seven, will be a synthesis of findings, a discussion, and a conclusion, including limitations of the study and recommendations for further research.
Chapter 4

Development of Competence to Function in the Languaculture Being Learned

academic … personal … cultural … the aspects that we were picking up were both equally important but different in their own right. – Jane, Semester Four, on development during Semesters One and Two

Overview

Exploration as to how sustained online interaction to develop a collaborative-reflective teaching practice can grant unique opportunities for world language education undergraduates to learn to develop competence for language teaching and learning is invited by data provided in the aforementioned surveys, focus groups, and collaborative-reflective online data sources, which are triangulated wherever that is possible. A longitudinal ethnographic study of participants’ digitally-archived work can reveal the process of development, which in turn can be described using evidence presented thematically in a case study format. ‘Jane’ is used as an example here, as she is a representative participant of the cohort. The first area of development discussed is functioning in languaculture being learned (e.g. using Spanish in relating to people for the purpose of accomplishing goals) because it is a topic that Jane broaches in her very first assignment during Semester One and it continues to concern her to the very end of the program. Discussion about Jane’s development in using Spanish for teaching in class and learning while abroad is grounded in her attitude toward technology (Dwyer et al., 1991; Hooper & Rieber, 1995) and in her use of reflection (Dewey, 1910; 1916). Information about Jane’s development is presented in terms of attitudes, skills, knowledge, and awareness consistent with Byram’s (1997, 2000) assessment framework for intercultural communicative competence.
Jane’s Reflective Interaction Online as a Case that is Representative of her Peer Group

Jane’s representativeness, as a case study example of the cohort, is founded upon previous studies of teaching and learning online, which have determined that positive attitude and motivation are indicated by regular and productive submission of work and participation in online dialogue (Ushida, 2005). Analysis of Jane’s Semester One online behavior provides evidence of engagement patterns, which serve as an indicator of positive attitude toward learning activity involving digital tools for the purpose of improving “interactive competence … sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic competence in foreign language learners as described in both the communicative competence and proficiency movements” (Chun, 1994). Though her entries are almost always among the shortest compared to those of her peers, the amount of minutes elapsed between her opening and completing both the beginning and ending survey is comparable to that of her peers; an interpretation of the latter fact may be that the time she dedicates to online interaction appears to be similar to that of her peers. Her assignments are submitted far before deadline consistently and she is one of the first to post for each assignment throughout the semester. Additionally, Jane responds to and addresses a variety of her peers, and she broaches topics to which different peers respond. The number of people to whom she responds, and who respond to her, are within the norm for her peer group. For those reasons, it cannot be said that any of her computer-related activity during the two year world language education Methods Block is either significantly extraordinary or, on the other hand, chronically symptomatic of typical online learning problems such as procrastination, minimal effort, or lack of interactivity (Pawan, Paulus, Yalcin, & Chang, 2003; Russo & Benson, 2005; Ushida, 2005).

The framework described in Chapter Three (referring to figure 3-3: Technology enhanced education analysis tool), that outlines interactivity in communicative computer use for teaching and / or learning language, can be used to determine a starting point for illustrating how specific ways of engaging with other people while utilizing the technology may have transformative potential. From the beginning, with successive interactions among cohort members and between them and their instructors, the level of reflection rises above that of the initial post on a consistent basis. An example of this is shown in Table 4-1 below, where Jane’s first Semester One quotes, from her language learner autobiography and subsequent responses to others’ autobiographies and comments and questions, are placed on the scale for level of reflection that was introduced in Chapter Three (Table 3-5). The level of reflection in Jane’s initial post (R = 4) is consistent with that of her peers (see Appendix A). Jane’s subsequent responses are bolded to distinguish them
from her initial post (August 26, 2009). A half level has been inserted to the aforementioned measure offered by Bain et al. (1999) so that there is space to show where Jane, like her peers, re-envision what could be done differently from what she experienced but is unable to implement changes (reconstruct) because she is not yet working with students.

Table 4-1. Jane’s initial level of reflection as per descriptors adapted from Bain et al. (1999).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Jane’s words from first Semester One assignment (LLAB) and associated comments and responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Re-tells; does not add insight.</td>
<td>I went through an Exploration Program, which allowed me to sample Spanish, French and German for a few months each.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Responding</td>
<td>Judges; expresses sentiment without adding reasons or seeking answers.</td>
<td>I fell in love with Spanish because of my Spanish teacher. I almost quit the language all together because of the [next] teacher I had. I thought she was crazy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relating</td>
<td>Connects with personal experience; identifies need for change</td>
<td>She was funny, energetic, helpful, and most of all, she showed that she cared about how I did in the class. Now I know that she was working with TPR or Total Physical Response. It may have worked had we been in elementary school, but the class of mostly juniors and seniors was not having it … she did not change her style to fit the students, which led to poor grades and frustrated kids.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4     | Reasoning | Integrates data with theoretical concepts | After taking 5 semesters of Spanish in the high school … I had studied for so long and still couldn’t speak … I don’t think I’ll be satisfied with my Spanish learning until I study abroad and immerse myself in the culture. – Jane, August 26, 2009

everyone has had that teacher… the one that everyone asks, "Who let them teach? … the problem? … how to adapt and relate to the students. (my emphasis) - Jane, August 28, 2009

4.5 Re-envisioning | I will probably try TPR with our 3rd and 4th graders this semester … Hopefully, things will go as planned and the kids will learn from and enjoy TPR. If not, I will definitely switch my strategy and go with what the students respond positively to. – Jane August 31, 2009 |
| 5     | Reconstructing | Applies learning with own students | |
Information on Table 4-1 above indicates that Jane’s potentially transformational thought, quoted in bold on level 4.5, manifests itself only after a peer comments on the initial post; therefore, it appears to be instigated and propelled by that online interaction. Moreover, when considering the intercultural communicative competence chart, based upon Byram’s (1997, 2000) work, that was discussed in Chapter Three, Jane moves from having an attitude of readiness to “adapt” to having a plan for changing her own behavior based upon hypothetical reactions of her future students. Jane’s implementation of her plan to adapt, should the need arise, would demonstrate increased competence. Again, though, the competence of utmost concern to Jane seems to be that of speaking Spanish, especially while she is in class teaching the language to students. The rest of this chapter is dedicated to narrating Jane’s self-described baseline for that competence from the start of Semester One, sharing excerpts of the analysis and increasingly reflective online interaction that illustrate development for her in that area in the meantime, and quoting her final self-evaluation from the end of Semester Four.

Diagnostic of Competence with Functioning in Spanish

Jane’s Initial Self-Reports about her Ability to Function in Spanish

Jane’s initial attitude of Semester One suggests a willingness to engage fully with the languaculture being learned, as she states in her autobiography, “I don’t think I’ll be satisfied with m[y] Spanish learning until I study abroad and immerse myself in the culture.” In the same paragraph, Jane summarizes the status of her knowledge and skills in both emotional and concrete terms: “I hated knowing I had studied for so long and still couldn’t speak … I can write essays and fill in worksheets … but speaking makes me nervous.” Jane’s own feelings comprise the criteria by which she illustrates her awareness of this issue: “After taking 5 semesters of Spanish in the high school, I still didn’t feel like I could speak effectively at all … In fact, even after transitioning into college, I still feel that way.” She closes this first assignment by referring even more directly to attitude and adding a comment that may be associated with her ability to learn how to develop competence, “other than my 10th grade Spanish teacher, every other Spanish teacher I’ve had has opened my mind to language and given my the tools I need to succeed (with a little struggle at first) at the next level [sic].”
Commenting on a peer’s language learner autobiography, Jane soon reiterates and further details her distress with her own diagnostic position, especially as it pertained to speaking Spanish; she then suggests that more authentic Spanish use during her education could have led to a different outcome for her:

I took AP Spanish in high school and aced the class. However, I took the test and felt like I had been punched in the gut … I did horribly with the speaking … I still to this day get nervous when I talk to professors in Spanish or in front of my peers. I really wish we had had more practice with real life situations. (Jane, August 28, 2009: comment on peer’s autobiography)

Her response to yet another peer’s autobiography is consistent with that, as she states, “total immersion and necessity are a dynamic duo when it comes to L2 acquisition.” When her instructor blogs a question to her about whether Jane’s discomfort with speaking relates to the “amount of practice / experience” Jane had, Jane answers, “that’s exactly it … The majority of my language classes in high school were held in Spanish, but our answers were given in English. Even my AP class spoke in English. How strange!” Jane goes on to say, “I can understand ‘Classroom Spanish’ well, but I doubt my abilities in the real world … I am really looking forward to studying abroad in hopes of righting the situation…” Thus, functioning in the languaculture would be Jane’s focus issue from the start for the teaching and learning of Spanish.

Soon after the initial online conversation about autobiographical learning background, Jane responds to an instructor-posed question to the cohort about why people teach the way they do. Jane replies, “teachers teach the way they were taught … teach to the textbook because it’s easy … Younger teachers may be scared to lose their position for trying something new …” And, about a week later, Jane’s wondering is: “After different research and just my own personal experience, I wonder how possible it is to reach native-like competence. … I am nowhere near fluent … hoping that my trip abroad will help with my confidence with the language…” So, it appears that Jane defines competence as being native-like and ‘fluent,’ and she believes that she will develop skills while she is in a source country of the languaculture being learned during Semester Two. First, though, she must do a practicum teaching Spanish to elementary school children during Semester One.
Jane’s Initial Reports about Students’ Functioning in Spanish

Before the start of practicum in Semester One, Jane’s intention to bring strong convictions to life for students in the classroom is pronounced in response to a peer’s wondering. Jane insists, “we can use the language to teach content …” In other words, she intends to use Spanish in order to teach it. Her consideration of speaking Spanish soon becomes more specific to students’ functioning in addition to her own functioning. Answering an instructor’s e-query directed at the entire cohort with regard to defining a good teacher and bad teacher based upon events occurring in their classes, Jane replies, “we can’t have the kids not speak the target language in the classroom because they don’t want to.” Furthermore, in response to a peer’s Wondering just before she begins holding classes for elementary students, Jane affirms, “I 100% believe that culture needs to be linked to the language because it promotes awareness of the world outside of our own.” That is to say, she plans to treat Spanish as a languaculture rather than portraying it as just a different vocabulary and system of grammar.

After that, on another blog response, Jane addresses considerations a teacher should make while functioning among students in the languaculture being learned; she says, “Do the kids understand? It’s all about being able to know and read your students.” Subsequent online assignments prompt Jane to discuss paralinguistic strategies and other signals that teachers use to facilitate functioning in the classroom for development of skills; she emphasizes procedures, and relationships among students and between student and teacher. She mentions, “teachers who have diverted bad student behavior with non-verbal cues … something as simple as a look,” and “calling on the person next to the misbehaving student, or using that student in an example to bring them back into the lesson (Curtain, pg. 211) [sic].” She speaks of such teacher behavior in terms of needing “to be honed and tweaked along the way,” and says that it is not “something that can be fully developed out of a textbook without real hands-on experience.” So, Jane already has some insight into intercultural communicative competence with regard to the nature of teaching and using body language and other cues to keep students engaged during activities related to the languaculture being learned (Agar, 1994).
Jane’s Development of Functioning in Spanish

Jane uses online collaborative-reflective dialogue based upon video footage of her teaching to strive toward growth in skills that is exemplified by her own functioning in Spanish with students, and students’ functioning in Spanish as well. Jane’s developmental movement, documented digitally, can be appraised for examples that will be applied to the aforementioned chart of intercultural communicative competence (Table 3-6), that was introduced in Chapter Three, to elucidate expansion of her capabilities. To see progress in communicative capacity, Jane’s comments are categorized according to what she says and does in her online text and video, and at the end of this chapter, the categories addressed are colored yellow on the chart of intercultural communicative competence (See Table 4-2, shown first in black and white as Table 3-6, adapted from Byram (1997)). Growth is shown by the number of colored areas in the charts by the end of Jane’s two years of teacher preparation. Improvement is confirmed by instructors’ online comments on reflections posted by Jane and her peers.

Applying Insight under Real-time Constraints

Nearly all of Jane’s focus with respect to functioning in Spanish pertains to increasing the amount of Spanish that is spoken in class and abroad. Despite her intentions, she realizes while watching video recordings of her teaching that she does not function in Spanish often enough (Krumm, 1973), sometimes fails to maintain appropriate student participation in Spanish (Horn & Little, 2010), and must remain vigilant about her level of formality with others in Spanish (Byram, 1997). These are points broached by an instructor on blog to Jane and her peers after they have taught their first lessons during practicum. Jane’s development in this area is documented by her online collaborative reflection with peers and instructors to find, describe, and / or annotate occasions in which she could have used Spanish; by blog resolutions to try to increase the amount of Spanish she uses; and by labeling frames in which she is shown utilizing extralinguistic and other strategies to help her use Spanish to interact with students, peers, and native speakers.
**Using Venue-Appropriate Genre**

On her first individual reflection, following her fourth lesson in Semester One, Jane laments,

I use ‘guys.’ I tried to break the habit with the Pre-K kids last field experience, but it's clear that I haven't. I used it at least three times in my lesson alone on Wednesday and I hate that. There are other words that I can use, ‘clase,’ ‘amigos,’ etc and I just need to really focus and get more comfortable with using those descriptors. (Jane, October 16, 2009: first individual reflection)

She chronicles the episodes three times within a single minute of a lesson shown on video caption in Image 4-1, below.

Image 4-1. Jane’s gain of insight as to venue-appropriate genre.

Jane builds upon articulating the desire to change her habit of addressing students with the word “guys;” which is inappropriate, by reiterating on this same entry,

I want to try to … use more language … I think it ties to my expectation of the kids, which definitely affects our interactions. I think I need to give the kids more credit in their ability to understand and also give myself more credit and believe that I can give the visual/gestures to accompany the language without using the L1. Instead of binding the L2 to the L1, I need to bind the L2 to the object/ideas. I tried to do this when reading the “Pez Arco Iris,” but I still used the L1 more than I needed to. (Jane, October 16, 2009: first individual reflection continued)
Here, Jane’s attitude seems to be shifting in that she is suspending disbelief of students as ‘other’ (Byram, 1997; Yam, 1986), as it becomes obvious to her that they comprehend more Spanish than what she had thought they would. She also seems to be more direct (Dewey, 1916), confident about her own capacity to make sure that students understand when she is functioning in Spanish. Jane’s heightened awareness of students’ abilities and increasing confidence in her own capacity to function effectively with them in Spanish may prompt her to take a risk (Clifford, 1991), or deviate from the script (Savignon, 1991), to negotiate for meaning with her students instead of simply repeating memorized pedagogical patterns that she learned by observing practices of her past teachers during her earlier years of language learning (Lortie, 1975). Jane’s adjustment of attitude is potentially transformational because it liberates her to respond uniquely in the learning environment as she employs venue-appropriate genre. Again, Jane’s “directness,” or “rising to the needs of the situation” with “faith in the possibilities of the situation,” is the definition of confidence (Dewey, 1916, p. 205), which is an essential element in the “method of knowing.” Jane’s instructor responds to her posted work by confirming that it properly addressed the question about “improvement,” the content of it included “insight,” and that Jane had already begun “changes.”

**Interpreting Dysfunction**

In the same Semester One lesson that is shown in the section above, though, students’ engagement with Spanish begins to falter. They are not participating appropriately in the designated learning activity. Jane reflects, “… by about halfway through, the kids seemed bored.” She captures the moment(s) on a video clip showing one student looking away and another with his head down while they are supposed to be responding physically and vocally to a story she is reading. Jane annotates the caption: “I’m losing the kids and I didn’t do anything to change it even though I noticed,” and annotates a similar message in another frame within about a minute during the same lesson. See Image 4-2, below.
In her written summary uploaded to blog along with the video, Jane confesses that during the lesson she was concerned about “looking dumb or sounding silly” and had attempted a feat that proved too difficult. She explains, “The book was in Spanish, but I was reading it … upside-down … in English while substituting the Spanish words. It was a lot for me to process and it definitely affected the delivery in a negative way.” Thus, it seems that Jane was lacking confidence and was being overwhelmed (Dewey, 1916; Wolfe, 1970). She continues, “I wasn’t as familiar with the story as I should have been … I wasn’t ready …” Once again, though, Jane ultimately re-visions functioning more competently; she resolves, “I will absolutely try this method again and the next time I will be more prepared and less worried.” Whether or not she accomplishes that mission remains to be seen; but if Jane indeed implements the general strategic teacher knowledge (Shulman, 1986) that she has gained, her functioning should be more automatic and therefore fluent (Segalowitz & Gatbonton, 1995). In other words, she will have more competence in applying gained insight in real-time for more effective communication (Byram, 1997) and better teaching.

**Formality**

During Semester One, in addition to being proactive in relating to students by using venue-appropriate genre, and being reactive by interpreting dysfunction (students’ lack of
appropriate participation in lessons), Jane, along with her colleagues, addresses prior knowledge about the level of formality a teaching context requires. Her group is asked online by an instructor about their interaction with one another in front of students during one of the first few lessons of practicum; specifically, the issue was how their informal mocking of themselves, a song, and each other while team teaching may affect students. Jane responds,

I think that this, particularly during the Baby Shark song, was a clear demonstration of how our closeness outside of the classroom did not work in our favor … joking manner made the transition seem not important and something that the kids didn’t really need to do … we learned from this and will remember to maintain that boundary in the classroom. (Jane, October 16, 2009: first individual reflection continued further)

Weeks later, annotated video clips illustrate Jane and her peers’ continuing commitment to improve in this area. See Image 4-3, below.

Image 4-3. Jane’s gain of awareness regarding collegial formality while teaching.

Although Jane and her peers concede in their reflection that their verbal exchange during team teaching could have been done at another time, they say, “We were talking about time and when to end the lesson. It was done in the target language and if the kids were listening, they were hearing more Spanish.” The informality of Jane and her peers, their interaction in front of students that was neither directed toward these learners nor contributing to their immediate learning goals, was a habit that Jane and her team are noticing more now. Jane begins to realize that an implicit reference to a shared meaning of that behavior could lead to a potential
communication breakdown (Byram, 1997). That is to say, students could interpret it to mean that the learning activity of the moment is unimportant and therefore become dysfunctional by disengaging themselves from that activity and ceasing to learn the intended lesson. Jane’s breaking of the habit of behaving informally with peers in front of students, on the other hand, could indicate increased competence on her part to maintain students’ appropriate engagement and participation; in this way, their learning may be supported better. In other collaborative reflective online interaction, Jane also addresses additional ways of expanding her capacity to maintain students’ engagement with Spanish, as shown in the following examples.

Using Non-Verbal Communication to Facilitate Students’ Functioning in Spanish

Visuals

As Jane has indicated in an earlier quote, she tries to increase her use of visuals to help students understand while she is functioning in Spanish while teaching. After her instructor’s blogged suggestion that more images could have been used during the first week of practicum in Semester One, Jane demonstrates how she employs three dimensional representation of animals to show to students as they hear the vocabulary in Spanish (see Image 4-4, below). Jane’s curricular decision-making to incorporate visuals is now more consistent with the recommendation of Dewey (1897) to support students’ learning.

Image 4-4. Jane’s use of non-verbal visual stimuli (fish) in teaching.
Jane’s creation and use of these visuals, as an additional prompt for students to demonstrate their comprehension by making animal sounds and motions commensurate with the story, are significant in their being an example of not just Jane’s increased use of non-verbal cues but also of her offering to students the opportunity to add non-verbal communicative strategies to their own repertoire. Thus, her own ability to function in Spanish may be augmented, and that of the students may be expanding as well as these learners see that to manifest a physical representation of the item about which they wish to communicate may propel interaction and that using body language may do so as well. What follows is greater detail in Jane’s using body language to facilitate functioning in Spanish.

**Body Language**

In Jane and her group’s final video from Semester One, Jane can be seen using body language to manage dysfunction during a lesson during the segment that she and her team labeled ‘Week 2’. She addresses a student, who is distracting a classmate from the lesson rather than paying attention Jane’s teaching partner’s instruction. First, Jane puts her finger to her own lips in a gesture suggesting that the errant student to be quiet. Then Jane puts her hand to her own ear to signal for that student to listen, and she shows the student where to look by pointing toward the person who is teaching. The three motions are carried out within a single second. Jane’s teaching partner calls on the misbehaving student when the distracting behavior resumes again within thirty seconds. Upon observing that the student is unable to answer the Spanish word for the animal being discussed, Jane discretely changes her own physical position to sit in between the student in question and the classmate who was being distracted. See Images 4-5 through 4-5d, below.
Image 4-5. Jane’s body language toward appropriate student participation: finger to lips for quiet.

Image 4-5b. Jane’s progression from previous image with non-verbal cues: hand to ear for listen.
Image 4-5c. Jane’s progress in using non-verbal cues to encourage student’s appropriate participation in Spanish, from previous image - using body language by pointing to where the student should look.

Image 4-5d. Jane’s progress in encouraging student’s appropriate participation in Spanish, from previous image - using body language – physical proximity intervention, sitting beside student to assure student’s attentiveness after student’s disengagement was apparent and other interventions failed to help.
In the final frame above (Image 4-5d, above), it is evident that the errant student is now looking at the person who is teaching and can focus on Spanish since Jane implemented non-verbal interventions through her body language. This opens the opportunity for the student to participate appropriately.

There is still not much actual communication in Spanish to be observed on the part of students in Semester One, though, according to an instructor’s e-query. So, Jane and her peers try something that they had not yet done and it appears to work well. According to Jane and her peers, in response to teachers’ acting completely befuddled when students use English, there is an increase in students’ speaking Spanish:

When students answer a question or say a vocabulary in English, we act confused like we can’t understand what they are saying because they are speaking in English and not the target language. This surprised the students at first but it actually worked! The students found this fun and ended up saying the word in the target language. If the student who said the English in the first place really did not know the corresponding target language word, other students would be excited to help out. Unfortunately, we have not been consisted in how often we use this method, but when we do use it, it does wonders [sic]. (Jane’s third group reflection: November 5, 2009)

Again, this third group reflection of Jane and her team-teaching peers shows that over time and through collaborative reflective online interaction with instructors, there is an augmented repertoire of non-verbal strategies that they use to facilitate functioning in Spanish.

**Tangible Object**

Later during Semester One, in response to more supervisor-initiated digital inquiries about students’ verbal participation or lack thereof, Jane and her peers explain that they “… give the opportunity for everyone to answer individually using ‘Super Oso.’” (See Image 4-6, below). They explain, “You have the power to talk when you are holding the stuffed bear …” Jane and her peers promise to “try to use more encouragement for the more timid students,” noting that the physical presence of Super Oso makes clear the expectation for participation. This is significant because considering expectations of others is an indicator of intercultural communicative competence according to Byram (1997).
Image 4-6. Jane’s tangible object indicator (‘Super Oso’) for proper turn taking expectation.

Confirming the augmentation of competence as manifested in the ability of Jane and her peers to support students’ participating appropriately and functioning in Spanish, an instructor posts a blog comment in reply. The instructor notes that Jane and her peers are specific and realistic about adaptations that they plan to make for improving instruction. She adds that such changes should transfer from the current classroom and students to affect future students’ experiences as well. However, while there has been evidence of progress in Jane’s communicative competence while teaching in Spanish during Semester One, there are still some concerns about students’ being able to understand and respond by participating appropriately so that they can learn more. Jane and her team teaching peers outline further re-envisionments as indicated in the following paragraphs.

**Modeling**

A supervisor, who had observed a lesson and interpreted a possible lack of understanding on students’ part, sends to Jane a digital inquiry about the situation. In reply, Jane and her group approach reconstruction (Bain et al., 1999) to support students’ comprehension and appropriate participation by planning on “… explaining the activity in several different ways.” Jane and her peers say, “we could change our style to suit the needs of the various learners … prevent misunderstanding … providing … concrete examples … a ‘practice round’ with only the
teachers.” The revision, having teachers model a practice round for a game, is indeed carried out the next week, as Jane and her peers annotate in the video clip (Image 4-7) below.

Image 4-7. Jane implements gained knowledge of using modeling to avoid misunderstanding and dysfunction – teachers show students how to play the game.

To summarize, over time and through collaborative reflective online interaction with instructors, Jane seems to have extended her repertoire of communicative strategies that serve to facilitate functioning in Spanish with and for students. Jane develops her non-verbal communicative strategies to include visuals, body language, tangible items, and modeling. She may have used some of these strategies in the past, but she has persisted, learning and implementing new strategies as well. Jane works on developing her verbal communication strategies in Spanish, too, and the effect this has upon students is apparent in the following descriptions.
Using Verbal Communication to Facilitate Students’ Functioning in Spanish

Commands

Late in Semester One, when a certain student persistently utters answers without having been called upon, Jane can be heard (but is not visible) on video telling her to “levanta la mano, por favor” (please raise your hand) twice within a ten-second interval. Then, the student raises her hand to ask a question about the activity, and Jane’s teaching partner calls on her. Soon, though, the student ignores instructions again; this time she is to close her eyes like classmates are doing as part of a game. Again, Jane can be heard addressing the student by name and saying, “Cierren los ojos, escuchen” (close your eyes, listen). Jane’s teaching partner attempts to physically cover the student’s eyes but does not succeed, so Jane says the student’s name again and adds, “siéntate por favor … because you didn’t follow instructions” (sit down please …). Now, the student has been physically separated from classmates who were allowed to move on to the next activity. Finally, the student is shown raising her hand a few times and Jane calls on her. The student answers correctly and Jane repeats the student’s response “Tigre” plus praises “muy bien” (Tiger, very good). See Images 4-8 through 4-8d, below.
Image 4-8. Jane’s reflection on Spanish commands toward students’ appropriate participation.

Image 4-8b. Progression from previous image about students’ appropriate participation – Jane’s peer tries to cover student’s eyes to prevent student from further dysfunction, which is breaking rules of the game by peeking.
Image 4-8c. Jane’s functioning in Spanish to encourage student’s appropriate participation in Spanish, continued from images above. After student’s persistent failure to follow instructions, Jane temporarily separates her from peers by telling her in Spanish to sit down.

Image 4-8d. Jane’s functioning in Spanish to encourage student’s functioning in Spanish, concluded successfully. After student resumes following instructions, Jane calls on her to say an answer in Spanish, and praises her in Spanish.
Since Jane has diplomatically intervened on behalf of others in the group by using venue-appropriate genre with a student who is sometimes overly-assertive here, she has demonstrated having augmented competence by extending her skills of interaction in areas of negotiation and navigation (Byram, 1997). Jane continues working on verbal strategies in the area of questioning.

Questions

When an instructor sends Jane a digital inquiry further encouraging her to bring quieter children into academic conversation, Jane seems to think only of the default strategy of putting students on the spot, so to speak – in other words calling on them regardless of their apparent readiness to answer. Jane sends back the message “I hate questioning students one on one … time at the beginning or at the end could be focused on the more quiet children in a one-on-one setting …” But later, in response to more of a supervisor’s digitally-communicated questions about students’ functioning in Spanish, Jane and her peers answer, “there are definitely times when the kids could use it [Spanish] and don't. They seem to opt for their L1 because it is much more comfortable, but are willing to change when a teacher asks for the L2.” Jane and her peers seem to extend their view of calling on students to include a different type of questioning; they explain that they re-envision using “questions with multiple answers so that all of the kids can take turns answering.” They vow, “Next week, we plan to … 1. Encourage all students to activity participate. 2. Encourage the students to use the target language when they first respond …[sic].” Jane’s augmentation of techniques in this communicative area is significant in that questioning is one of the skills that Byram (1997) considers as a point in evaluating one’s competence.

Development of Awareness, Noticing Other Ways to Facilitate Students’ Functioning in Spanish

Aside from questioning, Jane works on other ways of encouraging quieter students’ participation even more through her second individual reflection of Semester One, pursuant to an instructor’s digitally-posed query about keeping track of participation for each student. Jane acknowledges, “There are some shy students in our classroom and that was made very clear by the tangible numbers [sic].” This amplified manner of noticing, in attending to students’ verbal participation in speaking Spanish by physically marking down a point for each time every student
makes a Spanish utterance, appears to prompt Jane to say that she supports “split[ting] the kids into smaller groups …” This strategy can be used as an alternative to simply calling on reticent students, a technique that Jane had expressed the desire to avoid. Jane seems to be successful with this, as continues,

I figured, knowing that we have some shy kids in the class, that it would be better to practice the game individually on the desks first before getting up two-by-two … went over well … Two students did not want to play [against one another] and so they continued to play the [independent] version in order to practice the vocab. Some of the other shy students not only came out of their shell, but also won rounds of the game. I think it was a great confidence boost for all … I was able to see where the kids stood with the vocab while playing the game. (Jane, October 28, 2009: second individual reflection).

In this way, Jane is able to assess students while working around their being more inhibited than some of their classmates. Jane then affirms, “My lesson showed me that it really helps the kids to review, play an individual activity, and then play a game together … In the future, I will definitely try to incorporate this type of step-by-step lesson.” When asked by an instructor online about how Jane’s lessons addressed students’ performance with regard to language, or how she could be sure this had been successful, Jane responded by posting a video clip annotating that her peers were modeling for students and helping Jane to confirm students’ answers. (See Image 4-9, below – clip in which Jane is not visible but is enlisting colleagues in modeling and assessing).

Image 4-9: Jane’s evidence of implementing gained skills in noticing.
On Jane’s corresponding post, she says,

I could check how long it took to recall the word and also, if they recalled the correct word or not. Two words that we had trouble with were ‘cebra’ and ‘jirafa,’ so by playing the game, I was able to call those words more frequently.

(Jane, October 28, 2009: second individual reflection continued)

Jane makes it clear that watching video recorded episodes of her teaching, annotating clips of the videos, collaborating with peers, and blogging back to answer her instructors’ questions helps her to make and implement decisions that could contribute to maximization of opportunities for students to function in Spanish. An instructor certifies this on a blog comment by emphasizing the improvement Jane has made since the earliest evaluation of this first semester. The instructor specifies that Jane’s reflection details objectives that were accomplished due to improved assessment “on the go” and adapting instruction immediately. This is to say that among accomplishing other and aforementioned instructional advances, Jane has progressed beyond the point of simply overlooking students who are unassertive. She also avoids repeating patterns she observed from her teachers in the past (Lortie, 1975) by finding alternatives to just calling on students in front of all of their classmates when they may not be comfortable participating. Having learned how to notice which students are reticent, Jane has augmented her bank of strategies for facilitating the quieter students’ functioning in Spanish by varying group size and allowing students to choose among various academic activities. Once she has each student engaged and participating appropriately, there are opportunities for Jane to evaluate students’ learning of Spanish. Now, Jane has demonstrated employment of ways to assess students’ knowledge that had not been used in her previous lessons according to evidence in the form of her online video and blog posts. Jane’s subsequent online reflective interaction continues to offer her unique opportunities to learn to develop competence for communication in Spanish teaching.

Development of Jane’s Knowledge of Spanish and Use of Spanish while Teaching

Consistent with her Semester One statements about her low confidence and lack of speaking and listening abilities, on Jane’s first Semester Two blog, she indicates that her communicative competence in Spanish is not as advanced as she would like for it to be. She mentions her “not so excellent Spanish …” and an encounter with a taxi driver who is “a little
hard to understand because the accent in Spain is not like anything I had ever heard in me classes [sic]”. Moreover, Jane is “still struggling with the conjugations …” for the ‘informal plural you’ or ‘vosotros’ subject pronoun, “which most Spanish teachers think isn’t that important …” This ‘level 3’ reflection (Bain et al., 1999) indicates Jane’s noticing the intercultural difference (Byram, 1997) regarding use of “vosotros” and connecting it with her experience of the pedagogical problem of teachers failing to attend to it appropriately. In other words, immediately upon arriving to study abroad in Spain, Jane observes that her communication with a Spanish person is difficult. Jane’s problems, with interpreting and expressing verb endings that are consistent with a specific subject pronoun that is commonly used in Spain, stem from her past teachers’ choice to exclude verb conjugations that are consistent with the informal plural ‘you’ or “vosotros,” which is used only in certain Spanish-speaking communities and in particular contexts. Failure to use ‘vosotros’ when it is appropriate could result in an awkward social situation, and Jane strives to approach the issue proactively by persisting in trying to learn to use it.

This ‘vosotros’ point emerges in an online exchange that Jane has with Natalie during Semester Two when the cohort members are abroad. During a blogged conversation that endures between Jane and most of her peers throughout the semester, Natalie describes her perspective of the necessity to interact for learning purposes with members of the languaculture being learned by telling of new Spanish friends she has made. Natalie says, “I meet with them once or twice a week … we only speak Spanish … we talk on the Internet … I am using the language in ‘real’ conversation which is not always done in a classroom environment!” Jane then asks her, “… knowing how extremely different classroom Spanish and ‘real’ Spanish are, do you think it will have an effect in your classroom?” To this, Natalie responds, “… my language experiences here will effect my future classroom. I definitely want to teach the vosotros form. In all of my language classrooms, this form has always been omitted … want to have my students engage in more real conversation.” Here, Natalie and Jane agree that students should have opportunity to learn conjugations for all subject pronouns in Spanish because otherwise communication with certain members of the languaculture being learned could break down. This means that Jane and Natalie are breaking away from a pedagogical habit they have observed from their teachers in the past (Lortie, 1975), namely the custom of neglecting to teach the grammatical mechanics and cultural significance regarding the ‘vosotros’ subject and verb forms to students. Jane and Natalie are re-socializing themselves (Byram, 1997), or approaching ‘alternation’ (Berger & Luckmann, 1966) for professional transformation.
Jane also takes in what Kayleigh blogs about some differences between the Spanish used in Argentina and that in Spain itself, and it leads to her further exploration of the ‘informal you’ problem. Kayleigh says, “Cuando hablamos sobre el idioma ‘español’ acá, no decimos ‘español’... Es castellano.” (When we talk about Spanish language here, we do not say ‘Spanish’ ... it’s Castellano). Jane acknowledges this by commenting on it and by adding to the issue of location-based intercultural differences in vocabulary as she prides herself on conquering the ‘vosotros’ issue that she had mentioned in her very first entry regarding the informal plural ‘you’. In her acknowledgement, Jane tells Kayleigh,

El uso de acá es diferente para mí. Al mismo tiempo uso el tiempo verbal de ‘Vosotros’ ahora. Olvidé que antes he usado Uds. No lo usa nunca aquí.” (Jane, comment to Kayleigh during study abroad: May 17, 2010, 9:21am)

(The use of acá is different for me. At the same time I use the verb tense of ‘Vosotros’ now. I forgot that before I have used ‘Uds. [formal plural ‘you’]’ They do not ever use it here”).

Kayleigh then explains that the singular ‘you’ in Argentina is similar to the plural informal form to which Jane refers; thus the ‘vosotros’ form is useful to know:

Lo que dijiste sobre vosotros … No usan acá para nada. Pero si usan el forma ‘vos’ … significa ‘tú’ y es muy informal … Puedo enseñarte si querés (ooo un ejemplo). Te echo de menos gorda! No eres gorda, es lunfardo nuevo mío. Disfrútelo =). (Kayleigh, response to Jane’s comment: May 17, 2010, 10:30am)

(What you said about vosotros … They do not use it here at all. But they do use the form ‘vos’ … it means ‘you’ and it is very informal … I can teach you if you want [she addresses Jane by using the form they are discussing] (ooo an example). I miss you fatty! You’re not fat, it is my new slang word. Enjoy it 😊).

Kayleigh not only introduces new slang to Jane but also demonstrates for Jane that knowing ‘vosotros’ forms may help a person function while in Argentina although the Argentinian informal singular you is slightly different from the Spanish informal plural you. That is to say, Kayleigh shows to Jane that the verb conjugation for the subject ‘vos,’ Argentina’s informal singular you, is similar to the conjugation of ‘vosotros’ (querés versus queréis). Much of what Jane has learned during collaborative reflective online dialogue during Semesters One through Three appear in Jane’s lessons during Semesters Three and Four.
Final Evaluation of Jane’s Functioning in Spanish

Although no examples were found of Jane teaching the Argentinian ‘vos’ for informal singular you after her study abroad, there were many examples of her keeping her promise to teach students the informal plural you, ‘vosotros’ that was used regularly in Spain and that was related to the informal singular ‘you’ form of “vos” that is used in Argentina. The first example of Jane’s teaching about ‘vosotros’ appears during Semester Three when, in a reflection assignment requiring her to record and transcribe classroom discourse, she quotes a student’s verbal answer: “Vosotros sois and um ellos [mispronounced] son.” Associated with the commensurate lesson is a four-page review document that Jane created for students, on which she lists ‘vosotros’ four times explicitly to prompt students to write the appropriate verb form and she requires those forms on four additional problems. Many more instances of Jane’s using ‘vosotros’ with students were apparent during Semester Four. During that time, fourteen of the documented activities, one quiz, and two tests created by Jane for use in class prompted students to either read, write, listen, and / or speak ‘vosotros’ forms sometimes over a dozen times per lesson.

Jane’s constant inclusion of ‘vosotros’ in lessons illustrates her acting upon increased awareness of the importance of using it. She found out through authentic experience why and how it is essential for communication in Spanish, and she followed through on her decision to teach differently compared to her own former teachers (Lortie, 1975). By incorporating the ‘vosotros’ pronoun and its verb forms in lessons for her students during Semester Four, Jane implemented the re-envisioning that she had done in the collaborative reflective online dialogue with Natalie during Semester Two while Jane and Natalie were abroad. Thus, Jane has reached the highest level of reflection on the scale of Bain et al. (1999) by this reconstructing of instruction. Given that ‘vosotros’ and its verb forms were incorporated so much in her lessons, it is reasonable to argue that this change is transformational, and it is likely that Jane will sustain the transformation.
Jane's Final Self-Evaluation for Use of Spanish While Teaching after Two-Year Methods Block

By writing narratives and attaching them with her annotations on clips of computer-generated video recordings of her lessons at the end of Semester Four, Jane reflects upon her progress in speaking Spanish while teaching. She calculates that she spoke in Spanish sixty-eight per cent of the time during one lesson and forty per cent during another, both of which are better than the twenty per cent that was estimated earlier in the semester. Jane says that the amount of Spanish she uses while teaching still is not enough; she proclaims, “that a near-immersion classroom is the optimum goal.” Consistent with her technology facilitated self development techniques from Semester One, Jane pinpoints moments at the end of Semester Four in which she succeeded or failed to support speaking Spanish during lessons through her use of verbal and non-verbal communication, and she re-envisioned what could be done differently in the future for improved pedagogical performance.

Verbal Communication

Upon “watching the videos many times” with regard to her Semester Four lessons, Jane sees progress in her use of Spanish while teaching. She comes to “realize that places where I added L2 without even thinking about it.” Jane recounts, “I used phrases that the students were familiar with while giving certain directions … students were at the Science station. Instead of saying, ‘We will be working in groups of 2,’ I told them, ‘Vamos a trabajar en grupos de dos.’” Here, Jane has reached the point of automaticity by using Spanish during instruction “without even thinking about it [sic],” whereas in the past she would have normally used English in such situations. She also mentions a strategy almost identical to that which required her increased formality in Semester One, using “a Spanish song … ‘Cuenta’ (their number song)” to indicate when students should transition from one activity to the next. Jane rationalizes, “it reinforced numbers, which was the whole point of the lesson.”

In her final lesson plans and reflections during Semester Four, Jane also repeatedly comments upon her use of questions for the purpose of helping students to function in Spanish. Following through on the intentions that she logged during Semester One, she uses questions to ascertain students’ comprehension, to prompt, and to scaffold students’ communication in
Spanish. Her development of communicative competence for Spanish pedagogy is reaching the stage of evolution at which she is more confident of her ability to use Spanish in ways that facilitate students’ comprehension and learning, and she is becoming more confident in students’ ability to understand and participate appropriately.

**Non-Verbal Communication**

To further encourage all students’ appropriate participation in lessons, Jane still uses a tangible object to encourage all students’ appropriate participation in lessons; when a student is given the ball (rather than the ‘Super Oso,’ which was more appropriate for younger students of Semester One), that student should speak. Yet another non-verbal strategy Jane utilizes is collecting and recasting images via computer to facilitate her students’ learning and functioning in Spanish. Sometimes she uses captions on these visuals in an attempt to help students build their vocabulary, and other times she uses the visuals as models of projects the students must complete or prompts to help students understand the plot of a story.

Having listed her successes, Jane notices on the other hand that there were several times in which she used English while teaching whereas she could have and should have used body language to support functioning Spanish. By watching the lessons she conducted and recorded on video, she has opened more opportunity to further extend her use of Spanish in class by having gained this new awareness and having formulated a vision of how to change. This could be transformational if she follows through on it during her teaching career. Jane says,

> Another things that I noticed … the L2 could have been used during the overt instruction part in the beginning when I was describing the learning centers to an extent. In particular, with the rotation--that could have easily been demonstrated with movement while I spoke in Spanish [sic]. (Jane, Classroom Discourse Paper: November 19, 2010)

Additionally, as she did in Semester One, Jane has witnessed the power of her body language in the area of reducing dysfunction (lack of appropriate student participation during lessons) during Semester Four. She reports that according to her supervisor’s evaluation,

> I was able to use verbal cues much less … cut down the number of times I addressed “Clase” by a remarkable amount. In the first observation I said ‘Clase’ between 20-30 times, but in this class I only said it six times. Five with wait time and one without. It blew my mind … (Jane, lesson reflection: October 28, 2010)
Jane concludes, “I will be more aware of my own movement and my non-verbal vs. verbal cues in the classroom.” Using venue-appropriate genre, she demonstrated awareness of the effects of her behavior (Byram, 1997) by breaking the habit of using the English word ‘guys,’ which had been a concern of hers during Semester One; Jane re-socialized herself by instead addressing the students in Spanish with the word “clase.” Though her use of the Spanish ‘clase’ may be considered progress over her prior utilization of the English “guys,” Jane’s communicative competence during Semester Four has advanced yet another step in that she avoids both phrases in favor of being more proactive and employing non-verbal strategies to facilitate functioning in Spanish.

**Jane’s Final Evaluation of Students’ Use of Spanish**

At the end of Semester Four, by actually “counting utterances,” Jane estimates her students’ Spanish use for the first lesson at thirty-seven percent (37%) and the second at six percent (6%), and she concludes, “I felt that the amount of L2 was low.” She annotates a video frame for illustration of students’ using English instead of Spanish (See Image 4-10, below). Jane adds,

I am hoping that starting the year off fresh will allow me to set a high standard of language use, as well as set procedures in the target language. Things like going to the bathroom, getting a drink, and going to a locker can be done in Spanish (Jane, Video Analysis: April 22, 2011).

Image 4-10. Jane’s video frame annotation of students’ use of Spanish and English.
It is clear that Jane has utilized the laptop with video capability not just in post-testing herself with regard to her own functioning in Spanish for the classroom but she has also looked at students’ use of Spanish. By examining this data, Jane sees areas in which she can further promote students’ development in using Spanish to communicate. Moreover, she uses the computer to create visuals such as graphs (see Figure 4-1, below) that presumably help raise her awareness about use of Spanish during class time. In this way, Jane learns to develop competence with respect to functioning in Spanish for the purpose of teaching it.

Teacher and Student L1 & L2 Usage based on Utterances (Video 1)

![Figure 4-1. Jane’s graph depicting final analysis of her own and students’ use of Spanish.](figure)

Jane concludes that she will “better my own language ability … I plan on studying up on the language over the summer and working hard to find ways to continue to improve …” It is possible that she has the Internet in mind as well when she says, “I have friends in Spain who I haven’t talked to in a while, so I am hoping to get back in contact with them …” This plan, on Jane’s part, serves to illustrate that she has learned to develop competence. Her use of technology shows that the computer with Internet capability allows her to develop competence in ways that she may not be able to if that technology were unavailable to her.

**Summary**

This chapter narrates, in Jane’s own words, how she developed intercultural communicative competence in using Spanish for teaching and learning. It also illustrates technology’s role in facilitating collaborative-reflective online interaction that propelled this development. Evidence in the form of annotated video and digitally-logged conversation on the
Internet suggest that through such interactivity, Jane improved in the following ways while using technology to develop a collaborative-reflective teaching practice:

- Capacity for reflection was expanded to the point of transformation
- Ability to apply insight under real-time constraints was improved, especially with respect to the following:
  - employing venue-appropriate genre
  - interpreting dysfunction
  - attending to formality
  - using non-verbal cues such as visuals, body-language, tangible objects, and modeling
- Uttering verbal cues such as commands and certain types of questions
- Implementing other strategies such as grouping of students and particular ways of assessing
- Incorporating knowledge of languaculture into lessons for students
- Increasing the amount of Spanish used by not just the teacher but also the students
- Planning further competence-building personal experiences outside of the program

Jane’s progress in constructively blending with the cultures of the students and the school - all while functioning through use of the languaculture being learned, contribute toward her expanding synthecultural competence. Colored areas on Table 4-2, below, show where Jane’s improvements fall within areas of Intercultural Communicative Competence as described by Byram (1997).
Table 4-2. Jane’s development in using Spanish while teaching plotted on chart of intercultural communicative competence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curiosity, openness</strong></td>
<td>suspends disbelief about other and belief of own culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest</strong></td>
<td>Tries to engage with others equally and personally, not to profit, aggrandize, mainstream, or glorify the exotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Willingness</strong></td>
<td>Questions mores and assumptions inherent in customs of the ‘other’s’ environment, compares and contrasts with one’s own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Readiness</strong></td>
<td>Copes with states of adaptation (enthused, withdrawn) and experiences of being foreign (acceptance, rejection) while residing in ‘other’s’ environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adapts; engages with rites and conventions of verbal and non-verbal communication; attends to expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Of social groups, products, practices, processes of interaction in own and other culture</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relations</strong></td>
<td>Significant current and past political and economic figures and events between cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact</strong></td>
<td>How to access ‘others,’ their environment, institutions of mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misunderstanding</strong></td>
<td>Alternative interpretations of concepts, rituals; effects of behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memory</strong></td>
<td>Portrayal of events and identity of culture through socialization, how perceived by ‘others’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space</strong></td>
<td>Borders, regions, dialects, identities, landmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socialization</strong></td>
<td>National education system, religion, rites marking life cycle stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distinctions</strong></td>
<td>Clothing, food, language, and / or tradition differences between groups delineated by class, ethnicity, creed, gender, profession, age, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutions</strong></td>
<td>Public / Private health, recreation, financial, media, education organizations affecting daily life within and between countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction</strong></td>
<td>Formality; taboos, norms of public / private meetings, use of transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpreting and Relating</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentary Skills</strong></td>
<td>Locate ethnocentrism, explain origins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dysfunction</strong></td>
<td>Explain breakdown in terms of errors re: nuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediation</strong></td>
<td>Identify common ground, facilitate resolving conflict</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discovery and Interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notice</strong></td>
<td>Indicate implicit reference to shared meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question</strong></td>
<td>Elicit allusions from informant, establish hierarchical links and cause / effect, test generalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Navigate</strong></td>
<td>Use venue-appropriate genre, avoid offending, utilize resources to find out more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiate</strong></td>
<td>Intervene to mutual satisfaction of people involved; diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintain</strong></td>
<td>Continue acquaintance over time and distance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critically evaluate with explicit criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ideologically analyze items, occurrences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anticipate areas of potential conflict</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate toward accepting difference where incompatibilities exist</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5

Development of Competence in Use of Digital Applications for Learning and Teaching Spanish

Growth means change and change involves risk, stepping from the known to the unknown. –George Shinn, quoted by Jane on a reading work packet that she prepared for students for lesson of March 21, 2011

Overview

This chapter is dedicated to narrating Jane’s baseline for, and progress in, the competence of utilizing computers with Internet and video annotation capability for developing as a world language education undergraduate who is learning and teaching Spanish. Again, the data used in describing this development comes from surveys, focus groups, collaborative-reflective online dialogue, lesson plans, and other electronically submitted assignments from the start of Semester One through the end of Semester Four. Whereas Chapter Four showed Jane’s use of digital tools to engage in online collaborative-reflective dialogue with either or both peers and instructors to facilitate her own and her students’ functioning in Spanish more often during class time, Chapter Five displays examples of development in her use of the devices to help herself learn more Spanish language and culture, to create a bridge between Hispanic life outside of school and Spanish-related activity in class during which students in turn may extend their Spanish-related competences, and to help her students expand their technology-related skills for the purpose of learning more.

Diagnostic of Jane’s Attitude, Knowledge, and Skills Related to Use of Digital Applications for Learning and Teaching Spanish

Generally, in Semester One, Jane seems cautiously optimistic about using computers for teaching and learning language. It is apparent that technology is already on Jane’s mind, as she
mentions it early in the semester as a response to an instructor’s autobiography-related question that does not directly address digital tools. The question asks for a description of ‘good’ teaching versus the opposite. Jane’s reply included, “… if the kids don’t learn well from powerpoint lectures than try something new [sic].” Additionally, on the initial survey toward the end of the practicum phase during Semester One of the Methods block, Jane states, “I think it’s great to be able to use the technology in the classroom with the students, but also in reflections of myself” to describe how computers and video may contribute to her development as a language teacher. Therefore, Jane’s baseline for utilizing the aforementioned tools in education begins with employing them to some degree for her students’ development not just for her own self-development.

When asked on the Semester One survey (see Appendix F) about using video recordings of her teaching in order to self-evaluate, Jane remarks, “I think it’s a great way to learn and grow as a teacher.” There is one issue that Jane reports as having a negative effect on her perception of self-development with respect to world language instruction via notebook computers and video. She complains on the survey that she was required to learn and use different programs although they both “do the same thing.” Here, Jane’s attitude toward use of the tools for self-evaluation seems to be somewhat lacking in curiosity with regard to familiarizing herself with more technological applications that function similarly to one another and utilizing them. If Jane’s attitude remains the same, her ability to utilize technology may be limited in contexts where the application that she prefers is unavailable for whatever reason.

Jane’s knowledge for using technology is substantial. On the Semester One survey, she checks all activities listed (research, note taking, paper writing, social networking, instant messaging, professional networking, collaborating, and self-reviewing) to indicate that she is either using them currently or has used them in the past on computer. Considering the seven applications listed on the survey, Jane reports knowing how to use iPhoto and iTunes, both of which she engages for social endeavors, iMovie for coursework, and iCal for both social endeavors and coursework, but not iChat, iDVD, or iWeb. She rates herself as not familiar with iCal, iChat, iDVD, or iWeb, familiar with iMovie and iPhoto, and very familiar with iTunes before the Methods block. She claims that she was self-taught on iCal, iMovie, and iTunes applications but learned iMovie in a workshop, iDVD from peers in the College of Education, and iChat from both peers and friends. Aside from stating that she can ask others about these tools, Jane reports being aware that she could search online for information about how to work the applications. Her answers on the survey are comparable to those of her peers.
For the Semester One practicum itself, Jane seems comparatively skilled in using video annotation, as she is the only person in her four-member teaching team who annotates each required video properly; almost all videos submitted by other members of her team are either without captions or with just one caption for the entire clip rather than different annotations for successive frames. Early videos from Jane’s team are of poor quality in that they are too dark and off-center to clearly depict action, but action in their final video is visible and there are not only annotations done properly but also special effects. See Images 5-1 through 5-1d, below.

Image 5-1: First video is too dark. Image 5-1b: Subsequent video is off center.

Images 5-1c and d. Later videos are improved and include special effects for transitions.

Again, Jane appears to be informed with respect to technology, but Semester One data provides little diagnostic evidence of her employing it to help students learn Spanish. The
following section is a review of the diagnostic evidence, and the rest of this chapter discusses Jane’s development pertaining to use of digital applications for learning and teaching.

Jane’s Initial Use of Digital Applications for Helping Students with Learning Spanish

Jane’s attitude and knowledge, regarding the use of the aforementioned tools to help students learn Spanish, is apparent early in Semester One. In reaction to an instructor’s general question directed at the entire cohort about an article related to the value of technology in education, Jane characterizes the computer as provider of:

opportunities in the classroom that aren’t always readily available [otherwise] … a novelty or it can be a curse … a great asset as long as it doesn’t interfere with student-centered learning … useful because it allows teachers to continue their education, but can also allow students to learn to use technology … a subject in itself …” (Jane, third blog response of Semester One: October 7, 2009; my emphasis).

She mentions students’ seeing and hearing authentic cultural activities, creating ways to share their knowledge through menus, brochures, travel videos, comparing and contrasting their cultures with those of others, sharing with family and friends through blog or PowerPoint that could “easily be transferred to the home setting.” She says, “with programs such as Skype, classrooms around the world can communicate through video … kids can use technology to relay that information to each other. It can be great as long as that actual personal speech doesn’t die off.” Jane seems well aware of technology and potential in its utilization for language teaching and learning; however, she expresses that there may be some challenges involved with that.

Jane’s impression of her skill in implementing her knowledge of digital tools for helping students to learn Spanish is indicated on a particular response from the aforementioned survey. Specifically, cohort members were asked to self-assess on a scale from zero to six (0-6, zero being the least able) as to their ability to support student learning in general as well as while using technology. For this, Jane rates herself as a four (4, ‘able’) in general and four (4, ‘able’) with technology.

Despite rating herself on the high end of the spectrum in reference to supporting student learning while using technology, Jane’s use of technology for teaching Spanish to students is obvious only once during the Semester One practicum. She creates a PowerPoint about which students are to respond to her in order to demonstrate vocabulary knowledge during a lesson.
Jane’s plan is to “read the powerpoint while using gestures … kids will close their eyes and raise their hand for whichever of the two answers they choose.” Hence, planned communication is teacher-student in visual and aural form, and student-teacher through physical response. The reason for students closing their eyes during the exercise is not made obvious in Jane’s prose. The PowerPoint was not submitted digitally within the lesson plan, and no reflective comments could be found as to its value or outcome.

To continue, there are few digital artifacts in Jane’s work submissions from Semester One. A Bingo sheet that she submitted and discussed at length was made on the computer. Additionally, Jane not only mentioned in her Critical Review of Instructional Materials the fact that she made a purchase online but also linked the website within her submitted document.

There are two additional times in which a group reflection video shows Jane teaching with peers while a computer is in use for the lesson; however the primary researcher is unable to cross-reference with certainty these instances of technology use because computers are not listed in materials of lesson plans that were collected, nor are they referenced in accompanying narrations. Therefore, the benefit of using the computers as the video shows them being used in Semester One cannot be determined for sure. Apart from that, Jane’s group created a blog for parents to access and her peer added entries to it as the semester progressed. It introduced each of the members of her teaching team with a picture and biographical paragraphs, and listed vocabulary and activities pertinent to the group’s lessons. It is not clear whether parents indeed accessed the site, as there are no comments posted.

So, once again, Jane apparently has a sophisticated view of what to do with technology, how, and why, for the purposes of teaching and learning Spanish. At first, though, there is not much evidence of Jane implementing her technology-related attitudes, knowledge, skills, and awarenesses to help herself teach and learn Spanish or to help her students learn Spanish. This changes drastically in the following semesters.
Development of Jane’s Competence in Use of Digital Applications for Learning and Teaching Spanish

Attitude

Jane’s computer-mediated communication patterns for collaborative reflection online in Semester Two, during which she and her cohort study abroad, are consistent with her patterns of the previous semester. She fulfills her academic blogging obligations with regularity. She is not in the half of her peer group who, of their own accord, attach links to photos on their greeting blog upon arriving in their host countries; however, her participation volume, frequency, and rhythm is comparable to her peers’.

By the middle of Semester Two, Jane evidently reads her peers’ blog for pleasure rather than doing so only to meet requirements. For example, she says, “Hey Kira! I was just reading your blog only to realize that I had to react to it. Lucky me! I did the work without realizing it =)” on one occasion, and on another to Kendra, “it’s 2:45am here and I am not actually the one to comment on your blog this week, but I was reading it anyway and I had always wondered about Duquesne and why it looked NOTHING like how it sounded.” Jane’s peers also interact online more often than their instructor requires them to do. To illustrate, Kendra admits to Jane, “I’m not the one to comment on your blog for this week, but I was laughing about your title … Then I read it, and I just want to weigh in;” and Lourdes tells Jane, “I am also not supposed to comment on yours either … It made me so happy to read both of your comments about learning German! Do it!” What is more, Jane continues to blog to peers who are still abroad even subsequent to the semester’s official end.

Jane’s attitude seems to become progressively more open, interested, ready, and willing to engage with technology for teaching and learning Spanish compared to what it was in Semester One. At first, she had described her opinion of technology as being ‘great’ for self-analysis and either a ‘novelty’ or ‘curse’ that could ‘interfere’ with learning and potentially eliminate ‘personal speech’ when used with students. On the other hand, at the end of Semester Two, Jane’s final study abroad blog entry reads “The use of technology was key.” Moreover, at the beginning of Semester Three Jane blogs, “technology can really be an asset to providing meaningful experiences.” The first comment is apparently unprompted altogether, and the second seems to be related to an earlier post in which Lourdes mentions her desire to use “technology” to promote interpersonal communication once she has her “own classroom.” Toward the end of the
practicum phase during Semester Four of the Methods block, Jane answers the same survey question that she did in Semester One to describe how computers and video may contribute to her development as a language teacher by saying, “I love watching myself and analyzing. It has been only beneficial to me.” She no longer seems to mind having been required to learn a number of applications that function similarly and serve a similar purpose.

Knowledge

*Jane’s Use of Computer and Internet to Learn More Spanish Language and Culture*

Vocabulary

Jane’s first overt mention of using computers to help herself or others with language culture appears on her blog from abroad during the third week of Semester Two, when she chooses to discuss the topic of food. Here, she describes an interaction with her host mother during which Jane uses the computer with Internet access as an intervention to improve mutual understanding. This example converts easily to Byram’s (2000) template of documenting one’s feeling (F), knowledge (K), and action (Act) in the attempt to become more communicatively competent interculturally.

F: La cosa que no me gustó fue un bocadillo con berenjena fria y algo como "cream cheese" en pan blanco.
K: “berenjena…” No sabía la palabra en Ingles.
A: Después de ella intentar describirme la planta por un rato, abandonó la causa y puso la palabra en el Internet. El dialogo que seguía es abajo:
Yo- <<Ah!! Eggplant!>>
ella- <<Egg- plont?>>
Yo- <<Si, eggplant.>>
ella- <<Aaag-plaint.>>
Yo- <<No. Eggplant.>>
ella- <<Egg-plaint.>>
Yo- <<Si.>>
ella- <<Tienes un acento norteamericano.>>
Yo- <<Tú tienes un acento español.>> [sic]

(Jane, third post of study abroad: February 15, 2010)

Jane’s feeling of repulsion regarding cold eggplant led to her realization that she did not know the word for it, and she acted upon that by using the Internet through computer to remedy the
problem and learn the vocabulary that would enable her to effectively communicate.

Carnaval

Also during Semester Two in Spain, Jane exchanges information about ‘Carnaval’ with Kira, who blogs to her from Ecuador. The online collaborative reflective conversation includes the concept of culture shock, which each peer experienced in her own way in relation to ‘Carnaval’ events happening in the cohort members’ respective host countries. Kira and Jane have witnessed people engaging in behavior that is typically considered to be taboo in the United States, and their level of reflection (L of Refl) reaches ‘reasoning,’ (Bain et al., 1999) as they question mores and assumptions inherent in customs of others’ environment and compare it with their own, thus extending their attitude of willingness (Byram, 1997, p. 58). See Table 5-1 below.

Table 5-1. Participants’ extending attitude of willingness regarding cultural taboos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P or R or ACK</th>
<th>L of Refl</th>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Who / Where / When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F Act</td>
<td>I, honestly, don’t even feel comfortable describing what I saw … the first time I have ever experienced culture shock. was annoying when someone would dump ice water down my back or spray me in the face with foam asks, “Is it that it was actually something bad? or is it that the US has ingrained in our minds that it is bad? The little girls ranging from probably age 6-11 were dancing extremely sexually. This week I learned: Some people cannot embrace new cultures and traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kira Quito, Ecuador February 17, 2010: 9:56pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>F Act</td>
<td>it is super interesting to see how everyone's Carnaval is different. It was neat until I had a culture shock of my own … It blows my mind! (Kids … drinking) (Later, Jane presents to her six grade practicum class a study abroad PowerPoint, which includes a slide with the question about assuming “that something is bad / wrong / weird just because it is different?”) Here everyone dresses up … kids 14, 15, 16, and maybe even younger … standing on the pier along the water just drinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Alicante, Spain February 18, 2010: 8:50am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>F Act</td>
<td>I was kind of bummed when I found out that people don’t get dressed up here…but I can’t even pretend that I didn’t absolutely LOVE … … just going to the beach and hanging out with some Samba dancing boys… (I posted a video on facebook…check it out!) … Go read my other blog … more details. everyone was drinking. There is no such thing as getting carded here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kira Quito, Ecuador February 18, 2010: 8:08pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is no written indication of whether or not Jane viewed Kira’s “other blog”; nor can it be determined for certain that Jane took any other teaching or learning action as a direct result of the online exchange shown in Table 5-1 above. However, taboos appear to have become a topic that Jane presents to her students during practicum in Semester Four afterward when she asks them during her study abroad PowerPoint presentation, “Is it fair to automatically assume that something is bad / wrong / weird just because it is different?” The commensurate lesson and some of Jane’s other salient lessons will be described later in this chapter, but for now, Jane’s Semester Two activity is continued.

**Learning How to Learn**

After receiving an inquiry from a family member over the phone during Semester Two study abroad, Jane reflects online that at first she thinks her host city is “ugly compared to the other cities …” She claims, “that we have little history here … I wished I had studied elsewhere.” But then, she says her “view is changing,” and,

this got me thinking that since I've been here, I haven't really looked at Alicante in the same way as I had looked at the other cities. In the other cities, I am a tourist, but I live in Alicante. I had never really just wandered around the city for the sake of wandering around and looking at it. So the other day, I decided to do just that...

Here's what I discovered: That although there are ugly parts of the city, there are also beautiful parts... It's a pretty young city. I also realized that I don't really know about the history of Alicante. Sure, I walk past Plaza de Luceros EVERY DAY, but I never stopped to ask anyone what the statue is about. The other day, I visited two churches, town hall, and a few other places.

I am slowly realizing that Alicante has it's own personality and I just need to look for it.

Additionally … I plan on visiting some of the other coastal towns while I am here because, why not?!? I have made wandering around my new pastime...sometimes alone, sometimes with friends who speak Spanish, and hopefully with people who actually live here. Anyway, I think the city has it's positives and negatives, but overall, I am loving it [sic]. (Jane, seventh post of study abroad: March 22, 2010)
Jane has suspended her judgment about Alicante and reflected to the level five point of planning further learning (Bain et al., 1999) about other areas in similar ways. What is more, Jane realizes, “I have been slacking off in being proactive in my learning here in Alicante. I need to take charge b/c when it comes down to it; I am only going to remember the things I apply myself to [sic].” Essentially, Jane seems to be learning how to learn. It appears that Jane is getting more of a sense of what it takes to develop competence, and she is more resolute in her commitment to do it.

Blogging from France, Kendra endorses Jane’s outlook,

I’m glad that you’ve started wandering. Sometimes that's the best part of being in a new place. I did that over spring break in Ireland, and that was incredible; and of course I do it here. That's how I ended up walking through the Tuileries and discovering a neat little bridge across the Seine to the Musee d'Orsay.

Keep having a great time! I can't wait to see you... (Kendra, comment to Jane during study abroad: March 26, 2010)

Jane answers her, “I miss you! I also love that you are a wanderer. I think it’s the best way to learn a city … I am really working on getting to Paris.” Jane adds, “I am sure you are going to have tons of great stories to tell your kids in class! I can’t wait to hear them too!” Here, Jane connects her own learning how to learn with learning how to teach in mentioning that real-world experience should mesh with classroom practice. In fact, she takes a somewhat instructive role in reminding her peer to make such connections for future students (see Table 5-2 below).

Table 5-2. Jane’s collaborative reflective online dialogue demonstrates her learning how to learn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P or R</th>
<th>L of Refl</th>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Who / Where / When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I wished I had studied elsewhere</td>
<td>Jane Alicante, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Act</td>
<td>I have made wandering around my new pastime</td>
<td>March 22, 2010: 3:20pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>In the other cities, I am a tourist, but I live in Alicante. I had never really just wandered around the city for the sake of wandering around … I have been slacking off in being proactive in my learning here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Here's what I discovered: … ugly parts … beautiful parts … realized that I don't really know about the history … realizing that Alicante has it's own personality …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>overall, I am loving it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>I’m glad that you’ve started wandering.</td>
<td>Kendra Paris, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Act</td>
<td>I do it here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>I ended up … discovering a neat little bridge across the Seine (continued…)</td>
<td>March 26,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jane’s differentiation between being a “tourist,” and referring to herself and Kendra as “wanderer[s],” is akin to Byram’s (1997) comparison of “tourist” and “sojourner:

it is the sojourner who produces effects on a society which challenge its unquestioned and unconscious beliefs, behaviours and meanings, and whose own beliefs, behaviours and meanings are in turn challenged and expected to change. The tourist hopes for quite the opposite effect, first that what they have travelled to see will not change, for otherwise the journey would lose its purpose, and second that their own way of living will be enriched but not fundamentally changed by the experience of seeing others. (Byram, 1997, p. 1)

The significance of Jane’s becoming a wanderer is in the possible outcome. Byram (1997) explains,

The experience of the sojourner is potentially more valuable than that of the tourist, both for societies and for individuals … individuals gain an understanding of others and of themselves which makes them more conscious of their humanity and more able to reflect upon and question the social conditions in which they live. Where the tourist remains essentially unchanged, the sojourner has the opportunity to learn and be educated, acquiring the capacity to critique and improve their own and others’ conditions. (p.2)

Opportunity for transformation presents itself when Jane claims that during the rest of Semester Two she is becoming “more of an adventurer and more curious about other cultures …” instead of ‘slacking,’ to which she referred earlier. Thus, she engages with controversial topics of Spanish culture such as bullfighting, which she intends to include in future lessons for students.

Learning How to Teach

Late in Semester Two, Jane goes to the bullfighting arena regardless of the chagrin that her host mother and new Spanish friends express. Her post begins with a reference to a stereotype:
Bullfighting and Spain, Spain and bullfighting…they go together like peanut butter and jelly, right? That’s what I always learned in school when we had our cultural lessons … We went against my madre’s advice because she said it would be gory and gory it was … despite the blood, and the fact that I am not an advocate of killing animals for sport, I am absolutely glad that I went because I learned something: Spain, or at least Alicante, and bull fighting are NOT linked like they had once been.

On the contrary, many people, especially the younger generation, is anti-bull fighting. We went out in a group on the Friday night before the bullfight—half estudiantes españoles and half estudiantes americanos … we understood that in reality the younger generation is more proactive about voicing their anti-bullfighting sentiments.

What we saw was only semi what we expected. The people there seemed to be an older generation … some of the people there were more interested in the picnics that they had brought and conversation than the matadors and the bull. It also seemed that many of the people there were tourists … the arena was filled only about one third to halfway with people … From all the stories I had heard and all of the pictures and videos I had seen, they made it seem that it would be a full house of people cheering and screaming, but that wasn’t the case at all.

As I walked through the library the other day, … I passed a row of anti-bullfighting posters … Some said Cultura, but ‘cul’ was crossed out and in red ‘tor’ was written so that it said ‘tortura.’ … Others were poems written from the bull’s point of view, which sounds kind of silly, but with the personification, were incredible.

… there have been other anti-bullfighting movements through the rest of Spain. For example, there was an article on www.elpais.com* about protests in Madrid. A slew of people, between 2,000 and 3,000 people, marched … Other slogans included "Torero, cabrón, trabaja de peón" o "Esperanza, te gusta la matanza"

It was refreshing to find that things are changing rapidly and that my generation is changing the world all over.


Jane’s instructor praises her for the report and suggests that Jane eventually incorporate the information into a lesson for students. Jane responds,

It would absolutely be interesting to study in the classroom and I think it would be great to get the kids involved … an excellent debate topic in an upper level class, which is where I want to end up (Collegiate preferably). Often times we debate "American" topics, but there are so many things that could be debated in Spanish that are more closely related to the culture. It's a win-win if you ask me. (Jane, comment to instructor of study abroad: May 3, 2010)
Thus, during online conversation with the instructor Jane begins to envision how the topic of bullfighting can be integrated into curriculum for students to discuss alternative interpretations of the ritual. And, the cited web page makes it obvious that she has begun to regularly incorporate technology into her learning while making it accessible to others as well. The bullfighting lesson that Jane eventually creates and implements with her practicum class is described later in this chapter. In Semester Two and more so in subsequent semesters, the knowledge that Jane develops as she engages in this collaborative reflective online dialogue manifests itself in terms of implemented pedagogical skills, which is the next topic of interest in using digital applications for learning and teaching Spanish.

**Skills**

*Students Visit Spain and Contact a Native Speaker via Skype*

Jane’s final Semester Two blog before her departure from study abroad shows that she is putting her knowledge into action. She reports that she connected students in her former teacher’s class with her host mom in Spain, ‘live.’ She explains,

> I spent two full days in Spain sky[p]ing with 6 middle school Spanish classes. I made a powerpoint with pictures and I talked to them about them...Where I was, what I was doing, things I had tried, etc. They asked excellent questions and it was so cool to see their interest [sic]. (Jane, tenth blog post of study abroad: April 11, 2010)

Her subsequent online collaborative reflective dialogue with peers specifies, “They were able to meet my madre and see my bedroom and street via video chat.” Jane continues,

> I can't wait to share these experiences with my classes!

In regards to my classroom, I think that my experiences here in Spain have really given me an insight and experiences to share with my students. Traveling is such a motivation to learn a language and I am hoping that by sharing pictures and my scrapbook (that will one day be finished) will allow the students to see what's through the figurative door of opportunity if they choose to explore that option. (Jane, tenth blog post of study abroad continued: April 11, 2010)

Jane has shown her former teacher’s students a way of accessing ‘others’ in their environment. Next, during practicum in Semesters Three and Four, Jane implements her vision for attempting to affect the attitudes, knowledge, skills, and awareness of her practicum students when she is
teaching Spanish in her new middle school context. After study abroad, Jane’s use of computers during lessons increases significantly compared to Semester One. During Semester Three she utilizes them in four out of eleven lessons; and in Semester Four there are thirty-six confirmed instances out of sixty-five lessons, several of which incorporate students’ creation of digital projects.

_Students Explore Languaculture_

Study Abroad with Vocabulary and Gender Agreement for Adjectives

In Semesters Three and Four, Jane does exactly what she had planned for her practicum students during collaborative reflective online dialogue during Semester Two. For a lesson about study abroad that she implements with her eighth grade class during Semester Three, Jane indeed utilizes a picture featuring graffiti that she had finally uploaded on her Semester Two blog about wandering (See Image 5-2, below). She uses PowerPoint to construct a slideshow that features landmarks and maps of regions with borders to contextualize her travels, lists benefits of study abroad, shows Spanish adjectives consistent in gender and number with their corresponding pictured items, has embedded links to audio-video recordings of cultural events, and employs several special effects that seem compelling (See Figures 5-1 through 5-1c and Images 5-3 through 5-3d, below). Jane says that the students “will also be able to ask the question, ‘Why?’ which is so important when speaking of different cultures.” During the presentation, Jane requires students to complete her accompanying worksheet by answering questions about the value of study abroad and about architecture and various holiday traditions such as certain foods and dances that are all included in the show.
Image 5-2. Jane’s Semester Two blog display of graffiti from abroad with her added caption.

**Wondering:** I wonder why graffiti is such a big thing here—both artistic and in my opinion—fear! I wander around the town and see such pretty graffiti, but it’s almost discredited by the typical crap one would see in cities like Philly and NYC.

Figure 5-1. Jane’s Semester Three PowerPoint display of the graffiti from abroad in a lesson for students.
Figure 5-1b. Jane’s use of PowerPoint technology to contextualize her study abroad experience and help students to recall information.

Figure 5-1c. Jane’s use of technology to contextualize her study abroad experience and help students to recall information (continued).
Image 5-3. Jane’s use of technology in study abroad lesson toward practice with adjective agreement (continued) - food.

Image 5-3b. Jane’s use of technology in study abroad lesson toward reinforcement of adjective agreement (continued) – scenery and socialization.
Image 5-3c. Jane’s use of technology in study abroad lesson toward reinforcement of adjective agreement (continued) – more scenery and socialization.

Image 5-3d. Jane’s visual and textual PowerPoint invitation for continued discussion of study abroad.
As mentioned previously, Jane uses a version of this presentation later for her sixth grade students during Semester Four as well. She rationalizes, “culture and the sharing of stories are extremely important in the language classroom.” To get feedback from the students, Jane requires them to list five things that they learned from the lesson before they are allowed to leave for their next class. Jane appears to be satisfied that this activity helps students to “realize that there isn’t much that can’t be equated to something in the United States … close the gap between foreign as a bad thing and foreign as an interesting and exciting thing.” Unfortunately, though, she does not mention in her reflection any specific data from the students as to their reactions; nor does she include an image of Carnaval in the presentation or anything else on the slide to indicate exactly what issues she broached with students regarding the aforementioned question about whether something culturally different should have a negative connotation.

Hispanic Heritage of the United States, Student to Students Communication

Then, Jane undertakes a new academic venture with technology use to help students learn Spanish adjectives and vocabulary regarding personal interests, plus to raise students’ awareness of their own evolving languaculture with respect to Hispanic Heritage in the United States. She plans for students to report their findings to classmates. Jane explains,

I am so incredibly excited about this lesson … Hispanic Heritage Month is winding down, I thought it was important to have a cultural project day with the students. In order to relate it to them and their world, students will be asked to create a facebook page (on paper) about a famous Hispanic-American person. I think the kids will enjoy this much more than having to write a paper or create a powerpoint slide. Most of them know and use facebook on a frequent basis, so it should be more interesting [sic]. (Jane, lesson plan (rationale): October 14, 2010)

Albeit each student’s final project is to be written on hard copy paper and spoken aloud rather than digitally archived or recorded, Jane’s lesson is thick with use of computers with Internet access for teaching and learning and for student-to-students verbal communication. She prepares to have a Spanish song playing as students enter the room, to show the PowerPoint and question students to assure comprehension throughout her presentation, and to have students pick out of a hat the name of an Hispanic person to research. Jane’s students will “use FactMonster (http://www.factmonster.com/spot/hhmbioaz.html) to read and learn about their person … they will fill out their facebook page … ask questions … clean up and return the laptops …” Jane says, “The assessment will be informal during the presentation. The project will be the formal assessment, of both their Spanish use, and also their comprehension of the person's life and achievements.” The lesson involves concepts that are related to intercultural competence, such as
borders and identities, and it proves to be a great success (see Appendix K for sample Facebook template) both in Jane’s opinion and that of her students. It even attracts the attention of an experienced teacher who works in Jane’s assigned school building. Jane reflects,

This lesson was so refreshing in comparison to the others that I’ve taught. While it was hectic because we used the computers for the first time, it was a great lesson … I decided to use Facebook as a means to research and find out a little bit about famous Hispanic-American people. The students were very engaged in the lesson and I think one of the main reasons was that it related to them. Many of them use or at least know about Facebook and so including their interests into the classroom really helped … for me to see them get excited about something. It made my path in the classroom clear as day to me. I got to see the students excited about something and that, in turn, made me excited about it. (Jane, reflection on lesson plan of October 14, 2010)

Although in her reflection Jane does not give details about any resulting student-to-student dialogue, clearly this goes beyond being a critical event to Jane in that it confirmed her calling as a teacher. And, a couple weeks later, she actually goes back into the lesson posted on TaskStream® and makes this addendum about a different type of crucial outcome.

I just wanted to come back to this lesson really quickly. One of the French teachers came into the office yesterday and asked if I was the one who did the Facebook project with the kids. I guess one of my students is in her area (study hall-type period) and he said it was his favorite thing he's done so far in any language class. It made me feel good to hear from other teachers that students are talking about the class. (Jane, extra reflection on lesson plan of October 14, 2010: November 8, 2010)

Jane’s having taken the risk of trying this activity, and her concern with students’ level of engagement while learning independently and teaching one another, suggests that she is approaching the “adaptation” level of competence for technology (Dwyer et al., 1991). In other words, Jane’s use of technology is becoming “thoroughly integrated” in instruction (p. 47). Referencing Dwyer et al. (1991), Hooper and Rieber (1995) speak of teachers’ integration stage of technology use in terms of “‘break through’ … beginning of a professional ‘metamorphosis,’ but only if they progress even further in their adoption pattern” (p. 157). After this, Jane reverts to utilization of technology to support her lecturing early in Semester Four, about bullfighting, for example; but later, Jane progresses to put computers in the hands of students so that they may choose areas to research and construct artifacts to share with others.
Bullfighting in Spain Compared with Rodeo in the United States

In Semester Four, Jane implements the cultural lesson for eighth grade about bullfighting in Pamplona, Spain, as she planned during Semester Two in collaborative reflective online discussion with an instructor. This lesson includes a PowerPoint presentation about the festival of San Fermín, augmented with a street-level walking tour and birds-eye view of the route in which the running of the bulls occurs, a link to a news article about it, another link that plays the traditional song that is sung before the bulls run, plus two short videos of the bulls goring people as they reach the ring where matadors await (See Appendix L). Jane requires students to complete a worksheet (See Appendix M) that she made to accompany the show, and one of its questions refers to the poster she had blogged about during Semester Two (“Tortura no es cultura”). She rationalizes, “it’s important to talk about these traditions and look at their history and reasoning. With this type of disective thinking, we can open the eyes and minds of our students to the differences around them [sic].” Her plan is for students “to create a Venn Diagram to compare and contrast El Encierro/La Corrida. If they don't want to compare and contrast those with Rodeo and Hunting, they can create a pro/con list and write which side they support and why [sic].”

In her reflection after the lesson about bullfighting, Jane reports, “When we compared it to rodeo, it opened the students’ eyes to the idea of something different isn’t always ‘stupid.’” It is unclear what evidence she used to conclude that her students’ intercultural communicative competence was improved in this way, but certainly she targeted the lesson to expand students’ attitudes of interest in and willingness to explore another culture (Byram, 1997). Jane anticipated that the topic of bullfighting could bring about conflict as she saw that it did in Spain, she identified common ground between bullfighting in Spain and rodeo or hunting in the United States, she had as a goal for students to critically evaluate with regard to the reason and history behind the tradition, and she moderated toward rejection of the notion that different could be equal to stupid while taking care not to glorify bullfighting.

**Students Use Digital Applications, Fulfilling Criteria of Technology-enhanced Education**

Some of Jane’s Semester Four lessons address almost all criteria on the technology-enhanced education analysis tool introduced in Chapter Three (Figure 3-3), with the exception of contacting native speakers. In one of these lessons, Jane plans for the students to read, write,
speak, and listen to one another in Spanish about culturally relevant information regarding what they discovered about places where Spanish is spoken; all the while, they are using technology to facilitate that and build community. Jane had mentioned in her third blog response of Semester One that students could use technology to make brochures, and in Semester Three, she shares ideas about this during a collaborative reflective online dialogue with her peers. She wants her students to complete:

an activity that I never got the chance to do. When I was a senior in high school, I taught as an "intern" in the middle school during the second half of the day. One of the activities that we did with the students was to research a Spanish-speaking city and create a brochure and travel commercial. (Jane, fifth blog of Semester Three: September 26, 2010)

Jane adds, “Not only did the students get to be creative, but they were able to read, write, and speak the language. They worked hand-in-hand with the technology teacher as well--creating a sense of community.” Presumably, students would be able to access more information online faster than what they could do in the library and present it via a format that is different from how they have been asked to do so in the past.

In Semester Four, Jane abbreviates and adjusts the assignment to fit the abilities of a sixth grade class, asking them to create a postcard rather than a brochure. Her objectives include students’ demonstrating “mastery of technology” and of Spanish “colors, numbers, days, and geography;” and students are to also “show cultural understanding.” Her files include a sample that she made for demonstrating the project to students (See Appendix N), a rubric for grading them, plus several examples of her students’ work. She recounts, “I had a handful of students finish, but the majority did not. That was my miscalculation. The biggest problem was students being out for other school-related activities.”

With respect to this postcard project, Jane also notes that she adapts the requirements to accommodate a few special needs students who used Google docs instead of Keynote because “They were more comfortable and more familiar with the program.” She adds, “Honestly, I wish I had had all of the students use google docs. It would have been that many less downloads I would have had to wait for! [sic]” Her description of the outcome is as follows:

The students did an excellent job on the front of their postcards. Most of them also completed the Spanish section perfectly on the back. Others didn’t quite understand what it was saying and that was clear based on the fact that they didn’t change things like their birthday, age, and name from the example. Because the students weren’t given enough time to finish the project, I had to grade it differently. Unfortunately, it wasn’t a great judge of whether the students fully understood the material or not. While I wasn’t able to formally
assess their knowledge, it was clear that the students need more time on expressing their birthdays and their age. Sra. will continue to help them work on this even though my practicum is finished. (Jane, whole class assessment: April 22, 2011)

Now, Jane seems to be approaching an even higher level of mastery with technology use for students’ learning. This level is what Dwyer et al. (1991) refer to as appropriation and what Hooper and Rieber (1995, p. 157) describe as a teacher’s enabling “students to appropriate technology in ways that could not be anticipated.”

In a different assignment asking students to video record themselves pantomiming their understanding of the plot in a story they read, Jane further empowers students by including a guide to using the technology (see Image 5-4, below). Jane reflects that there were a few behavioral problems, but overall the students “did a great job working together, working with technology, and understanding the chapter.” Here, students enjoy the unique opportunity to create non-verbal communication, or gestures that associate meaning with Spanish, and share their work via technology.
| Flip Video Camera |
| Tips & Techniques: |
| • Do not carry laptop with camera connected. |
| • Hold with two hands to shoot video. Helps to steady shot during zoom changes. |
| • Hold camera as steady as possible, lean against a wall or use a table as a prop. |
| • Capture video with your back to light source. |
| • Be as close to subject as possible for best audio quality. |
| • Avoid zoom and pan as much as possible. |
| • Delete video from camera at earliest opportunity. |

| Upload Video |
| • Plug camera into USB port |
| • Open into iPhoto NOT Flip Program |
| • Click on Video and hit “Import Selected” |
| • WHEN IT ASKS YOU TO KEEP OR DELETE PHOTOS, HIT KEEP PHOTOS!!! |
| • Open iMovie and import video from iPhoto |
|   o File > Import > Media > iPhoto > Last Import |
| • Move thumbnails to create new project |
| • Share video as Quicktime |
|   o Leave all settings |
|   o Save as Cap2 and the Last Names of ALL Group Members |
| • Drop movie into my flashdrive |
| • Unmount camera and delete video FROM CAMERA ONLY! |
Awareness

Near the end of Semester Four practicum, on an individual learner report, Jane writes about a specific student’s behavior problem and her use of technology in addressing it. She says that a student, Jon, was “out of line behavior-wise and less than cooperative.” She continues, “I called him aside to let him know that if we didn’t get our behavior in line, I was going to e-mail home. He rolled his eyes, said ‘Whatever,’ and walked away.” The technology tact works to avert more dysfunction when eventually she follows through on the plan to email the parent, and the ensuing collaboration eventually leads to positive outcomes for the student, as exemplified in Jane’s graph of Jon’s increased completion rate for homework and higher grade. (See Figure 5-2, below).

![Figure 5-2](image)

Figure 5-2. Jane’s computer-generated graph to illustrate student progress after e-mails to parent. The computer with Internet gives to Jane and to the parent access to one another so that they can trade ideas in order to support Jon; additionally, the technology gives the parent access to homework information that Jane already posted on her website online. Considering the technology enhanced education analysis tool shown previously in Figure 3-3, this is physical evidence of Jane’s problem solving through technology use for the purpose of supporting teaching and learning. Jane concludes, “Every teacher loves the bright students who really try, but I have to say that my success with Jon meant much more.” The change for Jon is drastic in that his homework completion rate rises from a low of under twenty percent to a sustained one hundred percent, and his grade increases approximately thirty five points.
Dwyer et al. (1991, p. 50) suggest that conditions for change involve “emergent awarenesses about instruction and learning,” including the idea that incorporation of technology in teaching may make instruction more complex rather than simpler when it results in transforming one’s approach to “discover more powerful learning experiences for their students” (p. 52). It is clear that now Jane is beyond using computers and Internet merely for “delivery of content” (Hooper & Rieber, 1995, p. 157), and that is a necessary step for teachers to be able to continue inventing and evolving in support of their students’ learning (Dwyer et al., 1991; Hooper & Rieber, 1995).

**Jane’s Final Self-Evaluation: Using Digital Applications for Teaching and Learning Spanish**

Like the Semester One survey, the Semester Four survey also asked that participants self-assess on a scale from 0-6 (zero to six, zero being the least able) as to their ability to support student learning in general as well as while using technology, and Jane rates herself as a 5 in general and 5 with technology. Each of these is increased one point from the initial survey. She checks all activities listed as those in which she engaged using computers during her past and at present (research, paper writing, social networking, instant messaging, professional networking, collaborating, and self-reviewing), except for note taking; however, her discontinuing of note taking on computer may be due to instructors’ preferences that students put their laptops down during class. Of seven applications listed, Jane reports using iPhoto and iTunes not just for social endeavors now but also for coursework, iMovie for coursework as she did before, and iCal for only coursework now, but still not iChat, iDVD, or iWeb for anything. She rates herself as not familiar with only iWeb, somewhat familiar with iChat and iDVD, considerably familiar with iCal and iMovie, and very familiar with iPhoto and iTunes before the methods block. So, her familiarity increased with 5 out of 6 applications with which she was not already maximally familiar with in Semester One.

Additionally, to answer the question “if you did not have a notebook computer, what would you miss and why?” Jane responds, “I would hate not to be able to incorporate the world into my classroom. How can I ‘take’ the students to Cuba or to Spain without technology? … would be extremely detrimental to my creativity …” In contrast to her slight lack of curiosity in her Semester One attitude toward use of technology for teaching and learning, Jane’s Semester
Four attitude is indeed one of great curiosity; her final survey responses include this comment: “There are so many different resources … and I love discovering them.”

Summary

Jane’s use of technology has evolved during the two-year Methods Block as her attitude, knowledge, skills, and awareness developed. She is now more technologically agile in that her repertoire of digital applications has increased. She uses laptops, the Internet, and video not just to help herself teach Spanish by researching and providing visual aids for students, but also to become a better teacher through self-analysis, analysis of student outcomes, and collaborative reflective online dialogue with instructors and peers; moreover, she allows students to use laptops for their own research and their own collection and use of visuals often in connection with text that they have generated or read in Spanish. Finally, Jane uses the computer and Internet to collaborate with a student’s parent in order to successfully gain cooperation in supporting the student academically when there were problems.

While it seems that Jane, as the teacher, is audience to students’ Spanish output more often than their classmates are, her expansion of professional capacities seems potentially transformational in the sense that she continues to employ pedagogical strategies new to her and learning activities that are new to students, especially with digital tools. With this, though, there is still limited student-student communication in Spanish. Therefore, at this time, it cannot be determined whether Jane will keep on developing in a potentially transformative way or revert to teaching patterns that are typical of her past educational experiences. However, it seems plausible that she will establish an environment that prioritizes functioning in Spanish when she becomes fully in charge of a new group from the start, and that she will use laptops with Internet and annotatable video capability to help. Table 5-3, below, shows with green highlights the areas of intercultural communicative competence addressed by Jane as she develops in use of computers for teaching and learning.
Table 5-3. Areas of intercultural communicative competence addressed by Jane as she develops in use of computers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Attitudes</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity, openness, suspends disbelief about other and belief of own culture</td>
<td>Tries to engage with others equally and personally, not to profit, aggrandize, mainstream, or glorify the exotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Tries to discover perspectives of ‘other’ regarding phenomena from both cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness</td>
<td>Questions mores and assumptions inherent in customs of the ‘other’s’ environment, compares and contrasts with one’s own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness</td>
<td>Copes with states of adaptation (enthused, withdrawn) and experiences of being foreign (acceptance, rejection) while residing in ‘other’s’ environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts; engages with rites and conventions of verbal and non-verbal communication; attends to expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Knowledge</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of social groups, products, practices, processes of interaction in own and other culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>Significant current and past political and economic figures and events between cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>How to access ‘others,’ their environment, institutions of mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misunderstanding</td>
<td>Alternative interpretations of concepts, rituals; effects of behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>Portrayal of events and identity of culture through socialization, how perceived by ‘others’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space</td>
<td>Borders, regions, dialects, identities, landmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization</td>
<td>National education system, religion, rites marking life cycle stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctions</td>
<td>Clothing, food, language, and / or tradition differences between groups delineated by class, ethnicity, creed, gender, profession, age, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>Public / Private health, recreation, financial, media, education organizations affecting daily life within and between countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Formality; taboos, norms of public / private meetings, use of transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Skills</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpreting and Relating</td>
<td>Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locate ethnocentrism, explain origins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain breakdown in terms of errors re: nuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify common ground, facilitate resolving conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery and Interaction</td>
<td>Notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicate implicit reference to shared meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elicit allusions from informant, establish hierarchical links and cause / effect, test generalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Awareness</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critically evaluate with explicit criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideologically analyze items, occurrences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipate areas of potential conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate toward accepting difference where incompatibilities exist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use venue-appropriate genre, avoid offending, utilize resources to find out more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervene to mutual satisfaction of people involved; diplomacy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue acquaintance over time and distance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 6

Development and Transfer of Intercultural Competence while Using Online Interaction toward Problem Solving

It’s always an interesting conversation when you ask someone of a different culture what it is exactly that they think about your culture. The dynamic of the conversation is always odd because we want the truth, but the other person doesn’t want to offend or upset the questioner. The balancing act between the truth and maintaining a positive relationship can always be a tough one. – Jane, interview of a member of the languaculture being learned, April 27, 2010

Overview

This chapter explains how Jane’s collaborative reflective online dialogue facilitates her development of intercultural competence toward her being less overwhelmed as she engages with students as ‘other’ in the classroom while teaching Spanish (Wolfe, 1970), and as she engages with native speakers as ‘other’ while abroad (Byram, 2002). For class, Jane targets two problems that are intertwined for her and are contributing to her being overwhelmed while teaching elementary students during Semester One: using manipulatives and assessing students in action. What aids resolution for Jane’s being overwhelmed by these issues in class is her participation in collaborative reflective online dialogue in reference to video clips of her lessons that she recorded, annotated, and uploaded on computer. That activity helps Jane to figure out what to do differently to better support students’ learning. While abroad, Jane seeks to overcome homesickness by integrating herself more with Spanish people even when she does not feel like doing so, and even when some Spaniards seem resistant to her trying to relate to them. What aids resolution for Jane’s being overwhelmed by homesickness in Spain is collaborative reflective online dialogue in which Jane and her peers encourage one another to take the risk of participating more fully in the languaculture in their host countries. In that conversation, Jane and her peers trade strategies toward assimilating more harmoniously with their surroundings and changing their attitude about homesickness. This results in Jane’s persistence in speaking Spanish as much as she thought possible, becoming more tolerant, and reconceptualizing the idea
of ‘home’ and the nature of ‘culture.’ Finally, Jane transfers some of her newly-gained intercultural competence skills to yet another educational context, the middle school, during practicum in Semesters Three and Four. This leads to her making strides toward teaching differently than the way in which she had been taught when she was a young student of Spanish (Lortie, 1975).

**Becoming Less Overwhelmed**

**Handling Manipulatives Effectively and Assessing Students in Action During Class**

At the beginning of Semester One, Jane describes herself as “more than unprepared” and not “even remotely close to being comfortable with my knowledge and ability” particularly in reference to students with special needs. Later that same semester, she blogs in response to a peer who is concerned about being overwhelmed in the future with respect to high school students as opposed to the younger ones she had taught thus far:

> I am going to be overwhelmed when I walk into that classroom no matter what. The age is completely different, the setting is going to be different, and the number of kids will increase. I've just given up the idea that I will be ready to step into the classroom that first time. I mean, I am sure I'll be ready, but I won't feel ready. I always get those nerves … (Jane, comment on peer’s wondering: October 28, 2009)

In the meantime, Jane uses online collaborative-reflective dialogue based upon video footage of her teaching to strive toward becoming less overwhelmed so that she is more “ready” to interact with students. Jane’s “looking back” illustrates reflection as defined by Dewey (1910), and doing so to meet the challenge of student participation (Horn & Little, 2010) during a game is one of the first self-evaluative post-teaching activities that Jane’s instructor asked her to do after Jane had taught a few times. Jane responds on her first individual reflection in Semester One that careful planning for student use of manipulatives was something she “learned the hard way.” She explains,

> After watching the video and reflecting on the past two weeks, I think there were some things that I did really well and some that I didn't do so well and can improve upon. One main thing that I hadn't thought ahead on was using manipulatives and how to structure the lesson in regards to that. (Jane, first individual reflection: October 16, 2009)
Jane’s aim with the students, according to her lesson plan, is to have them use a puzzle “to play a ‘Where’s Waldo’ type of game” for reviewing animal vocabulary. She noted, “when I used the puzzle, the lesson was not effective because the kids were so busy playing with the pieces.” So, she “switched things up a little” during the next lesson, which also included manipulatives. “There was a clear introduction, a sharing portion, and then I collected the items and moved on with the lesson. It worked much better.”

But the ‘switch up’ still did not yield the quality of experience that Jane was hoping to provide for students. Her published (online) video caption shown below (Image 6-1) highlights an acknowledgement of the instructor’s words, recognition of the problem, success in improving the situation, and intent to alleviate it altogether in the future, all commensurate with Dewey’s (1910) reflective procedure [problem-setting, means/end analysis, and generalisation]. Jane’s accompanying essay reiterates and details revisionary means to accomplish goals:

I improved some when I brought in my Scuba gear the following class, but I still need to improve with that. I will be playing Bingo with the kids on Monday and so I will definitely show what I have learned. Intro--manipulative--collect it--then engage the kids. (Jane, first individual reflection: October 16, 2009)

Image 6-1. Further development of Jane’s intercultural communicative competence when mediating for students via manipulatives as they work between languages, and she works toward fluency in doing so through gaining and applying insight with regard to procedural decision-making and implementation.

Jane brings up the incident yet again in her Semester One critical review of instructional materials:
As for considerations for next time; I think I would … use the scuba gear to review after the book. The kids lost a little focus during the book because they were so excited about the gear. Also, I would have the gear on a table and let the kids come up and look and then sit back down. That was I could avoid passing things around at all [sic]. (Jane, critical review of instructional materials: December, 2009)

Jane is able to enact her re-envisionment of manipulatives when Bingo time arrives. She posts a narration of her evolutionary process:

I used a manipulative … however, I was much more prepared to handle the use of it … When it comes to using the manipulatives, I've definitely learned how to incorporate them in a more effective manner. The first lesson, I used a puzzle and I lost the kids' attention as soon as I brought it out. This time, the kids had cards in front of them, but I had them lie them on the desk and then explicitly said to not touch them until I asked them to. It worked pretty well and when I sensed I was losing their attention, I asked them to look at me saying, "Por favor, I want to see everyone's ojos looking at me." or something like that. It seemed to work well and the kids were able to move around and be brought back to focus. My ability to handle the kids with manipulatives is definitely improving, which I am happy about. (Jane, second individual reflection: October 18, 2009)

Jane adds, “I could tell by the focus of the kids, that they loved it.” Her instructor’s posted validation confirms the outcome with the digital statement that Jane did very well on the reflection; however, a concern is expressed that some students looked at other students’ work when they did not know an answer or were not sure what to do. Jane had been concerned earlier in the semester about what she had referred to as “antics” during her own early language education, saying “We used games … looking back I wonder how meaningful they were.” Now, faced with that issue, she responds by re-envisioning on the digitally-submitted critical review of instructional materials:

because the kids were sitting in a circle, they could see the other boards and so when [k]ids did have trouble, I didn’t always catch it before they looked at someone else’s card. If I were going to do this activity again, I would change the seating arrangements to incorporate a little more privacy so that the [k]ids have to think on their own and also so that I can assess their knowledge. (Jane, critical review of instructional materials continued: December, 2009)

Given instructor feedback as food for thought on her final individual reflection of Semester One, Jane conveys the impression of having more peace of mind; weeks before, she was concerned about being “able to change directions or activities in the classroom on our toes,” as she had phrased it. Now, she blogs back, “I think I’m doing a good job adapting to the younger kids. I’ve changed lesson plans and gotten more crafty … still maintaining the boundary as a teacher and not a friend …” But she portrays it as a formidable challenge. “In theory, I think it is
really important to assess and adapt lessons both as they are in progress, and also after. In practice, I’ve realized that this is much easier said than done … I am starting to get the hang of it.”

Jane then implies that she can keep on meeting that demand:

Anyway, I feel like I am definitely growing a lot as a teacher. There are certain things that I wasn’t able to do in the beginning that I feel like I am getting a hold on now. For example, I am more capable of teaching and assessing at the same time and in turn, adapting and reviewing more when necessary. I’ve learned to create lessons that allow for this easily … I guess I realized that it doesn’t have to be hard. (Jane, second individual reflection continued: October 28, 2009)

She intensifies her account of events a few paragraphs later:

I thought I was able to multi-task until I jumped into the classroom with these kids. I had to teach, assess learning, manage behavior and adapt to all of the changing situations. It was a lot harder than I had thought, but I seem to be catching on piece-by-piece. Things are starting to come together and I am starting to find things that are working and things that aren’t. It's amazing to see what I've learned in just one month. (Jane, second individual reflection continued further: October 28, 2009)

For both curricular and on-the-spot decision-making, Jane has improved in fluency and in automaticity (Segalowitz & Gatbonton, 1995), which should help improve performance by guarding against cognitive overload or becoming overwhelmed (Feldon, 2007). This increase in efficiency can be considered progress in proficiency or competence (Atherton, 2011).

**Dealing with Homesickness by Risk-taking through Deeper Engagement with Native Culture while Abroad**

Upon arriving for study abroad in Spain, in her first Semester Two blog, Jane mentions two coping problems, “major things I didn’t expect,” which she chooses to deal with by delving deeper into the languaculture being learned rather than by being discouraged. One is that she is homesick, and the other is that people speak English to her and around her. Jane reports being taken aback and overwhelmed by the homesickness, and being frustrated trying to avail herself of the opportunity for immersion in Spanish language and culture while abroad when English use persists with peers and sometimes even with Spaniards. On the blog, she posts how she endeavors to solve the problems of homesickness and of English use while abroad.

First, Jane addresses the less-motivated students from other United States’ universities
enrolled in Spanish classes with her in Spain; she refers to them as a “huge group of kids speaking English …” and scorns, “as if we didn’t already stick out enough …” Jane insists, “If study abroad was meant to be easy they would call it vacation. Of course there are times when I want to speak English, but as the old saying goes, ‘When in Rome…”’ Evidently, Jane feels conspicuous being surrounded by peers who are speaking English but sometimes she feels like giving in to the urge to fall back on the familiar and speak English too. However, Jane reaffirms her conscious decision to consistently try full engagement with the languaculture being learned, even if she does not feel like doing so. She pursues this point from the beginning to the end of the semester, starting with her initial observation, “People are very hospitable and generous here if you are making an effort to fit in…,” plus her wondering of “what exactly a native Spanish person thinks when they hear a group of American kids on the bus speaking in English and not even making an effort …,” and ending by her interviewing a new Spanish friend about it. Jane even uses Spanish regularly online for greetings and for emphasizing the content of her English narrative in context. For example, she writes, “getting to know the city … As the saying goes, ‘Estaba más perdida de un pulpo en un garaje [sic]’ (I was more lost than an octopus in a garage).”

To continue, Jane’s coping issue of “homesickness,” to quote both her and Byram (2000), is “overwhelming.” She muses, “It is something that I had never experienced before and I’ve traveled abroad before without my family.” In an attempt to assuage the feeling, she decides to join the rugby team and “made 18 new Spanish friends right off the bat …” She says, “It’s been a rough couple of weeks mentally and emotionally …,” but “Overall, I am happy …” Several cohort members respond to Jane’s statements, and throughout the entire semester on the blog, they revisit the issues of homesickness and striving to use the languaculture being learned to navigate within the host country.

Analysis of the cohort’s blog postings related to homesickness and using the languaculture being learned to navigate within the host country reveals how these peers interact online to foster their own and one another’s development of intercultural communicative competence, especially by prompting one another toward deeper reflection. From the start, Jane’s approach to conquering homesickness catches the attention of her colleague, Jill, who returns an admission regarding her own bout of “wishing I were at home or at school, not on a completely different continent …” Jill wants to know from Jane, “How did you handle it?” and comments, “Next time you feel homesick, let me know …” She also praises Jane’s choice in dealing with homesickness: “it’s awesome that you joined the rugby team. That was so outgoing, and I’m so
impressed by it.”

Likewise, Jill is struck by Jane’s concern about her classmates’ speaking English instead of Spanish. Jill writes:

As for your other frustration, you're really putting things into perspective for me. I agree, we’re here to learn the language and the culture, and I can imagine how frustrating it must be to want to speak Spanish when everyone else is speaking English. I think a lot of people feel that way, but also feel foolish if they are speaking Spanish and then the person they’re speaking to is speaking in English. I always just thought being abroad would automatically just make you fluent (I know, my ignorance is coming out...) But yeah, I'm going to try to start making more of conscious effort to speak less English and more Spanish.

In response to your wondering about what the Spaniards must think when they hear us not even trying to speak Spanish, it made me think of times when I've been in XXU and there would be a few native Asian speakers near me. And I always thought it was weird that they would speak their native language in public, but I was never offended, or it never bothered me. Yet yesterday, in Granada, I was doing something in a big group, and we were being loud, obnoxious, and speaking English. That was when I realized that the people around us were probably annoyed, because I know I would have been.

In all, I really enjoyed your blog, it really got me thinking about a lot of things, and the real reason we're studying here (and not vacationing here). (Jill, response to Jane’s comment of study abroad: February 7, 2010)

Clearly, Jane’s words affect Jill’s attitude with respect to intercultural competence and they are a catalyst for Jill to potentially change her behavior due to her newly developed outlook. As a result of the online dialogue, Jill seems to have developed a new perspective; she knows it is frustrating for some of her peers when she and others continue speaking English, so she resolves to act more conscientiously. In other words, Jill seems more ready to engage deeply with the languaculture being learned in her host country. Now, she no longer appears to “assume that familiar phenomena … are understood in the same way” (Byram, 1997, p. 58) by Spaniards as they are by her.

Jane replies to Jill, “It’s always easier to want to be somewhere comfortable, but what we are doing here is so awesome …” She also tells Jill, “I will definitely be sure to let you know next time I am homesick and you do the same!” She includes the admission, “I try to be more open about my emotions …,” and she answers Jill’s question by saying, “To get over it, I looked through the journal I had decorated with pictures of family and friends.” Jane explains, “rugby is this universal thing. I couldn’t count on both hands the number of times I’ve been stopped by a random person while wearing rugby gear. It’s awesome.” She adds, “the girls were extremely
welcoming …” On that same day, Jane blogs, “This week I have learned that I need to take risks in order to learn, both within my house and outside of it, especially in the realm of language.”

Sherry then posts a response to Jane, saying, “I’ve also learned that I absolutely need to take risks in order to learn … you cannot be afraid to take those risks. If it doesn’t work out as planned, then so be it, but at least you put yourself out there.” Jane acknowledges that she is “proud of us that we are willing to take those risks … They are so crucial in learning!” These two undergraduates’ words indicate that as they experience success in learning, their confidence increases (Dewey, 1916). This appears to further motivate the to take risks, continuing to push their developmental limits.

Thus, each time a peer writes to her about homesickness, Jane’s reflection goes first from a relatively shallow level two response on the scale of Bain et al. (1999), talking about how being homesick feels “overwhelming,” to a higher level three reflective statement about looking at pictures of family and joining rugby; here, she seeks answers and includes data of personal significance. Then, she reaches level four reflection in ‘reasoning’ about rugby being universal, which she seems to credit for a reduction in her sense of isolation with respect to random people stopping her on the street to talk about it. Finally, she reaches level five of reflection (Bain et al., 1999) in saying that risk-taking leads to learning.

In the meantime, Jane has been reading the blog of yet another peer, Natalie, who is in a different city in Spain. Natalie, too, seems to have been a bit homesick and ambivalent about using Spanish to function in her environment. She wonders about the “honeymoon phase” of the experience abroad, about which she was warned by program administrators, who say it is over when the novelty and excitement has worn off. Natalie posts,

At first, I was having an extremely difficult experience … all I wanted to do was return home! I was not giving Salamanca a chance. I believe the reason I was so upset was due to the fact that I missed my friends in the United States, and that I was frustrated with using my second language constantly. However … I have also made some really great friends who live in Salamanca. This is extremely helpful for me, because I am able to learn the language and culture through them. I meet with them once or twice a week, and during that time we only speak Spanish. We also speak Spanish when we talk on the Internet. This is an amazing experience, because I am using the language in ‘real’ conversation which is not always done in a classroom environment! I have used the language so much since I have been here, and I am really excited about this. I believe my language skills have improved so much since I have been here. I can’t wait to see my improvement in May! (Natalie, first blog post of study abroad: February 3, 2010)
Natalie’s reflection here is at a level three, or ‘relating’ quality because she explains why something occurred (Bain et al., 1999). Jane writes back,

I think my honeymoon period was very short-lived. I was so unbelievably homesick about a week and a half ago. I couldn't believe it b/c I never get homesick, and I've been abroad without my family before. I hadn't expected or planned on it and so I think it hit me pretty hard. The good news is, that like you, by getting involved and meeting people, I was able to get past it. (Jane, comment to Natalie in study abroad: February 4, 2010)

Later, Sherry and Kendra also chime in from France to address Jane on the blog. Sherry says, “So, rugby! That’s the perfect way to get involved and rid the feelings of homesickness. And Kendra tells her, “I’m kind of jealous of the fact that you’ve got extracurricular activities where you are.” After that, an instructor blogs to confirm that everyone “took initiative” and did what was necessary to “feel better and encouraged to continue on,” in addressing the issue of each person’s being homesick. Likewise, the instructor also comments upon the issue of engagement with the environment. She posts that reading everyone’s blog content, she is “pleased … how much you value the unique opportunity you have to immerse yourselves in the language and culture around you!” She encourages, “Stay motivated and don’t give in to speaking more English …” Thus, the undergraduates continue expanding their capacities of intercultural communicative competence through collaborative-reflective online dialogue about risk-taking to increase their appropriate participation in the languageculture being learned while abroad, speaking the language of their respective countries and striving to conquer homesickness (Byram, 1997, 2000).

Jane soon reintroduces both topics, avoiding English and conquering homesickness, on the blogs. As for the English issue, she states that she delights in helping to diminish stereotypes in that Spaniards seem astonished to find that people from the United States “speak Spanish … are so accustomed to the idea that we don’t …” She says, “It’s nice to see the surprise on people’s faces when I can more than hold my own in a conversation.” Later on the same day that Jane’s post is made, Kira blogs from Ecuador that she wonders whether “Ecuadorians judge me differently when they see me with my exchange group;” she explains, “when I am alone… they start talking to me in Spanish … but when I’m with my exchange group, they automatically know that I’m not from here.” In her reply to Kira, Jane shares two strategies for avoiding English with both Spaniards and English-speaking peers while abroad:

About the being judged thing … we were in the airport and the guy asked me a question in English b/c, let’s face it, I don’t look like I have Spanish heritage … I automatically answered him in Spanish. With a very surprised tone of voice he
says, “Oh, you speak Spanish?” and we continued the rest of the passport checking in Spanish … I have a small group of friends here that speaks in Spanish for the most part, so we try to break off and do our own thing whenever we can. (Jane, comment to Kira in study abroad: March 13, 2010)

In responding to Jane, Kira acknowledges Jane’s feelings and efforts to persist speaking Spanish with both English speakers and members of the languaculture being learned. She also offers information about her own coping skills:

Jane … As for the group of friends speaking Spanish thing…that’s awesome for you! Basically everyone in my Study Abroad group speaks in English to each other. It's really lame. And it's hard to be the one person who speaks in Spanish, because then everyone looks at you like, "oooooh. Little miss fancy pants over here thinks she's better than us." Luckily, however, the Samba dancing boys I met in Atacames during Carnaval have moved here to Quito. I've gotten into the habit of hanging out with them a good amount, and we talk on the phone and online. They don't know English, so I have no choice but to use Spanish...and I LOVE it. For me, it's hard to speak in Spanish to someone when I know they know English...especially when they know English better than I know Spanish. So, due to that, I'm trying to surround myself with Ecuadorians that don't know English. So far, it's going pretty well. (Kira, response to Jane in study abroad: March 16, 2010)

After that, Jill writes on Jane’s blog as well:

I'm not sure how I feel about the whole thing with natives not expecting us to speak Spanish … when I speak to them, and they answer in English, I know it's not with bad intentions, but it would upset me, and I'd feel like people were giving up on me without giving me a chance. I'm glad that you take it lightly, and actually enjoy being able to show them up. Good for you! … I really did enjoy this blog. These are things that I actually have thought about a bit. (Jill, comment to Jane in study abroad: March 20, 2010)

Again, Jill seems to reconsider her level of engagement after interacting with Jane online. Then Jane seems to come full circle in thinking about these ‘things,’ too, along with several associated issues.

Jane includes the engagement issue and related topics on her final formal assignment on blog from abroad. During her interview with a new Spanish friend from a class at the local university, she found an answer to what Spaniards think of people who study in Spain but persist in speaking English. Jane is told that “it’s loco that the students have a chance to really work their Spanish and actively choose not to.” Moreover, she finds confirmation that it is easy for Spaniards to spot United States’ students because they walk “rápidamente,” stand in a circular formation “with an empty space in between all of them,” and “Siempre hablan inglés y siempre están juntos. Hay un mogollón de gente.” (They always speak English and are always together.
There is a heap of people). The Spaniard tells Jane that the huge groups are intimidating to Spanish students who would like to interact with native English speakers, and closes “by saying that it’s impossible to live somewhere for four months and totally integrate oneself into a new culture, but there will always be people who try harder than others.” Essentially, this is what Jane has been telling Jill, who seems to be more ready to engage deeply with Spaniards now compared to what she was before the online dialogue.

Development of Jane’s intercultural competence is clear as she proclaims on her blog just a few weeks before returning to the United States, “I’ve definitely grown … am even more willing to put myself out there and just start up a conversation with someone I’ve never met before … My Spanish has also definitely improved.” Jane also reintroduces the topic of homesickness once more to share her change in perspective about it. She says,

> As you all know already, I had a really hard time with homesickness … One of the most valuable things that I've learned about myself is that it is not the place where I am that I call ‘home,’ it's the people that form that home. I was in class one day and my professor asked me how I defined my ‘patria’ and it was with that question that I realized that the answer isn't a where, but a who. I'm American, sure, but only because my passport says so. I could easily live in Spain if the people I care about were with me … (Jane, final blog of study abroad: April 11, 2010)

To this, Kendra blogs back from France, “My situation is exactly the same. I’d be fine with staying here if my friends and family were here, but they aren’t …” And Sherry, also blogging from France agrees, “I totally agree about the ‘home’ thing. Where you are doesn't make the home, but the people you're around do.” Though Lourdes adds to the conversation that she is not as homesick as she would have been in Germany now that she terminated her four-year relationship with a boyfriend back in the United States, she laments in a new blog post that she feels as if she knows everyone in her hometown but does not know anyone in her host town. Jane replies, “… when we think about the things we are missing, we miss the things that we are experiencing in our respective countries ... It took me until the end of my experience to realize that, but I wish I had thought about it before …” Lourdes responds that as her experience ends, she will “soak everything in for the last few weeks.” Again, Jane reaches level five in reflection with her personal theory and applying learning (Bain et al., 1999). She formulates a personal theory and “Displays a high level of abstract thinking to generalize and / or apply learning” (Bain et al., 1999); what is more, she encourages peers to progress with respect to languaculture and learning how to learn as well, in a sense planning for others’ future learning. If the peers indeed
engage in that learning, there is potential for it to be transformational for them as it has been for Jane.

**Becoming more Tolerant**

**Discovering the Nature of Culture**

As Semester Two progresses, Jane is also gaining insight as to the nature of culture itself, for the purposes of learning and teaching. Her online collaborative reflective conversation about it comes in response to Lourdes’ blog from Germany that states, “As many of you living in Europe may have found, smiling is frowned upon – literally … I smile, and get a blank face in return.” Lourdes continues, “… it is important to remain yourself, but also blend in with the culture and society you are living in,” and she asks, “Do you think that you were accurately informed or misinformed about certain cultural differences and social norms before arriving in your host country?” Jane answers,

I was cracking up when I read, ‘Smiling is frowned upon.’ ¡Qué lista eres!...aka You're clever! … I knew people here don't smile, but I did it anyway b/c it's habit. However, a few dirty looks and a couple unwanted advances later, I quit that habit cold turkey ;) (Jane, comment to Lourdes in study abroad: April 5, 2010)

After Jane describes her adaptation to Spaniards’ non-verbal convention of communication (Byram, 1997), she also directly addresses Lourdes’ question by saying, “In regards to your wondering, I don't think I was informed, nor was I misinformed. I don't believe you can learn culture from a book.” Lourdes blogs back, “I know what you mean when you say that you can't learn culture from a book. It really is true. There is no way to teach cultural norms, etc. You just have to experience them. Plus, adapting is the fun part.” So, Jane’s outlook on the nature of culture is similar to what she said about teaching (it is not “something that can be fully developed out of a textbook without real hands-on experience” over time. [Jane, Semester One, as quoted in Chapter Four]). Again, Jane is attending to expanding her own and others’ capacity to learn and especially to extend abilities with regard to languaculture.
Accepting Rejection and Awkward Physical Contact

Beyond her suggestion that initiating deep engagement with the environment of the languaculture being learned helps to alleviate overwhelming problems such as homesickness, Jane continues exchanging tips for adapting with peers who have had additional troubles. For example, Natalie blogs that it is a very difficult challenge to not be given “a chance.” She explains, “Walking down the street in groups … people will scream stuff at the Americans … they think we don’t understand … Sometimes we will say things back; however, now we just accept it …” Furthermore, Natalie complains,

I don't like how people will literally ‘ram’ their fingers into your spin[e]. This is the signal that they want you to move. It really hurts. What they do is they take their three fingers (pointer, middle, and ring), form a triangular shape, and just push it as hard as they can into your spin. I mean, it works, because people move after this happens! I just think it is really annoying that they just can't ask! (Natalie, seventh blog of study abroad: March 28, 2010)

Natalie closes with resignation, “Today I learned that it is really important to be easy going.” In reference to Natalie’s “groups,” Jane reminds her to “cho[o]se who your friends are!” And, Jane’s response about physical contact advises being attentive to formal versus informal language; she tells Natalie:

I haven't experienced the spine jabs. People usually just put their hand on your back and push here, which in comparison is much better. I've grown accustomed to using that method, but I also always add ‘Perdona/e’ depending on the person. It's definitely interesting to see the social differences. (Jane, comment to Natalie in study abroad: March 28, 2010)

Natalie retorts that she has “definitely experienced a lot worse … During Semana Santa [Easter] a woman was trying to physically fight me in Starbuck’s!” She expounds, “she wanted to be in front of me in line … screaming ‘OK, AMERICAN!’” Natalie reports that her engagement with other Spaniards became a partial solution in that employees with whom she had become acquainted came to her aid. She recounts that they “… pulled me out of line, asked me what I wanted, and they gave it to me for free … it was so nice … made me feel good.” Here, Natalie’s rapport with some Spaniards has served to protect her when there was a lack of rapport with other Spaniards.

---

3 perdona is informal while perdone is formal.
Relying on Members of the Languaculture for Mediation

Jane says that she, too, has gotten help from a Spaniard and she concludes her own Easter blog entry by saying that members of the languaculture being learned do not mind requests for information: “no les molesta … Muchas veces quieren explicártelo.” (“It doesn’t bother them … Many times they want to explain it to you.”). Like Natalie, Jane soon finds herself in the position of relying on members of the local languaculture as resources when she nearly becomes victim of a robbery. When Kayleigh blogs from Argentina that, “El tema de la seguridad es algo ambiguo … Unas calles son más seguras de otras, pero siempre existe la amenaza de algo peligroso. No me importa esto … es parte de vivir en una ciudad,” Jane replies with her story and a warning to be careful. Having just returned to the United States, Jane reports how a Spanish woman had helped her to thwart a robber just before her flight home:

En cuanto a la seguridad, estaba montando el autobús ayer con Jill al aeropuerto y dos hombres saltaron la línea entre nosotras. Después, una mujer que estaba sentada en el autobús me dijo, “Ese hombre intenta robarte.” Cuando le miré a él, pude ver que mi mochila estaba abierta. Por suerte, fue el bolsillo con mis tampones. Jaja! Sucker! De cualquier manera, tuve mucha suerte ayer y me alegré que la mujer hubiera dicho algo. ¡Ten cuidado! [sic] (Jane, comment to Kayleigh in study abroad: May 17, 2010)

Kayleigh responds that she witnessed a similar situation, cautioning that a robbery can be attempted not only at anytime but also anywhere and that being alert is another necessary deterrent for would-be perpetrators.

Jaja tengo un cuento para vos que es muy similar a tu experiencia en el colectivo. El día de San Patricio, unos amigos y yo fuimos a un bar durante el día para celebrar. Estábamos sentados afuera y mientras que comíamos mi amigo David se sintió algo tocando su pierna. Todos de nosotros doblamos y vimos unas chicas jóvenes intentando robar algo de su mochilla. Afortunadamente el tenía suerte en ese día (por supuesto por San Patricio) y las noticiamos antes de robaron algo. Todo de esto pasó durante el día, en un restaurante bueno, en un

4 The topic of security is somewhat ambiguous … some streets are more safe than others, but there is always the threat of something dangerous. It does not bother me … it is part of living in a city.

5 Regarding security, I was riding the bus yesterday with Jill to the airport and two men jumped in line between us. Afterwards, a woman that was seated in the bus said to me, “That man is trying to rob you.” When I looked at him, I could see that my backpack was open. Luckily, it was the pocket with my tampons. Haha! Sucker! Anyway, I had a lot of luck yesterday and I was happy that the woman had said something. Be careful!
lugar muy MUY seguro. Todavía me sorprende las cosas que hacen personas acá [sic].

(Kayleigh, response to Jane in study abroad, May 17, 2010)

Jane wants to know if Kayleigh’s experiences will be helpful in the future and tells Kayleigh, “Podemos hablar Español en EEUU” (We can speak Spanish in the United States). Kayleigh does not answer on those points, but information in the following section shows that construction of intercultural competence among participants continued online upon their return to the United States and that they applied their gained insight in their new educational context during Semester Three. Some of the intercultural competence that Jane developed carried over in her work with middle school students during Semesters Three and Four as well.

Transferring Intercultural Competence Contextually

Increasing Tolerance

In one of the first online discussions among participants during Semester Three, Jane and a peer implement collaborative reflective postings to help their German-speaking cohort member Lourdes gain insight to the pedagogical idea of developing students’ writing through an activity requiring the creation of a eulogy. When Lourdes’ first reaction is to consider rejecting the notion as “odd,” Jane and Annika reply to her explaining how the activity can be made ‘fun’ by connecting it with traditions such as the Hispanic holiday of “Día de los Muertos.” Lourdes promptly changes her attitude, as evidenced by her online response: “Perhaps I jumped to conclusions too fast and didn't give the eulogy idea a chance. I'm not sure how I could work it into a German lesson, but I guess it holds value.” As a result of other participants’ making her aware that not everybody regards eulogies in the same way, Lourdes now appears to be more tolerant and open to the idea of incorporating them into lessons regardless of whether they are repulsive to her personally. This serves as an example of participants’ applying their gained

6 Haha I have a story for you that is very similar to your experience in the bus. On Saint Patrick’s Day, some friends and I went to a bar during the day to celebrate. We were seated outside and while we ate my friend David felt something touching his foot. All of us turned and saw some young girls trying to rob something from his backpack. Fortunately he had luck on that day (of course because of Saint Patrick) and we noticed them before they robbed something. All of this happened during the day, in a good restaurant, in a very VERY safe place. The things that people do here still surprise me.
insight from previous semesters to their new educational context. Lourdes’ suspension of judgment may result in her showing less revulsion and more tolerance for ideas to which she is unaccustomed, and that gives opportunity for constructive rather than destructive professional relationships and pedagogical interactions with students. Lourdes’ hypothetical support of productive rapport would be a demonstration of syntheccultural competence.

**Intensifying Immersion**

Later in Semester Three, Jane indeed implements activities for “Día de los Muertos,” the topic that she discussed with Lourdes. Jane engages more deeply with language, pedagogy, and technology during practicum. She continues taking risks involved in deeper engagement rather than withdrawing to that which is familiar; in this way, Jane expands upon skills that are related intercultural competence and builds upon the work that she did during previous semesters. Now, for technology, Jane voluntarily completes two online courses of her choice although she knew that she would not get credit for them; one course is about prevention of online violence and the other is about copyright law. For language, Jane blogs, “I would love to speak in Spanish and practice with you anytime you want” to a peer who complained that her mentor did not speak with her in Spanish. And, for pedagogy, Jane’s collaborative reflective online conversation with peers reveals that her “mentor teacher has been really generous with sharing her classes,” so Jane is “teaching 5 days a week.” Jane says that this helps her with “coherence because I can see the longer term goals” and gives her opportunity “to plan my transitions carefully and multi-task frequently.” Jill answers Jane, admitting, “I can honestly say that I haven’t spent much time thinking about transitions … coherently.” Jill herself has “never even taught two days in a row” and is looking forward to a five-day series that her mentor wants her to do. Jane replies to Jill that the intensity of the experience contributes to her proficiency (Roelofs & Sanders, 2007): “Lesson planning is always a challenge for me because I push myself to be more creative. The planning itself takes less and less time each night that I do them.” Thus, Jane’s fluency, her automaticity and proficiency, and competences for pedagogy are progressing (Atherton, 2011; Feldon, 2007; Richards, 2010; Segalowitz & Gatbonton, 1995) as she pushes herself toward further immersion in technology, language, and teaching.
Mediating Dysfunction

Being immersed in pedagogy or “teaching entire lessons from the start” enables Jane and the students “to build a rapport and a trust,” according to more of Jane’s Semester Three written work. Jane blogs that her mentor teacher “said to jump in whenever I felt like it. So, I did.” Jane adds that her mentor teacher “truly put her faith in me … gave me a chance to learn from my mistakes and adapt my lessons accordingly.” From the beginning, Jane wants the students “to understand that I respect them … to guess and take risks in the classroom.” And at the end of Semester Three, she solicits information from these ‘natives’ of her new context (Byram, 1997) by giving them a survey. Jane reports that out of seventy-eight student responses, there was only one negative comment on the surveys.

However, on Jane’s first Semester Four lesson, one her classes behaves in a “horrific” manner. Problems with this class are chronic, unlike in Jane’s other eight classes, as Jane had noted in Semester Three that they “were pushing the boundaries and seeing how far they could go before I’d step in.” For mediation, Jane acts upon a competence development that she worked on during Semester Two study abroad. She uses “a range of questioning techniques to elicit [output] from informants …” (Byram, 1997, p. 62). She relies on native members of the community for help, and surveys the students once again; but this time, it is unknown whether she engaged in collaborative reflective discourse with peers, since the cohort was not required to blog with one another during Semester Four. Jane consults her mentor teacher, the students’ football coach, and the principal, who was a former Spanish teacher.

From the survey, Jane finds out that some students believe the class is too easy and for others it is the opposite; still others are bored or simply trying to be funny. Jane responds to the survey by designing a lesson that is consistent with what the surveyed students said they would like, but that class remains “a mess.” Jane laments, “half [of the students] were off task the majority of the class period … There are times where I feel incompetent,” and comments that their test scores are consistently lower than scores in other classes. Jane thinks about reverting to teaching tactics that are familiar to her; in her reflection, she says, “I don’t want to just give worksheets and drill them, but it’s coming to that.” This unresolved situation appears to threaten the permanence of the pedagogical advances Jane has made up until now that were based upon ideas that she discussed in collaborative reflective online dialogue. Those developments are discussed below.
Overcoming the Apprenticeship of Observation

The Semester Three collaborative reflective online dialogue is permeated by an enduring conversation that shows Jane and her peers articulating a shared problem and searching for resolution. They discuss ways to balance the incongruity between the desire to offer beneficial communicative activities to students and the fact that those students have a limited communicative repertoire with respect to the languaculture they are learning. This requires intercultural competence (Byram, 1997), rapport in communication for teaching (PA Dept. of Ed., 2010; Victoria, 1970; Yam, 1986) while instructing through use of the language being taught (Burke, 2005; Savignon, 1983), and overcoming the apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975). The undergraduates are preparing to attempt to bridge that distance between the ideal and the real, between the theoretical and the practical (Krumm, 1973); they envision themselves avoiding overt instruction through use of visually-representative images and gestures plus verbal modeling and prompting to facilitate students’ engagement in personally-relevant and meaningful dialogue. Jane and her peers are preparing to challenge themselves and their future students to solve this problem, and that places them at the top of the Hokanson and Hooper (2004) taxonomy of instructional design. Jane enjoys some success in this realm, as described below, while resisting to some degree the reliance on familiar but questionable techniques that she had experienced as a student.

Creating Alternatives to Past Patterns of Language Education

Jane’s early Semester Three posts show an attitude of willingness (Byram, 1997) on her part for engaging with students through pedagogical technique that differs from educational patterns typical of her past (Lortie, 1975). Referencing the required reading for her Methods course, she states:

As I read the text … it brought back many memories of my Spanish classes and schooling in general. It is so common to find a very blatant pattern in a foreign language classroom. I can't think of one of mine through high school that wasn't introduction, overt instruction, output practice (there was very little input practice), followed by in-class activities, and a project or test. Clearly, I've been able to learn the language, but after studying Spanish for almost 9 years, I wonder if this is really the best way. (Jane, first blog of Semester Three: August 29, 2010 [my emphasis])
The italicized words exemplify “question[ing] the values and presuppositions in cultural practices and products in one’s own environment” (Byram, 1997, p. 58), her pedagogical past as witnessed by her when she was a younger language student. Then, Jane’s reflective report and response (Bain, et. al., 1999) leads in to her envisioning how to teach differently from how she was taught, to transform the teaching and learning environment. Next, she declares that she is willing to try it:

I am not saying that overt instruction doesn't have a place in my classroom, but I think it should be minimal. I would love to jump right in using gestures, pictures, etc to talk and work with the kids, vocab, and grammar. After an intro I would go through a brief overt instruction (as the kids would have seen the new structure or words in the previous activity), and then finally focus on more input activities. This would absolutely take more time on my part since most, if not all, textbooks are output activity-based, but I am willing if it works. (Jane, first blog of Semester Three continued: August 29, 2010 [my emphasis]).

Here is opportunity for Jane to build upon the strategies, such as using gestures and visuals, which she improved upon during Semester One. She is “interested to get into the classroom and see what works and what doesn't” when it comes to breaking the pedagogical mold that she describes. Her plans to do so include promoting student-to-student communication about topics that are pertinent to their lives, and having students create visuals and initiate physical movement that will help them to remember vocabulary and a cultural story plot. Jane’s plans are consistent with established theoretical notions provided in literature about effective teaching and learning that were explained in Chapter Two (i.e., Burke, 2005; Butts, 1956; Byram, 1997; Canale, 1980; Canale & Swain, 1983; Dewey, 1897, 1916; Newhall, 1952; Savignon, 1972, 1983; and Yam, 1982).

Avoiding Formulaic Overt Instruction

Later in Semester Three, Jane responds to a peer’s statement to her by referencing Natalie, with whom she had “looked at incorporating the overt instruction minimally into our lessons” during a prior semester in a different class. On the blog response, Jane clarifies the connection between her current conversation and her past experience through her reflective relating and reasoning (Bain et al., 1999). She says, “I really feel that this method can be really helpful in getting the kids motivated. I also think that the decrease of overt instruction and the increase of input practice could be very beneficial for students.” She appears to have decided that
for teaching, talking at students is not a good idea; she thinks of other strategies to use instead, and plans to take the trial and error approach (Dewey, 1916) to discover how she should carry out those strategies.

Natalie acknowledges Jane’s post by echoing the reference to the course that Jane mentioned,

Natalie replies,

During my time as a language learner, I have found that overt instruction is used often … I feel that my language learning classrooms have been a very traditional atmosphere. At times, I feel that it is useful, but I also feel that it is the “go to” method where it is just simply easier for the teacher to present the material in that manner. The … class really opened my eyes to different ways of teaching the language that are more hands-on and interactive for students. (Natalie, first blog of Semester Three: August 29, 2010)

She then directs a comment specifically to Jane:

Jane,
I definitely agree with how you feel about the … class … showed us how we can teach the language differently … it is best to teach in such a creative manner. Overall, I believe that when students are enjoying what they are doing, they will be engaged more which will lead to a greater comprehension of the material. The traditional style of teaching permits students to simply sit in the classroom while not being active … One thing I also liked about the … course is that she reminded us to relate the material to the students’ lives. For example, if you were teaching a beginning level Spanish course here at XXU you could relate it to football season, etc. I really liked this idea, because I think it excites the students to see something that they can actually relate to. (Natalie, commen to Jane in Semester Three: August 29, 2010 [my emphasis]).

Participants are now displaying that they have developed enough intercultural competence to clearly envision and enact the type of rapport with students that is described by Burke (2005), the PA Dept. of Ed., (2010), Savignon, (1983), Victoria (1970), and Yam (1982, 1986). And, the next week, Jane chooses to answer Jill on the topic of communication in the classroom, which also includes a football-related example. Jill’s first point touches on critical cultural awareness “of potential conflict” (Byram, 1997, p. 64) and skills of interpreting and relating “explanations of sources of misunderstanding and dysfunction to help interlocutors overcome conflicting perspectives … identify common ground …” (Byram, 1997, p. 61). Jill writes,

Communication of any type, be it student-teacher or student-student, it's important for the students to be producing and listening to the foreign language, and they are not going to get that from worksheets and busy work … the teacher probably knows what answer they are looking to hear from the student. However, I think that there are a lot of student-student interactions where … they are having a conversation as opposed to student A asking student B a question
when student A knows what the appropriate response it … boring, because there is only one answer to each question [sic]. (Jill, second blog of Semester Three: September 7, 2010)

To this, Jane replies, “Hey Jill … the simplicity of the questions and the formulaic responses seem as mundane as just filling the answers in on a worksheet.” Likewise, she acknowledges, “On the other hand, students could be having very meaningful and useful conversations.” She qualifies her statement with, “Of course, it would be hard to throw a first year student into that, but allowing them to take that chance isn't always a bad thing, especially if we model and use prompting questions.” This last bit is directed specifically at Jill’s final sentences in which Jill had outlined her perception of “scaffolding”:

I think it's important to ask a straight-forward question, but also use that as a prompt. One example:
Teacher- Did you go to the football game on Saturday?
Student- Yes.
Teacher- Tell me about it.
Where the first question is a yes or no, it works as a prompt and then the student actually has to think and use their vocabulary and whatnot in order to produce their own response. (Jill, second blog of Semester Three continued: September 7, 2010)

Jane concurs, “I totally agree when you say … scaffolding,” then expounds by posting an entry saying, “Repetition and formulaic answers aren't as helpful or meaningful as real conversations about things that are relevant. Not only that, but culture can be infused so that much more easily if there is a real conversation [sic].” Here, Jane appears to be building upon her previous collaborative reflective online dialogue with Natalie, who mentioned “real conversation” in two discussions with Jane while abroad in Semester Two that were reported earlier in this chapter and in Chapter Four of this document.

Continuing the above conversation with Jill about communication in the classroom now, Jane also discusses “grammar rules disguised as conversation” versus “exchanges [of] information that is relevant and pertinent.” Jane concludes, “when we go for easy, we can sometimes lose focus on communication … Even if the students are using the present tense for everything, scaffolding can be used, and negotiation for meaning can be used to work with the students.” This statement is important with respect to potential transformation in that Jane has become consistent in her will to resist regressing to that which is ‘easy.’ At the beginning of Semester One, as reported in Chapter Four, Jane said that teachers use textbooks because it is easy and that teachers teach in the manner through which they were taught. An additional quote from Jane in Semester One is, “Although it would be easy to teach one way, using the same
games and activities every year, it just doesn’t make sense.” Likewise, as stated previously in this chapter, Jane told Jill that during study abroad it is easy to gravitate toward comfort when interaction should happen instead and that study abroad is not meant to be easy like a vacation.

By Jane’s second and third lessons in Semester Three, she implements ideas from collaborative reflective online discourse in order to avoid formulaic instruction or that which is easy. She plans to “test their [students’] competence level … to produce the words” by having them describe one another aloud. They also play “Adjective Tic-Tac-Toe, with an emphasis on agreement,” from a template that she created on computer, and they watch a short film on digital video disc (DVD). Jane says that this “brings in writing, multimedia listening, and speaking, in order to practice these difficult grammar points.” She explains, “Students really tend to struggle with subject/verb and adjective/noun agreements … particularly with the latter, because we don't see adjective/noun agreement in the English language.” Jane says that students were “engaged and learning,” with the exception of some students in her typically troublesome class. Soon afterward, she asks students to write, and read aloud, original acrostic poems comprised of their names and adjectives that relate to their personalities. This seems to be creative rather than formulaic, but sustaining that change appears to be difficult for Jane because some students fail to participate appropriately and there are some low test scores.

Quizzes are not included in many of Jane’s files, which was later confirmed to mean that she used her mentor’s quizzes for the most part rather than making her own. Jane’s writes that she wonders if some students’ quiz scores are low as a result of her choosing to have them practice orally while their subsequent test in writing. However, she reports that her mentor pointed out that at least one of the classes is doing especially well.

By Semester Four, Jane still strives for meaningful student-to-student communication, but she finds it difficult without instruction that is indeed overt and formulaic. She says, “I want to give them a more meaningful task to complete … to interview their partner and vice versa.” Her rationale is “While games are fun, many times they are more drill-like, than real-world oriented.” She adds, “They will be held responsible for the information during the following class period when they present the information.” Jane attaches to her lesson a rubric for assessment. By reflection time, though, Jane sees a problem, “I realized that once the students were tested on the information that it goes right out of their heads.” She explains, “They’ve forgotten simple questions that they should absolutely know.” Thus, she plans “to go over, explicitly, how to answer the questions.” After all, she “would rather give them more overt instruction and less help on the next presentation (Their hero).” Jane adds, “It blows my mind
that as soon as the teacher circulates somewhere else, the students switch to English.”

Continuing to hold on to her immersion ideal in Semester Four, Jane plans “to come up with a way to monitor and hold the students accountable for that in the future.” She rationalizes “It’s only hurting them because they won’t know how to say it,” and muses, “I want them to do well and succeed, but I can’t sit with every group. There is only one of me.” Jane seems to be overwhelmed again, and then she chooses to use technology to help reduce the impact of at least one of the grammar issues. What Jane does with technology is to design a PowerPoint to review aloud with the students some explicit guidance about the interview during next class period. She requires her pupils to “identify correct grammatical structures during the powerpoint while being prompted by the teacher,” and “implement the grammar rules and apply them to their own presentations.” She explains, “The powerpoint will show how to transform the questions (second person), to the answers (first person), to the final stage of presentation (third person).” Additionally, Jane relates this to the rubric, “During the powerpoint, they should be taking notes on important things because their paragraphs will be graded based on grammatical correctness.” She adds, “They also clearly needed a refresher on ALL of the basics and a more explicit look at the verb conjugations.” Jane’s “powerpoint is on the website so that they can review it.” It contains a GarageBand file of a sample interview. She rationalizes, “Because we are spending so much explicit time on this, I will not be providing as much outside help (ie. checking over them at home).” She predicts, “Granted, there will still be mistakes, but that’s the point,” and says, “I want them to see the mistakes so that they learn from them.” Moreover, she is “really excited … to see their progression on the next project that we do with this information …” However, she is somewhat upset after the lesson. “It’s so frustrating when I sit there and tell them something and five seconds later they ask me the question that I had just answered.” Jane concludes, “the lowest grade was a 75%, but all grades benefitted from the project.”

Jane’s Semester Four thoughts apparently continue to vacillate between activities that are meaningless versus those that invite self-expression. She seems to feel propelled by elements in her work environment to give up on change (Calderhead, 1993). Jane says, “I hate straight drilling, but the more I don’t drill, the more I realize that they need it. I try to use different activities that are more conversational, but it seems that the students need to practice them straight out first.” She still believes that there are ways for her to achieve her vision, but she is being drawn back toward the reliance on familiar but questionable techniques that she had experienced as a student. She tries to resist the regression, saying, “I am beginning to prompt and
scaffold much better, but I still need to work on it.” Jane explains how she is developing fluency for this venue:

Sometimes I find my instructions, directions, and explanations to be above their [students’] heads and therefore confusing. Since I’ve recognized this, I have begun to write my instructions and explanations out ahead of time and break them down more … in order to maintain a working flow in the classroom. (Jane, Journal: January 24, 2011)

As she is assigned to teach additional classes and levels, Jane keeps on implementing activities in which students communicate about topics such as their schedules and classes, but some students “speak in English the entire time.” Jane laments these students’ not responding appropriately to her teaching efforts and says, “I need to learn to not take it personally.” She reports that her mentor tells her “that I’ll just have to do drills with them.” But Jane says, “I hate to do that. I’d much prefer having conversations.” After this, there are many instances of Jane’s including worksheets and packets during lessons while there are few instances in which student-to-student conversation seems to have occurred. Her reverting to use of worksheets, with which she would apparently be more comfortable in the middle school educational culture, may be considered similar to the withdrawing behavior that a homesick person might display in a source country of a languaculture. While Jane was able to overcome homesickness while abroad and avoid teaching practices that were typical of her past teachers during Semester Three, it should be noted that those are times during which she was engaged in collaborative reflective online dialogue with her peers; that activity was not a part of her Semester Four Methods course, which is significant in that such activity may have helped her to persevere in this area. What Jane is able to persist with, and progress with, is her intention to implement non-verbal strategies to support students’ learning of Spanish throughout both Semesters Three and Four.

**Students Create Unique Visuals and Digitally-documented Gestures for Remembering Vocabulary and Demonstration of Reading Comprehension**

After Jane’s aforementioned comment about willingness to avoid overt instruction in Semester Three, she goes on in the blog to relate and reason, or “explores the theory / practice relationship,” by sharing “data of personal significance,” (Bain, et. al., 1999) about someone she knows who is trying to teach language by connecting it with visuals rather than with another language:
For example, the teacher who I had for 8th grade Spanish has recently switched from a textbook to Sym Talk Cards. Basically these cards combine oral words and pictures. The students learn to associate the Spanish word to the picture without the L1 at all. It's interesting and the kids love it. I'd love to try something like that. (Jane, first blog of Semester Three continued further: August 29, 2010)

By Semester Four, Jane is requiring students to fabricate their own visuals and movements in connection with Spanish rather than imposing teacher-originated visuals and gestures upon the students. She says, “I explained that matching pictures or funny memories help remember vocabulary.” The students play charades to represent Spanish words, video record their pantomimed interpretation of a chapter in a book they are reading, create a photo story for another chapter of it, draw a comic strip to depict the action in yet another chapter, make flashcards by hand with an image on one side and a Spanish word on the other, and make a menu and a family tree on computer with pictures that they got from the Internet. Jane seems satisfied with results of tests and projects, except in the one class. In her reflections and other files, she includes samples of students’ work and discusses the following “score reports” of tests (See Figure 6-1 below). To a significant degree, Jane assesses her teaching in terms of students’ success, or lack thereof, on the tests and projects.
As for the tests, Jane reflects, “it shows a great understanding of the meaning and spelling, but it’s rote memorization and I’d prefer to move away from that and delve deeper into the hierarchy or learning [sic].” Jane also comments specifically about the student who was mentioned in Chapter Five (the one whose mother worked with Jane over email to encourage his appropriate participation in class); Jane says he did “well” on the projects.

*Students Look, Listen, and Respond to a Story that is Custom-made for Them*

Jane also has a breakthrough with regard to her concern about students’ developing listening skills. Consistent with her blog comments during both Semesters One and Two, in Semester Three she once again laments that as a young student learning Spanish she had too little listening practice and that later she had too much trouble comprehending what she heard. She states,

> If there was one thing I wish we had more of in high school, it was listening … especially true in my AP class. The lack of more listening activities (native speakers in particular) really hurt me on the [AP] exam because I was really uncomfortable and lacking in experience … we did do certain things … but I definitely wish that there had been more and that those offered had been scaffolded better. Sometimes, especially at the lower levels, the activity was lost because of the difficulty. (Jane, fourth blog of Semester Three: September 17, 2010)

Jane finishes the post by talking about mixing audio and visual. Sherry concurs and lists her reasons.

> Hey Jane! I have to agree that in my experiences there was definitely a lack of listening activities. Listening to your teacher speak the target language only goes so far … I loved your idea of mixing the audio and the visual … cater to a whole
bunch of different learning styles … help with their comprehension skills … help them realize what specific words in the language they had problems with.  
(Sherry, response to Jane: September 19, 2010)

Additionally, Sherry reflects, “I think if I was involved in more listening activities, such as listening to native speakers, or hearing more people who actually knew the language, it would have been a lot more beneficial in the long run.” She, too, comes up with an idea that seems novel to her, “to have students act themselves a certain part of the text or something.”

Using technology in keeping with her goals, during Semester Three Jane combines the audio-visual and acting ideas from her recent collaborative-reflective online conversation. This time, she, rather than the students, will pantomime in a “lesson [that] incorporates a ton of listening comprehension … a short story about … a robbery … Srta. ‘Jane’ walking in to find the classroom disrupted and missing various things … recounted in first person present tense.” Jane reiterates, “I think listening is important,” and rationalizes “stepping out of my comfort zone and acting a bit … practicing the adjectives in a conversational/story-like manner, and incorporating technology that I learned more about during the workshop the other day.” She explains,

A pre-listening activity will start things off (questions, in English, to get the students thinking about details they will be looking for, in Spanish, during the story). The teacher will then re-enact walking into the classroom and tell the story of the robbery twice. Then the class will review the story with the teacher using a powerpoint. Lastly, students will be the detectives and solve the crime based on the "evidence" (pre-recorded descriptions, using a distorted voice option in Garage Band) to select which of their classmates was the thief. (Jane, lesson plan: October 22, 2010)

Images 6-2 and 6-2a, below, are two pages from Jane’s audio-visual book.

Jane is not disappointed in the way the audio-visual story lesson turns out. She reflects,

I am incredibly excited about how well this lesson went. I was a little worried in the beginning, that I would lose some students with the amount of Spanish, but even my students who are typically struggling comprehended the majority of it. They were also really interested and involved in the "Line-Up" to figure out which of their classmates stole the items … Their enthusiasm was contagious. (Jane, reflection on lesson of October 22, 2010)

Here, Jane seems to have used technology in applying insight to prevent the type of student disinterest during her story lesson of Semester One, as this new audio-visual book is reminiscent of the *Pez Arco Iris* book that she had modified and used back then. Having prepared this digital material before class rather than having to read the story in real-time, Jane appears to be less overwhelmed; and perhaps the students’ interest is held by the stimulating visuals and interesting special effects. However, it seems that Jane’s earlier commitment to ‘scaffold’ was over-fulfilled, perhaps with pre-listening questions in English, and she seems to have forgotten about her Semester One revelation that students understand more than she expects them to; she admits, “I had a student ask me to make the line-up more challenging next time (if we were to do it again). He, and his classmates seemed to agree, that it was a little too easy …” Although students did not hear “native speakers” in Jane’s lesson, and no similar lessons could be found in Jane’s Semester Four files, this instance serves as evidence that collaborative reflective online dialogue helped propel Jane into attempting to break the cycle of poor listening comprehension in Spanish. She seems to have used different if not more activities for listening comprehension than what she experienced as a younger student of Spanish. She combined events relative to the learning context, plus body language with audio and visual on computer, and assessed comprehension by having students solve the mystery.
Summary

This chapter revealed how Jane’s collaborative reflective online dialogue facilitated her development of intercultural competence, some of which she was able to transfer to her new cultural context of teaching students in middle school. Through the use of digital tools, Jane availed herself of peers’ support as she learned how to become less overwhelmed and more tolerant, she gained insight as to the nature of culture, re-conceptualized the idea of ‘home,’ and she observed that members of the languaculture being learned could serve as mediators when intercultural problems arose. In turn, she transferred those intercultural skills to new contexts as she supported her peers by promoting tolerance and offering to help immerse them in Spanish; she also immersed herself in technology and teaching, and she reached out to ‘natives’ in the middle school to help when dysfunction arose in class. While their guidance sometimes encouraged Jane back toward teaching the way she had been taught when she was a young Spanish student, she felt ‘at home’ with eight out of nine classes, and she took risks in helping students to practice listening and to develop intercultural competence in ways that were new both to her and to them. To do that, she created a contextually relevant audio-visual Spanish storybook and pantomimed the plot, and her students created gestures and visuals in an effort to link meaning with Spanish rather than returning to think in terms of English. Thus, they were immersed, or “fully engaged with their environment” rather than “encapsulated in the links with home,” as Byram (1997, p. 50) says. This is how people are most likely to increase their intercultural competence and it is how Jane taught differently from the way she was taught when she was a younger student of Spanish. Evidence in the form of Jane’s reflections from Semester Four indicate that Jane’s students were given opportunity to develop attitudes of willingness and readiness for decentering to the point at which they could envision attaching Spanish significance to an image or movement rather than limiting significance to English words that they were accustomed to using. Areas highlighted in purple on Table 6-1 below show categories of intercultural communicative competence that Jane addressed as she used collaborative reflective discourse online toward solving problems of being overwhelmed, dealing with tolerance issues, and overcoming the apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975) by transferring what she learned during Semesters One through Three to her teaching context in Semester Four. Some of these areas of growth apply to not only Jane but also to her students, as she gave them exceptional opportunities to learn, especially as they employed computers, the Internet, video, and other technological applications to facilitate communication during class time with her. It is clear that a
few of the computer related applications and activities for language teaching and learning were new to both Jane and to her students, and that the technology was used productively. Thus, Jane’s synthecultural competence continues to grow.
Table 6-1. Areas of intercultural communicative competence that Jane addressed while problem solving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Attitudes</strong></th>
<th><strong>Curiosity, openness, suspends disbelief about other and belief of own culture</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest</strong></td>
<td>Tries to engage with others equally and personally, not to profit, aggrandize, mainstream, or glorify the exotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Willingness</strong></td>
<td>Questions mores and assumptions inherent in customs of the ‘other’s’ environment, compares and contrasts with one’s own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Readiness</strong></td>
<td>Copes with states of adaptation (enthused, withdrawn) and experiences of being foreign (acceptance, rejection) while residing in ‘other’s’ environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adapts; engages with rites and conventions of verbal and non-verbal communication; attends to expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Knowledge</strong></th>
<th><strong>Of social groups, products, practices, processes of interaction in own and other culture</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relations</strong></td>
<td>Significant current and past political and economic figures and events between cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact</strong></td>
<td>How to access ‘others,’ their environment, institutions of mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misunderstanding</strong></td>
<td>Alternative interpretations of concepts, rituals; effects of behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memory</strong></td>
<td>Portrayal of events and identity of culture through socialization, how perceived by ‘others’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space</strong></td>
<td>Borders, regions, dialects, identities, landmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socialization</strong></td>
<td>National education system, religion, rites marking life cycle stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distinctions</strong></td>
<td>Clothing, food, language, and / or tradition differences between groups delineated by class, ethnicity, creed, gender, profession, age, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutions</strong></td>
<td>Public / Private health, recreation, financial, media, education organizations affecting daily life within and between countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction</strong></td>
<td>Formality; taboos, norms of public / private meetings, use of transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Interpreting and Relating</strong></th>
<th><strong>Document</strong></th>
<th><strong>Interpreting and Relating</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dysfunction</strong></td>
<td><strong>Locate ethnocentrism, explain origins</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Explain breakdown in terms of errors re: nuance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Identify common ground, facilitate resolving conflict</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Discovery and Interaction</strong></th>
<th><strong>Awareness</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notice</strong></td>
<td>Critically evaluate with explicit criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question</strong></td>
<td>Ideologically analyze items, occurrences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Navigate</strong></td>
<td>Anticipate areas of potential conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiate</strong></td>
<td>Moderate toward accepting difference where incompatibilities exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintain</strong></td>
<td>Ideologically analyze items, occurrences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Skills</strong></th>
<th><strong>Interpreting and Relating</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notice</strong></td>
<td>Identify implicit reference to shared meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question</strong></td>
<td>Elicit allusions from informant, establish hierarchical links and cause / effect, test generalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Navigate</strong></td>
<td>Use venue-appropriate genre, avoid offending, utilize resources to find out more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiate</strong></td>
<td>Intervene to mutual satisfaction of people involved; diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintain</strong></td>
<td>Continue acquaintance over time and distance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 7

Synthesis and Conclusion

This semester … I’m sure you have read and you’ve seen – it was powerful … In learning about their [participants’] thinking, we also got to see where were they developmentally in terms of their profession … the power and the potential that technology has for really just creating these relationships and really these bonds … We believe in the power of them – providing that feedback to each other.
- Instructor from Semesters One and Two, Focus Group: June 14, 2010

Overview

A synthesis of the results for chapters four through six is offered here with respect to answering the research questions posed and context relevant to that. The summary is meant to lend insight to those considering future endeavors that include sustained use of technology to develop a collaborative reflective practice in world language teacher preparation. Limitations of the study, implications, and recommendations for further research are included.

Synthesis of the Findings

Near the beginning of Semester Four, Jane seemed concerned about how much change she could accomplish given her circumstance. She said, “I’m just the ‘student’ teacher … I came in to a classroom where procedures were set and it’s hard to change habits during the year.” At the end of the two-year Methods Block, in Semester Four, when Jane looked back at her original language learner autobiography, she responded by mentioning her troublesome class and wrote about intercultural competence, language, teaching, and transformation. The following excerpt in Jane’s own words best summarize the outcome of her case especially with respect to nuance and avoidance of offending.
I wasn’t skilled enough to couple the strictness with warmth and caring, so I think the students perceived me to be mean and cold. I hate putting that in writing, but I think it’s true.

Over the past month or so, I’ve changed things around a lot and I’ve begun to build that rapport back up with the students. They understand why I am strict and I give them more of a choice in the classroom. We have a count down method, which makes it clear when students are not on task. They know that if I get to one, we switch activities because they aren’t doing the work that needs to be done. This countdown method is great because it gives them a clear, unwavering warning system, as opposed to me switching when I decide, which is rather ambiguous to the students. I am proud to say that I can definitely see the difference in the dynamic in the classroom, as well as student behavior.

The one thing that I am worried about, still to this day, is my language abilities. When I was abroad, my Spanish was excellent. I grew exponentially in my speaking abilities while I was in Spain. Since coming back, I’ve had few experiences to speak the language and certain rules and tenses are slipping from my brain. I know them, but I can’t speak them proficiently. I love the middle school age group, but I need to find a way to continue to speak and work with the language. I hope to travel again soon and I plan on studying the language over the summer. (Jane, reflection on her language learner autobiography from August 26, 2009: March 22, 2011)

Jane adds, “I am surprised at how different I am from the day I wrote the LLAB,” and, “I am continuing to learn and grow in the language and my teaching.” Jane has grown with regard to intercultural communicative competence and she has seen the benefits of applying what she knows; she is also aware that her transformation is still very much in progress. The rest of this chapter is dedicated to answering the research questions posed in Chapter One with respect to Jane and also her peers.

**What can the use of laptops with wireless Internet access at any time, from anywhere, and video software that has annotation capability contribute to participants’ teacher development?**

It is difficult to imagine how a developmental experience for beginning teachers, without the use of the technological tools described in this research project, could be equal in quality with respect to the affordances provided by using technology toward a collaborative reflective practice. Employment of these tools to engage with peers and instructors in collaborative reflective dialogue affords a unique teaching situation for instructors, and learning environment for participants, in that it allows constant access to a combination of components that facilitate
improvement in teaching and learning. These components include: reflective thinking (Dewey, 1910) and reflective writing (Colesworthy, 1887; Jackson, 1969; Le Fant, 1949; Progoff, 1975) that may be exceptionally helpful when done collaboratively, starting with the language learner autobiography (Schumann & Schumann, 1977), which can be shared and discussed with peers (Brock, Yu, & Wong, 1992; Bailey et. al., 1996) and continuing in conjunction with audio-visual recordings of undergraduates’ lessons (Fortune, Cooper, & Allen, 1965; Wolfe, 1970) by annotating via computer the frames of film that are salient (Frederikson, Sipusic, Sherin, & Wolfe, 1998; Rich & Hannafin, 2009; Roschelle & Sibley, 1992). Jane combined these components to assist in her development as a teacher, especially for successfully achieving appropriate student participation in listening activities associated with her story telling. She vowed in Semester One that she would try story telling again after she reflected about the Pez Acro Iris lesson’s going poorly; in her reflective thinking and writing, she annotated video clips of particular moments in which she saw that students’ were inattentive. Over time, she collaboratively reflected with peers about a lack of listening activities in her past as a language learner, and technological options to increase listening opportunities for her students. Finally, she invented a new audio-visual book called “Robo de la Clase” that worked well in Semester Three. How these components could be combined in a comparable way and made so accessible without the technological tools is practically inconceivable. The affordances helped Jane to expand her sythecultural competence.

Where were these tools used to facilitate collaborative reflective discourse in a way that would be difficult if not impossible to accomplish by other means?

Across numerous time zones from South America to Europe, these tools were used to facilitate both synchronous and asynchronous collaborative reflective discourse most of which was enhanced by visuals that were either captioned or accompanied by narrative and automatically archived, and this dialogue continued literally every hour of the day and night. Instructors were able to see participants virtually and comment at their convenience whenever they were unable to attend live lessons in class or visit personally abroad. Participants were able to incorporate this work naturally into their lives from wherever they were, by reading and writing posts and comments as quickly or as slowly as they wanted to, without having to go to a meeting place that may be out of their way and without having to wait to take turns.
communicating. Members of this learning community interacted dynamically and intensely with the technology that afforded opportunities for them to do so. An example of the benefit of this anytime / anywhere collaborative reflection is especially evident in the ‘vosotros’ discussion that took place between Jane and Kayleigh after Jane had blogged about it first with Natalie, as reported in Chapter Four. Jane commented from Europe on the post that Kayleigh made from Argentina, and Kayleigh was able to see Jane’s comment within a very short time and she responded to Jane in just over an hour. The continuity of access that Jane had to reviewing the ‘vosotros’ concept may have helped Jane with her immediate and constant need to be able to use ‘vosotros.’ The awareness that was raised during blog discussion, about areas in which ‘vosotros’ or a similar concept is used, also may have been a factor in Jane’s including ‘vosotros’ so much in her lessons for students in class during practicum. Learning about ‘vosotros’ provides opportunity for Jane to use an appropriate level of formality with students in class, and help them practice it so that they may be able to use it in a situation demanding of it.

What else did participants do with the tools for themselves and each other?

Did they engage in other novel activities with the tools?

If so, to what extent if any, can these activities be expected to contribute to evolution of competences?

Besides collaborative reflective online conversation with instructors and with one another, Jane and other participants in the focus group reported that they alerted one another on Skype or Facebook that there were blog posts about certain topics while they were abroad during Semester Two. According to the focus group members, this information resulted in their being interested, motivated, and spending “a lot more time reading blogs,” and writing comments on blog while they were abroad even when they were not required to do so. Sometimes they would post a comment on their peer’s Facebook instead of on that person’s blog for class. Some participants kept personal blogs apart from the ones required for class while they were abroad; on the personal blogs they would post additional pictures, and narrations about situations that they thought might be inappropriate to converse about on a blog for class. Participants read and commented upon one another’s personal blogs as well. While this activity further immersed them in technology for teaching and learning, they said that the contact that they had while abroad was
comforting and resulted in their learning about differences between cultures; moreover, it helped them to maintain a working relationship that was even closer once they returned home.

Other efforts to maintain relationships were reported by focus group participants that used the computer with Internet to contact their former instructor from XXU who had given them feedback on blog while they were abroad but had since moved for employment at a different educational institution far away. One participant used e-mail to keep in touch and offer to do volunteer work with an advisor from the host university, and other participants did so to ask for recommendations from professors. Additionally, these participants said that they used technology to keep in contact with their host mothers and friends from their host countries not only to maintain relationships but also to avoid losing the skills that they had acquired with respect to the language being learned. Aside from practicing their language being learned online with people in their host countries, a focus group member reported using websites to listen and to watch videos for pronunciation and for feeling like she is “back in the culture rather than being here.”

To reiterate a final example mentioned in Chapter Four, the case study cohort member Jane used the computer with Internet to mediate between herself and her host mother when Jane was having trouble ascertaining from the woman what they were eating. When her host mother said the food word to Jane, and Jane did not recognize the word, Jane asked her host mother to describe the food in other words. When that did not work, Jane typed the word into the computer to search the Internet for it and find out what it was. Then she taught her host mother how to pronounce it in English, and she and her host mother talked about one another’s accents.

To review an episode discussed in Chapter Five, Jane also used the tools to prepare herself for teaching her future students about her experiences abroad by practicing from Spain through Skype with the students of her former Spanish teacher. She said, “they asked excellent questions and it was so cool to see their interest. I can’t wait to share these experiences with my classes!” She blogged about having done this, and one of her peers subsequently said in focus group that she is headed back to Spain soon and that she “told my teacher I would Skype with her … if she would allow me to do that” and told Jane “I was telling her about you.” Thus, Jane’s peer envisions implementing technology in a way that allows her mentor teacher’s future students to see Spain ‘live.’ This could contribute to syntheeultural competence for her and for her mentor, plus intercultural and communicative competences for students.
In what situations were these tools used to solve a problem in a way that was not able to be accomplished by other means?

In situations during which Jane became overwhelmed in class, she was able to review a lesson after it happened and observe what she was not able to notice while the lesson was happening. She could solve the problems of not using manipulatives proficiently and coping with students’ not participating appropriately by finding episodes in which she could have made and implemented a pedagogical choice that would have more satisfactory outcomes, trading ideas with instructors and peers regarding what to do about it, envisioning the change, enacting the change, and reflecting on the result of it. While there was one class out of nine in Semester Four that remained troublesome, Jane expresses none of the lack of confidence and lack of preparation that she had conveyed earlier in Semester One two-year Methods Block. On the contrary, she states in Semester Four, “I am certainly looking forward to having my own classroom.”

When Jane was overwhelmed with homesickness in Spain, she was encouraged online by peers and the instructor to continue intensifying immersion in the languaculture. The collaborative reflective dialogue resulted not only in her reconceptualizing the concept of ‘home’ so that she could take full advantage of her learning opportunities abroad instead of withdrawing but also led her to discover the nature of culture so that she lived it when she returned to the classroom rather than trying to teach it in a way that would separate it from language and grammar that students were learning. Such teaching is desirable (Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1983; NBPTS, 2010; PA Dept. of Ed., 2010; Savignon, 1983 & 1997) and possible (Burke, 2005 & 2006), but may prove to be especially challenging for world language education undergraduates in particular (Krumm, 1973; Wolfe, 1970).

During the instructor focus group conversation at the end of Semester Two, an instructor confirmed that the first two semesters of the experience were powerful for the undergraduates. The instructor went on to say that the online activity afforded the opportunity to see where the undergraduates were in their professional development. She added that she would never go back to instructing undergraduate prospective language teachers in a manner that did not incorporate the use of technology in the way it was utilized for this pilot cohort of language teaching candidates.
Do specific uses of these tools have transformative potential for world language education?

Was there development of skills involving use of these tools?

Together, collaborative reflective online dialogue offered to participants the opportunity to learn how to develop communicative competence, intercultural competence, and technological competence. Those three competences can serve as a foundation for building synthecultural competence for education, which requires a combination of the competences, otherwise known as intercultural communicative competence. Having and using skills associated with intercultural communicative competence, Jane as an example showed growth in her pedagogy as she was able to offer students the opportunity to build those skills as well, especially when the students had access to computers with video capability and Internet access. When students had access to these tools, they were able to practice associating meaning with Spanish by creating visuals and recording gestures instead of returning to think in terms of English. The practice of learning in this way with technology and having an attitude that resists withdrawing to that which is easy or comfortable can build intercultural competence and prepare students for implementing skills of intercultural competence in communication. For Jane, this was potentially transformational in that it was different from how she was taught (Lortie, 1975; Burke, 2011).

What did participants do with the tools for / or with their students?

Again, through use of technology to develop a collaborative reflective teaching practice, Jane increased her ability to utilize verbal and non-verbal strategies to facilitate functioning in Spanish while she was conducting instruction and while she was studying abroad. She worked on becoming more aware of others’ behavior and applying insight for curricular and on the spot decisions that involved interpreting dysfunction, using venue-appropriate genre, and attending to formality. Jane learned more Spanish language and culture, learned how to learn by wandering, and learned how to teach with regard to implementing and sharing with students the technological and languacultural attitudes, knowledge, skills, and awarenesses that she gained through collaborative reflective online dialogue with peers and instructors and other related activities. Jane also used the computer with Internet to provide resources for students via the website she created and to collaborate with a student’s parent through e-mail to increase the student’s
appropriate participation in class, which resulted in better outcomes for him. Finally, Jane used the computer to analyze students’ test scores, which led her to take a closer look at the consistency between learning activities and assessment procedures and adjust teaching strategies accordingly. This is demonstration of increasing synthecultural competence for education.

Did participants engage in novel activities with the tools?

*If so, to what extent if any, can these activities be expected to contribute to evolution of competences?*

Jane’s first novel activity was having students use the computer to create a Facebook template on which students would log their Hispanic Heritage research results from their Internet search and use that to report information to classmates. This can be expected to contribute to students’ intercultural communicative competence in that they had opportunity to become more aware of the make up of their own languacultural society, had practice using the technology as a learning resource and functioned in Spanish by writing it, speaking it, and listening to it. Another breakthrough for Jane was giving students the opportunity to practice listening comprehension through solving a mystery that she conveyed to them by pantomiming and using the audio-visual book that she created. A third activity new to Jane and the students was using Keynote to create a visual and textual postcard of a Spanish speaking place of their choice for the purpose of increasing their cultural knowledge, practicing their writing skills, and improving their technology skills. In a different assignment in which students video record themselves implementing communication skills through pantomime to convey their comprehension of the plot in a story they read, Jane gives them further opportunity to develop technology competence by including a guide to using the flip cameras.

**How is the use of laptops (with video software that is annotatable, and Internet access) for language teaching and learning perceived by world language education undergraduates?**

*How often did they broach such computer use without direct prompting?*

Without prompting in their very first assignment, which was the language learner autobiography, Jane was not among the approximately 40% (n=9) of her peers that mentioned computer technology in terms of being required to create videos, visit websites, do online
exercises, send and receive emails, and / or look at teacher-made PowerPoints in class, for example. It seemed to be a normal part of most of participants’ lives and they did not seem to give it much special attention compared to other topics during the two year Methods Block.

What did they say about it, whether prompted or not?

Was there a change in attitudes toward this type of computer use?

Throughout the world language education undergraduate program, Jane’s attitude improved and her use of computers for teaching and learning increased in quantity and quality. As for video reflections, at the end of Semester Three, Jane wrote,

Overall, going back through my lesson and really critiquing it has made me a better teacher … I recorded a few different lessons in order to reflect on my teaching—what I thought I was doing vs. what I was actually doing in the classroom … I plan on using recordings and reflections on my own in the future as well. (Jane, Classroom Discourse Paper continued: November 19, 2010)

This planning of future learning is level five reflection (Bain et al., 1999) that Jane has maintained independent of required online collaborative reflective discourse with peers and instructors. If she continues it during her years as a certified teacher, it could be transformational.

Did world language education undergraduates credit their experience with this type of computer use for any changes in attitude that they thought were pertinent to becoming a better teacher?

In the end of Semester Four, on the final exit survey, Jane claims that not having a notebook computer for teaching “would be extremely detrimental” and she “would hate to not be able to incorporate the world in my classroom.” Jane and her peers say that collaborative reflective online blogging from abroad should be required. Focus group members agreed that it will be helpful for them to be able to look back over their blogs to remember what they learned. They said that at first they did not look forward to doing it but they came to appreciate and enjoy it, and they were glad that they did it.
Limitations of the Study

A broader view of what happened with this pilot cohort would be available if the story of each participant whose blogging was continuous throughout the two years (i.e., during study abroad as well as during Semesters One, Two, and Three) were examined in the same way that Jane’s was analyzed here. As compelling and informative as Jane’s case is, it is likely that exploration of completely collected data from others’ cases would lend greater insight with regard to answering the research questions of this project. Replicating this study in that manner would improve construct validity, especially with respect to which elements of intercultural communicative competence were developed for participants in both pedagogy and the languaculture being learned and in terms of their levels of reflection. However, replicating this study in that manner even just for the individuals in the focus group would be difficult because they were stationed in different schools for practicum and did not have as much access to technology as what Jane had.

There is potential for bias, too, in the fact that the researcher has had a positive experience as a Spanish teacher who regularly mentors student teachers and participates in many of the activities described here pertaining to learning, teaching, technology; it is possible, therefore, that whatever interpretations are here would be different from interpretations that a researcher with different experience would relate. Moreover, the amount and richness of data, even just when related to Jane, was unwieldy. Additionally, both participants and professors established a new blog for each course, and posts were made in various locations online, some of which were not aggregated. Thus, important details may have been missed.

In addition, while Jane’s online behavior patterns suggested that she was not extraordinary with respect to technology compared to her peers, Jane may have been unusual in other ways that would be difficult to measure but significant to her development. It could be interpreted that even Jane’s learning behavior while abroad falls within the continuum of her peers’ when one considers that Jill was reticent to interact with Spanish speakers, Kira insisted upon interacting only with Spanish speakers that did not know English, Natalie committed to interacting with Spaniards at least a couple times per week, and Jane consistently sought out both Spaniards and English speakers who regularly spoke Spanish. But, Jane seemed to function from the basis of not only her mind but also her soul when it came to transformation in teaching. That is to say, she set herself apart from her peers especially with her final statement regarding the last question on the exit survey. To answer ‘Why do you suppose that people teach the way that they
“...do?” in the end, Jane started with a statement that could be expected but then approached the transcendental. She said, “I think people teach the way they were taught because it’s habit and it’s easy. I’m working toward breaking the mold because this is what I love to do and I believe that our students deserve better.” Jane’s sincerity appears to be of an almost spiritual nature, and such comments were not found in her peers’ writings. It seems to go even beyond the wholeheartedness and responsibility about which Dewey (1916) wrote. Therefore, the small and perhaps unusual sample, potential for bias, and possibility of pertinent information being accidentally excluded are reasons that the findings of Jane’s case cannot be generalized.

**Implications and Recommendations**

The computer with Internet allowed Jane to permeate classroom walls for contact with outside world, especially with members of the languaculture being learned, members of the pedagogical culture, members of the students’ culture. Insight gained from connecting with these people in this way contributed to her expanding intercultural communicative competence with regard to Spanish and teaching, and it helped her to solve a problem with a student. Her growth opened more learning opportunities for students and was transformational to a recognizable degree in some aspects such as formality and functioning in Spanish while in class and while abroad. Jane’s continuing to apply these skills to support a productive classroom community, and consistent encouragement for colleagues to do the same, would be demonstration of synthecultural competence for education, and that is vital to the well being of the larger society. A force of syntheculturally competent language teachers would serve to break the ties that world language instruction currently has with economically unsustainable and globally impractical education in the United States. If teachers of other academic areas were empowered similarly, education would result in automaticity of technology-facilitated communicative skills that could grant more productivity than what can be achieved within the persistent teacher-centered, text book-oriented, factory-like system that yields unprepared teachers and unskilled students. (See figure 7-1, below for a diagram of the potential positive effects of certain uses of computers in education.)
Figure 7-1. Potential positive effects of certain uses of computers in education.

It would be beneficial to pursue research about numerous technology points related to this report. For example, educators may be more able to capitalize on the benefits of collaborative reflection with annotated video if it were more clear what exactly is powerful about representing experience in that way. When considering how to design digital tools that build upon what worked in this case, it would be useful to know how to most effectively incorporate what annotatable framing allows: namely, the ease of representation and sharing, the opportunity to attach a physically closer and philosophically alternative label, and the ability to watch repeatedly in slow motion to permit a different or greater consciousness.

Additional recommendations are as follows:

- A follow-up study should be done on Jane.
- Another case study should be done on one of Jane’s peers.
- Similar studies should be done on other cohorts and at other institutions.
- There should be cascading blog mentorship. (The university could offer a Master’s course credit for first year teachers to blog to student teachers; student teachers could in turn blog with study abroad undergraduates; those in study abroad could blog with others who are preparing to study abroad, and younger language education students could blog with high school students who are interested in studying languages and / or becoming teachers.)
• Collaborative-reflective online interaction should continue during student teaching (Semester Four).

• More instructor feedback should be done during study abroad, and online interaction in the languaculture being learned more often; if there are not enough undergraduates studying a particular languaculture to interact, perhaps another university could participate in the virtual learning community.

• Teacher educators should consider evaluating student teachers’ developing quality of pedagogy in terms of developing in a languaculture being learned so that these undergraduates can build confidence on their own terms and then take risks rather than be preoccupied with perfection and stick to the script.

• Before placing student teachers in schools, level and quality of access to computers with Internet should be ascertained and considered.

Finally, it may be helpful if instructors were more explicit about asking world language education undergraduates to think about their teaching as a cultural event.

**Conclusion**

This model of using technology to develop a collaborative reflective teaching practice, in association with the EDUCATE initiative, affords unique opportunities for world language education undergraduates to learn to develop competence. Collaborative reflective online interaction, which often included annotatable computer-generated video recordings of World Language Education Undergraduates’ teaching, allowed the case study participant Jane to expand her capacity to improve her communicative ability for teaching and for functioning in Spanish during class with students. During this time, she also increased her computer skills and developed her ability to make curricular and on-the-spot decisions to afford more learning opportunities for students. Those decisions, according to Jane, affected student outcomes. Evidence suggests that Jane made breakthroughs in her efforts to leverage digital devices for students’ enhanced learning opportunities. However, Jane herself said that she was concerned about continued lack of meaningful student-student dialogue in Spanish, her own neglect of using enough Spanish while teaching, her over-utilization of worksheets, overt instruction, and lecture; also of concern to her was persistent inappropriate student participation and faulty alignment between tasks on student tests with respect to activities in which they engaged during class time.
Jane felt that the time pressures, the number of students and their lack of appropriate participation, and her mentor teacher’s advice and quiz formats were influences that caused her to choose to include more drills than what she wanted to do in lessons; she did not mention much resistance to use of computers for learning, but during Semester Four there was a marked decrease in online evidence of intentional guidance by mentors and collaborative reflective online dialogue with peers. There were instances of lost opportunity for higher levels of reflection that may have prompted action that would have catalyzed her implementation of more student-to-student conversational activities. The dynamic in language teaching and learning may not have changed for Jane and her students in class during practicum; however if Jane were to follow through on her commitment to continue reflection when she is fully in charge of a new group of students, there would probably be a chance for her practice to be transformed so that she is not teaching so much in the way she had been taught – a way that left her unable to speak and unable to comprehend spoken Spanish well despite her having studied for many years.

Transformation is a complex process that naturally takes more time than what Jane had during her two years of this Methods block experience. Given that, it can be argued that the EDUCATE initiative with respect to world language teacher education was effective because it fulfilled criteria in the literature that claim to be predictive of change. Whereas the nature and content of the data does not allow a claim that Jane’s students clearly made gains with respect to functioning in Spanish and being interculturally competent, it is reasonable to say that Jane’s own words and actions reveal that her academic use of computers contributed positively to world language teaching and learning. Table 7-1 below combines the tables at the ends of previous chapters to show that Jane covered a lot of ground that Byram (1997) outlined as important indicators of intercultural communicative competence. This shows that further endeavors, which build upon the structure of the EDUCATE initiative (i.e., more thorough) for using technology to develop a collaborative reflective teaching practice, should prove to be worthwhile.
Table 7-1. Areas of intercultural communicative competence that Jane addressed in two years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curiosity, openness</strong>, suspends disbelief about other and belief of own culture</td>
<td>Tries to engage with others equally and personally, not to profit, aggrandize, mainstream, or glorify the exotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest</strong></td>
<td>Tries to discover perspectives of ‘other’ regarding phenomena from both cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Willingness</strong></td>
<td>Questions mores and assumptions inherent in customs of the ‘other’s’ environment, compares and contrasts with one’s own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Readiness</strong></td>
<td>Copes with states of adaptation (enthused, withdrawn) and experiences of being foreign (acceptance, rejection) while residing in ‘other’s’ environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adapts; engages with rites and conventions of verbal and non-verbal communication; attends to expectations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Of social groups, products, <strong>practices</strong>, processes of interaction in own and other culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relations</strong></td>
<td>Significant current and past political and economic figures and events between cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contact</strong></td>
<td>How to access ‘others,’ their environment, institutions of mediation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misunderstanding</strong></td>
<td>Alternative interpretations of concepts, rituals; effects of behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memory</strong></td>
<td>Portrayal of events and identity of culture through socialization, how perceived by ‘others’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space</strong></td>
<td>Borders, regions, dialects, identities, landmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socialization</strong></td>
<td>National education system, religion, rites marking life cycle stages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distinctions</strong></td>
<td>Clothing, food, language, and / or tradition differences between groups delineated by class, ethnicity, creed, gender, profession, age, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutions</strong></td>
<td>Public / Private health, <strong>recreation</strong>, financial, media, <strong>education</strong> organizations affecting daily life within and between countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction</strong></td>
<td><strong>Formality; taboos</strong>, norms of public / private meetings, use of transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpreting and Relating</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dysfunction</strong></td>
<td>Locate ethnocentrism, explain origins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediation</strong></td>
<td>Explain breakdown in terms of errors re: nuance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identify common ground, facilitate resolving conflict</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notice</strong></td>
<td>Indicate implicit reference to shared meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question</strong></td>
<td>Elicit allusions from informant, establish hierarchical links and cause / effect, test generalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Navigate</strong></td>
<td>Use venue-appropriate genre, avoid offending, utilize resources to find out more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiate</strong></td>
<td>Intervene to mutual satisfaction of people involved; diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintain</strong></td>
<td>Continue acquaintance over time and distance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critically evaluate with explicit criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideologically analyze items, occurrences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipate areas of potential conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate toward accepting difference where incompatibilities exist</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Appendix A

### Table of Interaction on First Blog Entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Responder(s); I=Instructor</th>
<th>Commented on; o=own</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annika</td>
<td>8/28, 30; 9/3</td>
<td>11:38 a</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>I, Lina, Kerri, Self</td>
<td>Lourdes, Charline, o</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>8/27, 31</td>
<td>5:21 p</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Kerri, Kathleen</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brianna</td>
<td>8/28, 29</td>
<td>7:20 a</td>
<td>1126</td>
<td>I, Nancy, Self, Sherry</td>
<td>Kathleen, Lourdes, o</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candice</td>
<td>8/27, 29</td>
<td>3:43 p</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>I, Self</td>
<td>Kendra, Lourdes, o</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charline</td>
<td>8/27, 29, 30</td>
<td>11:39 a</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>I, Self, Annika</td>
<td>Jane, Lydia, o</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunice</td>
<td>8/28, 31</td>
<td>2:29 p</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>I, Kathleen, Self</td>
<td>Kathleen, o</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>8/26, 28, 31</td>
<td>10:57 p</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>I, Lydia, Self</td>
<td>Lourdes, Tory, o</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>8/28, 30</td>
<td>10:38 a</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td>I, Tory, Sandie</td>
<td>Lydia, Sandie,</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>8/28, 29</td>
<td>7:46 a</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>I, Self, Charline</td>
<td>Kendra, Sherry, o</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>8/27, 30</td>
<td>4:12 p</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>I, Brianna, Self, Bob, Eunice</td>
<td>Eunice, Natalie, o</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayleigh</td>
<td>8/27, 29, 31</td>
<td>12:50 p</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>I, Self, Lourdes, Natalie</td>
<td>Kira, Sherry, o</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra</td>
<td>8/26, 30</td>
<td>3:45 p</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>Jane, Lina, Candice, Lourdes, Kira</td>
<td>Sherry, Natalie</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerri</td>
<td>8/28, 30</td>
<td>12:32 a</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>I, Self, Bob</td>
<td>Annika, Tory, o</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kira</td>
<td>8/27, 29, 31</td>
<td>3:43 p</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>I, Kayleigh, Self</td>
<td>Kendra, Tory, Lydia, o</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lina</td>
<td>8/27, 29, 30</td>
<td>12:28 a</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>I, Self</td>
<td>Annika, Kendra, o</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lourdes</td>
<td>8/27, 29</td>
<td>3:43 p</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>Jane, Mary, I, Brianna, Charline, Lourdes, Self, Sherry, Sonia, Andrea</td>
<td>Kayleigh, Kendra</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>8/27, 30</td>
<td>3:43 p</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>I, Kira, Jill, Charline, Sonia, Self</td>
<td>Jane, Sonia, o</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>8/27, 28</td>
<td>11:55 p</td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>I, Tory</td>
<td>Lourdes, Natalie</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>8/27, 28</td>
<td>2:50 p</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Brianna, Sherry</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie</td>
<td>8/28, 30</td>
<td>10:22 a</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>I, Mary, Kendra, Kathleen, Sandie</td>
<td>Kayleigh, Tory</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>8/27, 30</td>
<td>3:43 p</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>I, Jill, Self</td>
<td>Jill, Natalie, o</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>8/27, 30, 31</td>
<td>3:44 p</td>
<td>2654</td>
<td>I, Lydia, Self</td>
<td>Lourdes, Lydia, o</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tory</td>
<td>8/27, 28, 29, 30</td>
<td>3:44 p</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>Jane, I, Self, Kira, Kerri, Natalie</td>
<td>Jill, Mary, o</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry</td>
<td>8/27, 29, 30</td>
<td>3:43 p</td>
<td>2231</td>
<td>Nancy, I, Kayleigh, Jane, Self, Kendra</td>
<td>Brianna, Lourdes, o</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Participants posted on at least two (2.6) others responded; maximum = 8</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>At least two (2.6) others responded; maximum = 8</td>
<td>6 participants (25%) commented on blogs of those who had already commented to them</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Jane</td>
<td>Jane posted on 3 different dates</td>
<td>-727</td>
<td>Three others responded</td>
<td>among the 75% who commented on others’ blogs instead</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Description of Courses in Semester One: Elementary Methods Block

WLED 411 is a seminar and WLED495B is a field experience; they function together with a focus on teaching world languages in grades 1-5.

Seminar

Introduction

This course was designed to introduce world language teaching theories, methods, and standards in connection with planning, materials design, and teaching. Its intended purpose was to help beginning teachers to prepare “for a lifelong, reflective teaching career.” Its objectives included familiarizing cohort members with theory about learning, language, and language teaching so that they would be able to apply those in curricular design and execution.

Cohort members were to have a hard-copy text but also download readings from the online course management system. Aside from attendance and participation, the syllabus list of assignments to be evaluated was comprised of: the language learner autobiography, wonderings, reading responses, blog responses, article presentation, method test drive, and critical review of materials. The first four were to be posted on blogs, the article presentation was to be done in-person during class time, and the final two were to be submitted via the online course management system. So, all work was to be turned in digitally with the exception of a live report on a journal piece. Each blog was to be tagged with a pre-designated label so that it would be easy to trace and re-access. Altogether, for each cohort member, there was one major assignment per week for the semester of fifteen weeks duration (one language learner autobiography, answers to the language learner autobiography questions from instructors and comments on peers’ postings, five wonderings, two reading responses, three blog responses, one article presentation, one method test drive, and one critical review of materials, for a total of fifteen items). Grades would be on a traditional A-F scale.
Assignments

Language Learner Autobiography

With the purpose of raising awareness about personal orientation toward language teaching, the language learner autobiography was to be a single narrative of past language learning experiences, both informal and formal, discussing teachers, classes, and transitions between levels of classes. It was the first assignment of the semester, and cohort members were to post reactions to two other language learner autobiographies, and answer extension questions online and in class. Participants were unaware that around graduation time, they would be asked to look at what they had initially written for the language learner autobiography and write a reflection about their current thoughts on the issues that they had brought up in the introductory assignment.

Wonderings

Wonderings, on the other hand, were ongoing and numerous. There were to be five per person posted on blog over the semester, and they were to be based upon readings or class discussions. Their content was not prescribed, but confusions, curiosities, or contrasts of beliefs were among several ideas for topics that were offered on the syllabus. For each Wondering, cohort members were to post a reaction to that of one of their peers while taking care to respond to various classmates rather than just the same one every time.

Reading Responses

Each week, students were to do required readings. They were to summarize and react to two of them on the blog during the semester. Their posts were to include connections between the article and either their experiences or prior readings.
Blog Responses

Students were supposed to answer three sets of specific questions that the instructor posted on blog over the semester’s time.

Article Presentation

For class time conversation, each cohort member was to find, summarize, and reflect on an article that would be pertinent to other course discussions and real classroom experiences.

Method Test Drive

This assignment was to be directly linked to the other half of the Methods Block, which was the 495 field experience. Cohort members were to select a particular method for teaching their chosen topic to elementary students, video-record themselves implementing it, and post both the video with annotations and a written reaction about it on blog. The post was to include the method, the topic, activities and interpersonal interactions that took place as a result of it, evidence of its impact, feelings about it, and a comment about whether or not it would be used again and why or why not.

Critical Review of Instructional Materials

Like the method test drive, this assignment was to be directly linked to the field experience. In the classroom with their students, cohort members were to employ each of four types of materials listed on the syllabus: Commercially available, adapted, “from scratch,” and ‘authentic.’ Authentic materials are those originating from LBL countries or native speakers principally for consumption by members of their own languaculture. They can be foods, clothes, every day items, any genre of literature, entertainment, sports equipment, supplies for special cultural events, and so on. Commercial materials are those that are ready-made and able to be purchased in stores. Adapted materials were to be pre-made ones that cohort members altered in
some way for classroom use. And homemade materials were to be those uniquely created by cohort members themselves. Chosen materials were to align with instructional goals and relate to national standards for language education. The activities in which they were used were to be meaningful, and tailored to learners’ developmental status.

**Field Experience**

**Introduction**

The cohort divided into groups of three or four to teach in a (voluntary for primary students) after-school elementary school world language program twice per week over a 6-week period. Each cohort member was to design and execute approximately ten (10) lesson plans that fit with plans made by other group members within a themed curriculum labeled with the group’s name and topic. Each week was to be counted as a different unit with plans following a designated format.

**Assignments**

**Lesson Plans**

Apart from being a list of who would do what and when, the format was comprised of objectives, standards from the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages and the state of Pennsylvania, assessments, materials, procedure, rationale, adaptations, and transitions. Each plan was to be compiled on a single group document and handed in via the online course management system, and in hard copy with samples of students’ work as evidence at the end of the program. As per the course syllabus, assignments to be evaluated were not only lesson plans and final binder, but also individual and group reflections, a final video, and overall teaching performance with respect to domains listed the Pennsylvania framework for K-6 (Planning and Preparation, Teaching, Reflection and Assessment, and Professionalism).
Reflections

Each week, cohort members were to write a reflection either individually or as a group. They were to complete three cycles of alternating between individual and group reflections, so that at the end of six weeks they would have three individual reflections and three group reflections. Each of the individual reflections was to pertain to four days of teaching, which means that everyone wrote about each of his or her own lessons. Also, every individual reflection was to include a completion of the sentence “Today I learned …” for each day. All reflections, both individual and group, were to be accompanied by a video coded at least three times to indicate instances of either addressing or not addressing the instructors’ pre-designated pedagogical concerns of teacher-student interaction, assessment, and student engagement. Every reflection with coded video was to be uploaded to a blog. Instructors planned to respond to each reflection with questions.

On the syllabus, instructors suggested that groups meet at the end of each week to watch videos of their teaching, talk about the quality of their lesson execution plus feedback from instructors, and discuss next steps. Apart from the aforementioned coded video, each group reflection was to include plans for improving performance, a list of attendees, and an explanation of whether or not the meeting time was utilized well.

Final Video

The final video was to show the success that cohort members had in implementing plans for improving performance. It was to include three sets of before and after examples from weeks one to two, three to four, and five to six. It was to be shared during class at the end of the program and submitted on blog as well.
Appendix C

Description of Online Course in Semester Two: Study Abroad

Introduction

CI497C, became required for world language undergraduate education candidates after the pilot cohort, is a class in which those enrolled communicate amongst themselves and their instructor regularly from their host countries on a course blog. The main objective is to increase instructors’ ability to help their cohort members to realize a connection between real-world experience and classroom instruction, and for cohort members to help one another and begin to think of ways for doing that with their future students as well. Graded assignments were blog entries, participatory observation, and interview. For this pilot cohort, final grades would be either Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory, or Deferred, rather than a letter grade.

Assignments

Blog Entries

Participants were to choose ten out of fifteen suggested topics to write about. Topics on the syllabus were designed by the researcher primarily, agreed to by the instructor, and approved by the department chairperson. Topics were: arrival, family, food, home, routine, extra-curriculars, school, town, entertainment, traditions, and other (current events, politics, economy, sports, etc.), a status check (what’s annoying, what’s funny, what I need to do better), big picture (values & priorities, the law, international relations), and leaving (I can’t wait to …, I will miss …, I have changed regarding …).

Each blog entry was to include a completion of the sentence “This week I learned …” a wondering, and a newly learned word, phrase, concept, or grammar point. Blogging was to be done in English so that all cohort members would have access to the posted information, except
for three designated times in which instructors paired cohort members with same-language partners within the course to respond. All other blog postings were to be commented upon digitally as well by pre-designated cohort partners from any one of the languacultures being learned (French, German, Spanish). On the syllabus was a reminder from the instructor that the content of entries should be substantive, educational, and well-founded; those enrolled were to avoid posting content that seemed to reinforce stereotypes, and refrain from making assumptions, prejudicial statements, or including information that was too personal.

**Participatory Observation**

Each cohort member was to upload a two-page report on a participatory observation with (a) host-country community member(s) regarding some event such as a cultural holiday / festival, family birthday, wedding, etc., or a visit to an institution of the LBL (school, hospital, factory, government office, etc.). The objective was to engage the cohort members within the languaculture being learned community and assure that they were not always remaining with peers from their home country.

**Participant Interview with a Member of the Languaculture Being Learned**

Each cohort member was to converse with (a) host-country community member(s) about either perceptions of the United States or a worldwide concern. On the syllabus was a message from the instructor that participants should remain impartial and strive for understanding of facts rather than becoming overly emotional or opinionated. Furthermore, the instructor encouraged participants to keep in mind their future role of teacher as emissary of the languaculture being learned.
Appendix D

Description of Courses in Semester Three: Secondary Methods Block

Seminar

WLED412W is a seminar about theory, practice, standards, and student goals and assessments related to learning a world language. It works in concert with CI495C, a field experience in which participants once again engage in inquiry about professionalism, teaching tools, conceptual and contextual relationships, and outcomes, this time in grades 7-12.

Introduction

The focus here was on formulating and communicating objectives and connecting them with standards, plus aligning them with activities, materials, assessments, and other choices related to teaching / learning related choices made in practice during field experience or at other times. Emphasis on the syllabus was placed upon cohort members being able to offer a variety of activities through which learners would use the languaculture being learned for communicative purposes. Aside from attendance and participation, graded assignments listed on the syllabus were blog, group teaching experiment, unit development project, and classroom discourse paper.

Assignments

Blog

On a weekly basis, cohort members were to post entries on the instructor’s blog that was located within the online course management system, and post a response to at least one peer’s entry. In the first half of the semester, posts centered on readings downloaded from that same system. Posts during the remainder of the semester directly pertained to observations that cohort
members made in the field, and they were linked with concerns broached during the first half of the semester; this curricular design was meant to afford the undergraduates an opportunity to reflect critically through conversations with peers. Topics as listed on the syllabus were: first impressions, classroom interactions, anatomy of a lesson, classroom management, instructional materials, assessment, and final reflections.

**Group Teaching Experiment**

Together with up to three peers, cohort members were to plan, carry out, and assess a thirty-minute language lesson in which their Methods classmates and instructor pretended to be secondary school students. Classmates were to fill out and give to the group an evaluation sheet detailing the group’s effectiveness in communicating, maintaining ‘flow,’ learning opportunities, participation structures, questioning strategies, other supportive teaching tactics, language use (English and that being taught), assessment, creativity, and overall impressions. As a group, those who taught were to view and annotate video footage of their lesson according to concerns that arose during the lesson or during subsequent conversation about it. A week later, they were to give a reflective debriefing of the experience to their classmates, explain how they could revise the lesson, and submit the written report to the instructor.

**Unit Development Project**

This assignment combined a five-lesson unit plan and written summary. It was intended to expand upon cohort members’ prior experience in curricular design and activities in that it suggested that they include revisions of past lessons (perhaps from 495C) that they had created, implemented, and reflected upon, plus insisted that this time they narrate how each lesson would be linked to the one before and after it. Other required topics to be explained in this assignment were sequencing, communicative modes, pre-assessment, and instructional technologies.
In this assignment, the undergraduates were required to record, at least on audio, between five and ten minutes of a lesson that they were conducting during the field experience 495C. Subsequently, they were to transcribe and scrutinize whatever dialogue they could hear; if they were able to video record, non-verbal communications were to be considered as well. The purpose was to raise awareness of discourse through discovering interaction characteristics that were not obvious to the cohort member while s/he was conducting the lesson. The goal was to arrange for discourse structures that would maximize learning. In addition to analysis topics listed in other assignments on these Methods courses’ syllabi, other concerns to attend to were turn-taking, how much each student spoke, who was speaking to whom, teachable moments (instigated, capitalized upon, squandered), and ideas for supporting learners more effectively based upon insights gained through this exercise.

Field Experience

Introduction

For eight weeks of the semester, each cohort member is paired with a mentor teacher in a public school to spend approximately thirty-two half days (every other day for three weeks, and every day for five weeks) assisting the mentor and teaching at least six lessons independently. Other than lesson plans, assignments include a resume, philosophy of education, letter to the mentor, a web-based teaching portfolio, and reflections. During this time, all world language education students together were to meet with their supervisor as a cohort once per week.
Assignments

Lesson Plans

Requirements as stated on the syllabus were that the following criteria be met at least once within the six lessons: incorporate inquiry and/or discussion; use cooperative/collaborative learning; integrate kinesthetic and/or arts; include technology and/or multimedia; cooperatively develop and implement with the mentor teacher; design for not only large group but also small group and/or individual instruction.

Reflections

On the syllabus there was a list of questions that the reflections were supposed to answer: what went well and why; what was learned about planning and teaching; what did the students learn and what evidence confirmed that; a plan for action in improving with regard to the group of students being taught. The syllabus also contained a clause advising that the supervisor may ask additional questions on TaskStream®.

Web-based Teaching Portfolio

The purpose of this, according to the syllabus, was for cohort members to demonstrate their skills in each domain (planning and preparing, teaching, inquiry and analysis of teaching and learning, professionalism) of the performance framework. It was also supposed to help them learn to teach, as they were to submit revisions.
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Description of Course in Semester Four: Student Teaching

Introduction

CI495E is a practicum affording participants the opportunity to determine their level of independence as they approach the status of a first-year teacher, and to figure out which strategies, approaches, and theories are appropriate to rely on in various situations. It integrates all preparatory activities and documentation of teaching, learning to teach, and actual instruction. Aside from attendance and participation in weekly after-school seminars, graded assignments as listed on the syllabus are lessons, a ten-day unit, an individual learner project, a portfolio, a student teaching notebook, and teaching practice assessed with respect to domains listed the Pennsylvania framework for K-6 (Planning and Preparation, Teaching, Reflection and Assessment, and Professionalism). Additional responsibilities as listed on the syllabus were: inquiry into community school and classroom (a report between three to five pages in length), observation of two other teachers for three periods each, reflections / analyses of lessons, emergency plans, two video analyses, seven journal entries, weekly summations, a personal philosophy updated from 495C, two bulletin boards, and weekly schedules.

Assignments

Lesson Plans

The only works that were required to be submitted digitally were the lesson plans and portfolio. Plans were posted on TaskStream® for world languages, whose template accepts text input for the following fields in the following order (See Image A-1, below):
• Basic Information – title, author’s name, source of lesson, date of creation, date of modification, grade level, language level, duration of lesson
• Key Concepts - objectives, rationale, standard of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
• Materials - for students’ and teachers’ use, including a place to link websites and / or upload documents, presentations, and / or multimedia files
• Lesson Structure - including introduction, activities, interactions, assessments / rubrics, and conclusion
• Notes and / or comments
• Lesson analysis and reflection

Reflections and Other

Reflections were allowed to be hand-written and other assignments were allowed to be submitted in hardcopy. Therefore, only some reflections and other assignments are included in the data summary.
Image A-1. TaskStream® lesson plan template for world languages.
Appendix F

Initial Participant Survey on Qualtrics®
Serving Students

On a scale of 0-6 (zero being the least) how well are you able to support student learning using digital technology?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

On a scale of 0-6 (zero being the least) how well are you able to support students in their learning efforts in general?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Experience with technology

In the past, what types of activities did you do with a notebook computer? (check all that apply)

- research
- note taking
- paper writing
- social networking on a specific site(s)
- instant messaging
- professional networking with classmates by exchanging general ideas, discussing impressions, sharing
- collaborating
- self-reviewing
- other
What do you usually use it for now? (check all that apply)

- research
- note taking
- paper writing
- social networking on (a) specific site(s)
- instant messaging
- professional networking with classmates by exchanging general ideas, discussing impressions, sharing
- collaborating
- self-reviewing
- other

Which applications do you use regularly, for either coursework or social endeavors?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coursework</th>
<th>Social endeavors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iCall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iChat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iDVD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iMovie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPhoto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iTunes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iWeb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe your experience with these applications prior to your entry in the Methods course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>iCal</th>
<th>iChat</th>
<th>iDVD</th>
<th>iMovie</th>
<th>iPhoto</th>
<th>iTunes</th>
<th>iWeb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considerably familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Familiar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where did you learn about the following applications? Click all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Workshops</th>
<th>Individual Instructors</th>
<th>Peers in the College of Education</th>
<th>Roommates</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Self-taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iCal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iChat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iDVD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iMovie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPhoto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iTunes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iWeb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you need to learn more about an application, how do you go about doing that?


In a typical day, how much of your time is spent using applications for coursework? (Choose one)

- less than 20%
- 20%
- 40%
- 60%
- 80%
- more than 80%
- If you answered 40% or more, is it worthwhile or is it busy work? Explain.
# World Language Course Work

How is the educational experience in WL 411 different from what you expected / heard it would be?

---

How has looking at your teaching through video altered your conception of yourself as a teacher?

---

How has blogging reflections about your teaching video altered your conception of yourself as a teacher?

---

Does blogging help you ‘think about your thinking’? If so, give examples.

---
How would you describe the role of your computer and video resources in your learning to become a World Language educator?

What, if anything, have you learned about teaching that you can directly connect to having a notebook computer?

What, if anything, have you learned about student learning that you can directly connect to having a notebook computer?

Have you had trouble-shooting issues with technology?
If so, to what extent did these problems negatively effect your perception of WL instruction via notebooks and video?

Have you had trouble-shooting issues with technology?
If so, to what extent did these problems negatively effect your perception of WL instruction via notebooks and video?

If you were required to purchase your own notebook computer, which of the previous four answers above would change and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This would Change</th>
<th>Why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The role of computer and video resources in learning to become a teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning (about teaching) that was directly connected to having a notebook computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about students that was directly connected to having a notebook computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems (specify regarding any answer here)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If your notebook computer were somehow removed from your life as of this moment, how would that effect your education / development as a teacher?

In other words, if you did not have a notebook computer, what would you miss (and why)?
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Instructor Focus Group Topics

The following topics were broached with the expectation that information gleaned as a result may aid in triangulation and generate instructors’ discussion of other themes remaining as-yet unclear to researchers:

- Instructors’ prior experience blogging with students, preparation regarding it, attitudes about it, rationale for its use, strategies for implementing it, logistics of carrying it out
- Purpose, value, results of blogging with students
- What worked well, what did not work well, and why; what was memorable
- Trouble-shooting issues for students, technical support for students
- Responding to general technological developments, choosing / changing software, features / affordances of software
- How having all of students’ work online and blogging compared to past pedagogical practices and experiences for these instructors
- The issue of connecting online discussion with seminar activity in class
- Audience
- Turn-taking
- Feedback (instructor and peer); questions versus statements as catalysts for continued discourse; expressing thoughts versus feelings
- Participation (instructors and students), instructors’ role
- Community online and in class, rapport; getting to know someone in the blogosphere and in a lecture hall, assertiveness
- Characterization of the interaction on blogs
- Peer collaboration, responsibility, professionalism, vulnerability, validation
- Nature of the reflective process using blogs, time investment, potential for longitudinal continuity, expanding the autobiography exercise over time
- How blogging compared / related to other digital means of submitting work
• The volume of work online; division of labor between instructors and their students; ownership; quality of work

• Learning about students’ thinking, instructors learning along with students

• Unit theory with practice

• Students’ level of professional development over time

• Blogging’s potential to reveal world language education undergraduates’ previously undiscovered lack of evolution

• Cohort members’ locations (countries) and decision whether or not to blog

• Effect on instructors’ own motivation level, reflection activity, confidence

• Keeping track of assignments, grades

• What the instructors were in the process of changing for future blog use in Methods courses, improving their instructional blogging practice for students’ development

• Instructors’ intent to stay in contact with students, research interests, future professional plans

• Vision for expanded use of blogging for the two-year certification block

• Connecting cohorts (with those from before and after) through blogging

• Initiatives for blogging between world language education undergraduates and secondary school world language students

• Associated others’ willingness to engage in lifelong learning

• Practice and guidance for teachers who want to do instructional blogging

• The requirement for future cohorts to purchase the computers rather than having the university’s College of Education provide them for borrowing during the block

• The university’s College of Education being checked by National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education for alignment to standards

• Researcher’s hope to keep in contact with instructors

• Anything else the instructors wanted to talk about

The focus group also discussed the relationship between Spanish language and culture and language teacher training, and aligning the World Language Education Department and other
departments in Curriculum and Instruction, and approaching the problem of supervisors who do not use much technology.
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Participant Focus Group Interview Questions

1. What benefit, if any, was there in knowing that your peers were there (online) during study abroad?
2. Did your online interaction with peers affect your experiences upon return? Explain.
3. Were there any times that you read peers’ blogs that you were not assigned to read? If so, were there any times that you wanted to comment but refrained since it was not your turn, so to speak?
4. Was the tone of this blogging different compared to earlier blogging experiences with your certification-block instructors (Fall 2009-May 2011)? If so, how (if at all) did that affect your learning?
5. Are you still in contact with anyone (including instructors) that you communicated with during certification-block (including study abroad)? Explain.
   (If so, how often, by what means, what topics, etc.)
6. What affected the timing, frequency, and / or length of your postings both State-side (here in the United States and abroad)?
7. How do you compare the development of yourself as a teacher during State-side experiences and during study-abroad?
8. What are the biggest factors that affect your technology use for teaching and self-development now that you are officially entering the teaching profession?
9. Here are target-language excerpts that you posted on blog during study abroad (hand each person their photocopy). Do you feel that you’ve progressed substantially since you wrote that? If so, in what way and how due to what factors?
10. Is there anything else that you’d like to say?
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Transcript of Principal Researcher’s In-person Request for Reflection on Language Learner Autobiography

Hi, I am researcher Dana Webber as you may remember.
I am here to invite you to review and respond to your language learner autobiography and associated comments, written in Fall 2009.
Brenda said this could serve as one of your journal entries if you copy, paste, and print for her.
If you are interested, please email me.
I will send you a copy of your LLAB. Feel free to simply reply to the email with whatever you want to write upon seeing what you had said a year and a half ago.
Thanks
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Principal Researcher’s Subsequent E-mail Request for Reflection on Language Learner Autobiography

Hi!
Thank you so much for considering this idea that I offered at your most recent seminar.
And THANK YOU to the people who already did it!!! Excellent Work.
To clarify for those who weren't there or who didn't understand,
Brenda said that you may do a reaction to the language learner autobiography that you wrote a year and a half ago.
If you email me that you're interested, I will send you a copy of what you had written; you look it over and comment, add, whatever...as a response to what I send you. Before you press "send," be sure to copy and paste onto a word doc so that you can hand to Brenda as one of your journal entries.
Good luck, keep it up, you're almost certified and have a well-deserved break to look forward to.
What you've done is profound and will have great effect, even if you can't see it right now.

Sincerely,
Dana (the researcher)
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Jane’s Facebook Template for Hispanic Heritage Lesson

Nombre: 

Clase: 2 3 4

Sonia Sotomayor is busy being supreme!!

Información Básica:
Sexo: Mujer
Fecha de nacimiento: el 25 de junio de 1954
Padres: Juan Sotomayor y Celina Báez
Hermanos: Juan Sotomayor
Ciudad de origen: Bronx, NY
¿Cómo es?
1. Trabajadora
2. Simpática
3. Inteligente

Gustos e intereses:
1. Estudiar Las Leyes
2. Viajar a Puerto Rico
About him/her:

 Judge Sonia Sotomayor is a very esteemed woman. Not only did she graduate from Princeton with honors, but she also earned her law degree from Yale. After working as a private practice lawyer, she joined the U.S. District Court in 1992. In August of 2009, she officially became a justice of the Supreme Court. She is the first Latina woman to hold a spot on the Supreme Court. An interesting fact about Judge Sotomayor is that she has had diabetes since she was 8 years old.
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Jane’s Bullfighting PowerPoint Presentation

The Festival of San Fermín and The Running of the Bulls

“El Encierro” takes place in Pamplona, Spain.

La Historia

The Festival celebrates San Fermín

- Traveled and preached Christian doctrine
- Bishop at the age of 24
- Martyred at 31
- Was decapitated but legend has it that he was tied to a bull and dragged through the arena. He was actually Saint Saturnino.

¿Cuándo? July 8th to the 14th
- “El encierro” takes place after day break on the 7th
- Must be a male
- Began in 1901
- Practical reason: To move bulls to the arena

Ropa Típica

- Pantalones blancos
- Camisa Blanca
- Camisa negra
- Camisa roja
- Chaqueta negra

- Stage
  - Passage of Santo Domingo
  - Most dangerous part with little escape route
  - El Ayuntamiento
  - Short wide and relatively safe
  - La Estafeta
  - Small and narrow cobblestone path
Virtual Tour

Injuries?
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Jane’s Worksheet for Students to Complete during Bullfight Presentation

**Directions:** Work individually or in pairs to answer the following questions, on a separate sheet of paper.

1. What is the name of the bull that is raised specifically for bullfighting?
2. What is the name of the bull ring in Spanish?
3. When did bullfighting switch from horseback to on-foot? Who was the key figure who came up with the rules?
4. How do you say bullfight in Spanish?
5. How many “tercios” (stages) are there in a bull fight? What are they?
6. Briefly describe what happens in each stage of the fight.
7. Can bulls be pardoned? How?
8. What can the matador win if he performs extremely well?
9. What is it called when a matador is hit with the bull’s horn?
10. Why is there controversy around the bullfighting tradition?
11. Which countries have raised the most controversy?
12. Where has bullfighting been banned?
13. What do you think the sign that says “Tortura no es cultura” means?
14. Although bullfighting has been a major cultural tradition for around three centuries, there is a major movement growing against the tradition. Write three paragraphs about bullfighting. The first should summarize the tradition. The second should talk about why people are anti-bullfighting. Lastly, write a paragraph about which side you are on and why.
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Jane’s Postcard Project Sample

¡Buenos días Paco!

¿Cómo estás? Me llamo Señorita y soy de Pennsylvania, EEUU. Mi cumpleaños es el de agosto. Tengo veinte y un años. ¿Cuántos años tienes?

I found this picture of Alicante online and I am really excited to visit it! It’s the castle of Santa Barbara and it looks beautiful. I can only imagine that you can see the entire city from the top. It was built in the 9th century and used as a fortress until the 18th century. After that, it was occasionally used as a fortress. In 1963, it was opened to the public.

Paco, I am very excited to meet you and spend time in Spain!

Hasta pronto,
VITA

Dana E. Webber

FORMAL EDUCATION

2006, 2013 Curriculum and Instruction, MEd; Instructional Systems, PhD.,
      The Pennsylvania State University.
1995  Instructional I Teaching Certification, Education, Lycoming College.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Spanish Teacher, Grades 9-12, Levels I, II, III, AP® V, and Literature. 1997- present, State
      College Area School District, State College, PA.

PUBLICATION

Webber, D. & Murray, O.T. (2011). World Language Education Students' Inter-continental
      Blogging during Study Abroad. In R. Bergami, S. L. Pucci, & A. Schuller (Eds.), Proceedings of
      the X Worldwide Forum on Education and Culture: Dedicated to Teaching and Learning in
      Today's Global Classroom (pp. 91-103). Rome, Italy: Worldwide Forum.

PRESENTATIONS

Burke, B.M., Brosious, S, Klebacha, S., & Webber, D. (Upcoming, 2013). The EPD Model:
      Coaching Teachers to Use CLT in Classrooms. Presentation at the ACTFL Convention and World
      Languages Expo, Orlando, FL.

Webber, D. (2012, November). World Language Teaching Certification Candidates’ Inter-
      continental Blogging during Study Abroad. Research Roundtable Presentation at the ACTFL
      Convention and World Languages Expo, Philadelphia, PA.

Burke, B. M., Cherpillod, R., Goodwin, M., Klebacha, S., Pearson, L., Schwarten, M., & Webber,
      D. (2011, November). Bridging the Gap: Promoting Quality World Language Pedagogy with
      Teamwork. Panel Discussion about roles of pre-service and mentor teachers and relations between
      University and K-12 institutions at the ACTFL Convention and World Languages Expo, Denver,
      CO.

      World Language Education. Research project presented at PSU Graduate Exhibition, State
      College, PA.

Olcese, N. R., Murray, O. T., & Webber, D. (2011, February). World Language Teacher
      Education in the 21st Century: Modern Digital Tools Extending our Capacity. Research project
      presented at AACTE’s 63rd Annual Meeting and Exhibits, San Diego, CA.

Webber, D. & Burke, B. M. (2010, November). Blogs and IMs: The Ultimate Communicative
      Experience for Secondary Students. Presentation at the ACTFL Convention and World Languages
      Expo, Boston, MA.

Webber, D. (2010, March). EDUCATE WLED: Improving Education through Technological
      Innovation. Research project presented at PSU Graduate Exhibition, State College, PA.

      How and Why. Research project presented at AATSP Rio Arriba Chapter Meeting, Selinsgrove,
      PA.

      Pedagogical Innovation. Research project presented at CALICO conference, East Lansing, MI.