

Reflections on the combined World Language/English as a Second Language methods course: Perspectives, challenges, and prospects for our decade

Paul A. García, *University of Kansas (retired)*

Patricia Davis-Wiley, *The University of Tennessee*

“Which road do I take?” (Alice)

“Where do you want to go?” (Cat)

“I don’t know.” (Alice)

“Then, it doesn’t matter.” (Cat)

Abstract

This experientially and literature-based position paper considers the implications of a combined methods class for K-12 world language (WL) and English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher candidates. Such a course is typically one semester in duration, and is replete with unavoidable impracticalities. Inherent in most WL methods sections is the instructor’s challenge of how to address pedagogical issues that are applicable to all languages and those that are germane to the individual languages represented by the

Paul A. García (Ph.D., University of Illinois) began teaching in New York area schools in 1965. In (2008-2010), he served as Visiting Associate Professor of Foreign Language Education and Director of the Ph.D. program in Second Language Acquisition, Instructional Technology (SLA/IT) at the University of South Florida after his retirement from the University of Kansas School of Education. Prior to that he taught German and Spanish, K-12, and was the FL supervisor for the Kansas City, MO, Schools (1973-1998), where he implemented immersion language programs for French, German, and Spanish. He was President of ACTFL in 2000, NADSFL (1989-92), FLAM (1984-88), and ALL (1992-1995). His publications and over 100 conference presentations concern immersion education, listening comprehension, methods pedagogy, and general teacher education practice.

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

enrollees, whose respective fields may include any combination of French, German, Russian, Chinese, Latin, and Spanish. Although the existence of such a linguistically-overloaded WL methods course may well be a budgetary necessity, we argue that the growing appearance of a combined WL and ESL methods section possesses sufficiently unique parameters that compel pragmatic reflection. All stakeholders must share a rationale that addresses multiple objectives. Course intent and content must be praxis-oriented to meet the pedagogical needs of preservice teachers as well as heed the K-12 community’s expectations for teacher preparation. In this paper, we offer recommendations that address this contemporary methods challenge.

Introduction

Dauer im Wechsel, the permanence of change, is an expression that students of German literature and culture come to learn. It is, of course, the reality that educators

... any given aspect of school exists in a state of continuous revision.

live, irrespective of their teaching assignment. The reason is simple: any given aspect of school exists in a state of continuous revision. Be it technology implementation, textbook usage, instructional practices, assessment, or classroom management decisions, successful teaching is akin to hitting a moving pedagogical target, continuously—and cinematic versions of master teachers in the classroom are wide of the mark (Raimo, Delvin-Scherer, & Zinicola, 2002). This permanent flux is understood by teacher trainers. In the world language (WL) teacher education arena, the complex dialectic presently includes two interrelated challenges for the next decade:

- The first is to shape the role and scope of the methods component for supporting WL teacher candidates, be they pre-service undergraduates/ graduates or in-service professionals wanting to obtain additional certification. This challenge, which we have discussed elsewhere (García, Hernández & Davis-Wiley, 2010), will persist as a topic of concern as general teacher education undergoes continued reform (Levine, 2006).
- The second challenge delineating change in WL teacher education—the focus of our paper—is the necessary skill set and experience of WL methods faculty who assume greater responsibilities by preparing yet another sub-group of teacher education students in the same methods section: the beginning English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers for English language learners (ELs), that growing U.S. student population whose home language is not English.¹

The origin of the combined WL/ESL methods course may often be fiscal. Financial considerations may suggest to budget-conscious leadership the merits of offering a unitary language methods section. Enrollment and/or staffing circumstances may prevent separate methods classes from being the optimal option.² Other institutions may have traditionally offered one sequence (perhaps entitled “Teaching Language in the K-12 Schools”), irrespective of an acknowledged differentiation between teaching a WL and teaching ESL. Regardless of whether the inception of the combined course occurs by administrative decree (thus beyond the instructor’s control) or as a result of deliberate faculty conceptualization in light of local realities (such as a low

Reflections on the combined WL/ESOL methods course

student enrollment of K-12 WL education majors), the methods instructor's critical task remains: how to deliver instruction to both WL and ESL audiences that meets appropriate pedagogical and professional standards in two disciplines. Should an ESL-only methods section not exist and the need for one arise—but whose inception is constrained somehow, then the combined WL/ESL methods class would at a minimum guarantee that pertinent state licensure requirements will have been met. This action would thereby ensure that future K-12 ELs have equitable access to a learning environment taught by qualified, credentialed teachers who have completed a methods sequence.

The genesis of combined methods courses may also be attributed in part to two contemporaneous national education phenomena. First, we continue to experience a surge in EL enrollment in K-12. This growth has occurred primarily over the past two decades. From an estimated 3.1 million students in 1990-1991 (Payán & Nettles, 2008), there are now approximately 5.4 million or more ELs enrolled in 55% of our nation's 119,150 schools [Keigher (2009, p. 8); National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA), 2010].³ The raw numbers are compelling. The increase postulates a critical need for additional ESL teachers (and for supplementary professional development in language acquisition for all teachers) in the coming decade (Ballantyne, Sanderman & Levy, 2008). Second is a more complex factor: the numerical decrease of WL teacher candidates. This is a long-standing, well-documented dilemma (Miller, 2010) facing our globalized American society. Paralleling the overall school-age population growth nationally, the absolute numerical increase of enrollees in both traditionally taught and less-commonly taught languages reported by Jackson and Malone (2009) and Rhodes and Pufahl (2010) further exacerbates the WL teacher shortage. Simultaneously, we are witness to a sharp drop in existing K-12 WL teaching posts that is often the case in those communities where financial constraints and/or curricular decisions—some possibly related to No Child Left Behind, as Johnson, Malone, Peyton, Pufahl, and Rhodes (2009) suggest—have reduced the number of WL students and/or eliminated long-sequence programs of study.⁴

Be they beginning professionals or experienced WL teachers seeking add-on endorsement in ESL or undergraduate dual majors (i.e., in ESL/French or Spanish/ESL), the pre-service and in-service educators interested in EL education will encounter a wide array of classroom-related instructional challenges. These result from the manifold aspects of teaching English to K-12 pupils whose requirements for promotion include mandatory, state-sponsored high-stakes assessments that offer few appropriate accommodations for language learners (Acosta, Rivera & Shafer Willner, 2008; Shafer Willner, Rivera, & Acosta, 2009). The future EL teachers' pedagogical skill needs range from developing basic language acquisition activities (Graves, 2009) to teaching content in fields such as science and mathematics. Accordingly, they would employ a *sheltered content instruction* approach, which is defined as the use of teaching practices and materials adaptation to make grade-level content area learning linguistically accessible to pupils (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2007). Additionally, the methods course students

Should an ESL-only methods section not exist and the need for one arise—but whose inception is constrained somehow, then the combined WL/ESL methods class would at a minimum guarantee that pertinent state licensure requirements will have been met.

in ESL must become acquainted with phonology, morphology, pragmatics and syntax (Adger, Snow, & Christian, 2002). They learn how to present to the EL matters of word usage and grammar pattern choice (the linguistics term is *appropriacy*), discourse length expansion, and even the grouping together of certain words in a specific order (*collocations*, such as “God, motherhood, and apple pie,” “baby Swiss,” or “red, white, and blue”). In this way, the ESL teacher helps students develop aspects of English literacy, and provides insights and examples of how Americans express themselves (and what they mean) when they speak or write. The ESL methods students learn about teaching reading in content areas (Ballantyne et al., 2008)—itself an obligation not necessarily limited to future language teachers. Their logical expectation is that the WL methods professor, now serving as *their* ESL methods instructor, will address such concerns effectively. (This would also be the expectation of a WL methods student on vocabulary acquisition, for example, if an ESL instructor were to direct a combined ESL/WL methods class.)

The subtleties of each discipline’s particular knowledge base, and their applicability in the K-12 WL or ESL classroom, may well overwhelm the student enrolled in a WL/ESL methods class.

The subtleties of each discipline’s particular knowledge base, and their applicability in the K-12 WL or ESL classroom, may well overwhelm the student enrolled in a WL/ESL methods class. Where the combined methods class may have once been a standard curriculum feature previously limited to smaller institutions, the growth in the incidence of the two-in-one ESL/WL methods course calls for reconsideration of course objectives—*intent*—and course materials—*content*. One cannot invoke past practices as a guide for future programmatic decision-making, given the pace of school population change and language interests in the K-12 sector.

The combined WL/ESL methods class is a present reality facing contemporary and continuing challenges. We should reconceptualize this combined course, therefore, and then restructure it into a professional advancement model, whereupon it has its place within the larger context of teacher education.

As instructors of both WL and ESL and combined WL/ESL methods, with over 40 years of teaching and K-12 administrative experience (at five universities in three Midwestern and two southern states), we reflect on the generally-accepted aims of teaching and the requisite aspects of language learning methods for both WL and ESL teacher education candidates. These draw upon the pedagogically ideal and pragmatic bases that characterize successful schools that produce successful students. A principled framework for the combined WL/ESL methods course, we believe, helps education reform help to achieve the goals set for K-12 teaching and learning: highly-trained, qualified teachers; strong administrative leadership; extensive parental and community support; and a positive learning environment, as Marzano (2003) explains.

Awareness of these critical factors for school change is prerequisite for developing the language methods student’s knowledge, skills, and teaching disposition. It empowers future K-12 teachers to provide the WL or ESL student exemplary teaching for language and content area learning. The redesigned combined methods course thus affirms the broader concerns of education while it addresses the real issues inherent in

Reflections on the combined WL/ESOL methods course

a combined WL/ESL methods course. We begin by situating the successful combined course as the product of five vectors:

- First and second are the two K-12 student populations (ESL and WL), and their respective program and academic requirements;
- Third, the career goals of K-12 WL or ESL teachers;
- Fourth and fifth are the expectations of each academic discipline, ESL and WL.

Their influence is shown through describing a combined WL/ESL methods class, taken from real-life experiences; it displays the dichotomies in objectives of the ESL and the WL methods students. These five forces, we argue, create and sustain a tension whose differing but related objectives shape the methods course *intent*. The professional goal of what teaching language means to WL and ESL methods students—the fourth and fifth vectors— is illustrative here. The study of language as language is the traditional province of K-12 WL classes. WL teachers primarily teach students about languages, even when language programs embrace the *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century* (SFLL) [National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (NSFLEP), 2006] and its advocacy for language to be learned as an avenue to various ends. The WL classroom teacher's primary focus is on the language itself, and content is selected to show language use in context. The vocabulary, verbs, idioms and their usage are the chief focus of student activities, therefore, and are augmented by important aspects of the speakers' culture.

The study of language as language is the traditional province of K-12 WL classes. [...] The WL classroom teacher's primary focus is on the language itself, and content is selected to show language use in context.

The counterpoint to WL programs is subject-specific content area learning. This is nominally the domain of the ESL teacher in K-12, who, together with secondary school subject area colleagues—in biology, social studies, and math—must teach with, across, and through two disciplines: English language study and the respective content. The ESL teacher's focus is split between teaching content and language — teaching content through the language. This objective— language as content and language in content—is more complex than those goals traditionally established for the K-12 WL classroom of *language study as language*. Although language immersion students do indeed learn language and content through content [Met (1991); García (1990; 2009)], their impact on broad issues in WL teacher education (and WL study) is minimal, because immersion, being offered in only 323 of the nation's 98,000 schools [Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), 2006; U.S. Dept. of Education, 2011] constitutes a very low percentage of learners nationally.

The counterpoint to WL programs is subject-specific content area learning. This is nominally the domain of the ESL teacher in K-12, who, together with secondary school subject area colleagues—in biology, social studies, and math—must teach with, across, and through two disciplines: English language study and the respective content.

Through understanding the broader perspective of language and content (which does not contradict the objectives of varied learning goals that SFLL endorses), we can develop a joint WL/ESL methods experience that disperses the language/content

tension as simultaneously it resolves potential discipline-related disparities. Reviewing relevant research literature contributes to establishing the necessary course guidelines.

Review of the Literature

Despite the abundant research regarding teacher education in general and EL and WL education in particular, there is a dearth of published discussion treating either the combined WL/ESL methods course or its origins.

Despite the abundant research regarding teacher education in general and EL and WL education in particular, there is a dearth of published discussion treating either the combined WL/ESL methods course or its origins. No prior literature exists that illuminates the two essential aspects of instructional decision-making—the course *intent* (the instructor’s consideration of the objectives of language teacher education) and its *content* (course information). As already mentioned, the former (instructor intent) may not have played a role in its inception. An overview of individual ESL and WL methods topics, however, serves to address the latter.

Except for the critical additions of SFLL and ESL standards [*Pre K-12 English Language Proficiency Standards* (2006), developed by Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)] and approaches to communicative language teaching, we contend that course content for ESL and WL teacher candidates may not have undergone extensive change as the standards and communicative language teaching might suggest. Support demonstrating this stasis is seen when we compare Grosse’s two empirical studies (1991, 1993) with the findings of subsequent research. Grosse provides a meta-analysis describing the topics pertinent to second language methods instruction during the 1980s and 1990s. Her investigation represents the most extensive formulations of course content available. Grosse sought to identify a common core of goals and objectives for ESL and WL methods courses. Syllabi were examined in the two studies to determine course content and the amount of class time dedicated to each topic. In the first study, Grosse (1991) invited 120 teacher preparation institutions to participate. She received 94 responses, consisting of 55 ESL course syllabi and 77 questionnaires completed by ESL methods instructors. Her second report (1993) analyzed 157 WL methods course syllabi, drawn from 144 post-secondary institutions. It presented a side-by-side comparison of content and percentages of time spent for ESL and WL course topics. Included among these were the following: the importance of language study; first and second language acquisition principles; the relationships between language and culture; meeting students’ diverse learning styles; planning increased instructional objectives; and classroom activities. These topics retain their value for future teachers. As such, they continue to be part of contemporary language methods syllabi. In her concluding recommendations for future discussion, Grosse (1993) suggested that instructors address the following issues for language methods content; their abiding presence and relevance two decades later is noteworthy: “...development of the teacher as decision-maker and problem solver....empowerment of the teacher through professionalization....development of metacognitive awareness in effective teaching” (p. 42), and “reflective teaching” (p. 43).

While the WL and the ESL methods syllabi she reviewed had collectively addressed a similar set of content topics overall (see Appendix A), Grosse (1993) found

Reflections on the combined WL/ESOL methods course

meaningful differences, especially in the amount of class time that methods instructors in both fields reported dedicating to specific themes. The WL syllabi (Grosse, 1993) ranked culture, testing, and methods as the top three topics for methods class discussion, compared with methods, language learning theories, and writing as most important for ESL. Oral proficiency and lesson planning occupied the next two rank positions for WL, in contrast with reading, speaking, and grammar for ESL. Occupying the least important position for both method class groups were student motivation and professional attitudes or behaviors. Grosse's (1993) rank-ordered lists for methods class content further reveal that the importance (i.e., the amount of class time spent) attached to writing, reading, speaking, and pronunciation skills in ESL methods classes by instructors was greater than that given to the receptive listening skill. WL methods instructors, however, ranked writing and listening skills higher than reading and pronunciation. Finally, Grosse makes no mention of an immersion or dual immersion model in either methods sequence; only a minimal amount of teaching time for the general concept of bilingual education was listed.

Contemporaneous with and subsequent to Grosse's seminal research, other WL education scholars provided additional insights about critical issues facing teacher educators. The methods program itself was one such concern, as echoed later by Vélez-Rendón (2002), who cited it as one of five pressing challenges for teacher educators. Lange and Sims (1990) and Cooper (2004) reported related concerns. The former surveyed 95 teachers regarding their professional preparation and experiences. One of the findings pertinent to the topic of content to be covered in methods courses was their respondents' endorsement of future pre-service programs providing time to discuss classroom management. Cooper's (2004) larger survey of 341 teachers in K-12 reaffirmed the call for including practical classroom matters. Furthermore, his respondents urged that strong mentor relationships be established, which was consistent with results reported by García and Petri (1999, ACTFL; 2000) and Schulz (2000) in her comprehensive review of WL teacher education literature from 1917-2000.

Raymond (2002), in an examination of how teachers' understandings were influenced by the methods sequence and field experiences, demonstrated that WL education majors did indeed gain knowledge about how to teach from their methods course. At the same time, she highlighted their concerns in implementing the new knowledge when circumstances in the practicum assignments did not permit the pre-service students the opportunity to practice what they had learned. This is a significant difficulty when we consider the consensus regarding K-12 students' target language use, as Allen (2002) determined from her nationwide survey on the implementation of SFL. She found that there was general agreement that students must communicate in the WL, just as Grosse (1993) had earlier concluded when ranking proficiency as an essential topic for WL methods classes, and speaking and pronunciation for ESL methods.

More recently, and similar to Grosse's earlier work, Wilbur (2007) sought to identify a set of WL methods course goals through an examination of syllabi at 32 universities. She ascertained that action research and reflective practice (Freeman, 2002; Freeman &

Johnson, 1998) were not always a part of WL or ESL course objectives, just as Grosse (1991, 1993) had previously determined that the use of the WL in the classroom and addressing the needs of diverse learners were not present in the syllabi. Taken together,

That a national language teacher education curriculum could be developed for individual WL and ESL or combined WL/ESL methods content may be an elusive quest. [...] We suggest that the basis of a default standardized methods class curriculum found for WL and ESL education has been produced.

the work of these two researchers seems to document a *de facto* consensus regarding appropriate topics for inclusion in methods course syllabi—thereby affirming the continuing validity of Grosse’s recommendations. They also call to mind Schulz’ (2000) observation that the field has maintained—and still not resolved—the same teacher education concerns for more than 80 years.

The consistency of methods topics persists, therefore, despite the addition of contemporary teaching approaches and standards to the teacher education curricula. It complicates the conceptualization of a combined WL/ESL methods course that would possess applicable or uniform content. That a national language teacher education curriculum could be developed for individual WL and ESL or combined WL/ESL methods content may be an elusive quest. Its organizational underpinnings provide valuable guidance to a resolution, however. We suggest that the basis of a default standardized methods class curriculum found for WL and ESL education has been produced. The three extant factors or operant conditions in methods practices that have contributed to this *content consistency* are:

- Dependence on individual methods instructors’ interpretation of what is important for course coverage, and what is needed for that university’s surrounding communities;
- Methods textbooks (Hernández, 1996; Horwitz, 2008; Lee and VanPatten, 2003; Omaggio Hadley, 2001; Shrum and Glisan, 2010), whose availability and respective topics influence instructors’ decision-making regarding syllabi; and,
- Endeavors made in the last decade by teacher educators to align methods and other course content with guidelines of professional education groups for program recognition, such as the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC, 2002) and, most importantly, the WL and ESL teacher preparation program standards developed by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in cooperation with the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL; ACTFL/NCATE, 2002) and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL/NCATE, 2010).⁵

The first two and additional factors that shape a local WL or ESL methods sequence may not necessarily extend beyond its respective service area or state. The third, the NCATE program standards (PS), however, do. Their impact on language teacher education programs seeking recognition (and subsequent state accreditation) has begun to be felt nationally (Dhonau & McAlpine, 2005; García, Hernández & Davis-Wiley, 2010), precisely because program standards connect course *content* to course *intent*. At a minimum, course intent for a combined ESL/WL methods class requires

Reflections on the combined WL/ESOL methods course

Table 1. ACTFL Standards Compared With TESOL Standards for Teacher Preparation

	ACTFL Standards	TESOL Standards
1	Language, Linguistics And Comparisons: Second Language (L2) Proficiency; L2 Language Systems; Comparisons Of English With L2s; L2 Communication Skills	Language As A System, Language Acquisition And Development
2	Cultures, literatures, cross-disciplinary concepts; L2 distinctive views and practices; integration of other disciplines <i>vis-à-vis</i> L2	Culture and its impact on student learning
3	Language acquisition theories and instructional practices; use of L2 in meaningful interaction	Planning, implementing and managing instruction
4	Integration of standards into curriculum and instruction; lesson and unit planning and use of appropriate resources; connecting L2 with other disciplines	Assessment: issues for ELs; language proficiency; classroom-based; local, state and federal
5	Assessment of languages and cultures: appropriate age and L2 level assessment; reflection and reporting of formative and summative student performance results	Professionalism: ESL research, history; professional development; partnerships; advocacy
6	Professionalism: professional development; strengthening of L2 linguistic and cultural competence; reflection of one's practice in the profession; interaction with professional organizations	

consideration of the PS. This is because each document describes the essential practical knowledge base for the respective training program [NCATE uses *specialty program* (SP)], and thus for pre-service teachers. Although similarities exist between the WL and the ESL PS, as we show in Table 1 above, their discipline-related specificity clarifies the contrasts. These differentiated expectations for WL and ESL teacher candidates arise in part in the portfolio documentation that the teacher education program or unit submits to NCATE as evidence of its adherence to the PS. These considerations aid in constructing a framework to establish our recommendations for the combined methods course, and serve as a point of departure for others in WL or ESL teacher education who undertake the development of either a unitary or combined methods course. The PS mandate obligatory reflections on course content and course intent.⁶

As can be seen, matters of intent drive matters of content, and vice-versa. Congruencies and differences exist. Both sets of standards, for example, call for the study of language as a unified system that includes grammar, syntax, semantics, phonology, and morphology. Language acquisition is integrated into K-12 content or discipline areas (WL immersion and partial immersion programs and ESL education

in general). For WL education, the pre-service candidate's oral skills attainment is a feature that speaks directly to quality concerns. The expected achievement benchmark standard of Advanced-Low on the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI; Breiner-Sanders, Lowe, Miles, & Swender, 2000) or level check serves to evaluate a SP's ability to prepare qualified K-12 teachers, just as the ACTFL Learner Guidelines (Swender & Duncan, 1998) are a means to evaluate K-12 students' language achievement. The same holds for ESL teacher education (TESOL, 2006). Similarly, for WL and ESL teacher candidates, structured lesson planning or the creation of learning units is a customary assignment. Teacher professionalism is also a critical feature for each, and so continuing education—such as the WL teacher improving his or her oral proficiency and cultural knowledge, or the ESL teacher developing new classroom instruction techniques—is stressed as well. Teacher education standards in both the broader and specific contexts thus play a direct role for the combined WL/ESL methods course.

Teaching Matters

Education researchers have analyzed the critical components of successful K-12 schools and their programs (Anness, 2003; Clark, 1988; Levine, 2006; Meier, 1995; National Capital Language Resource Center (NCLRC), n.d.; Sizer, 1984, 1996; Walqui, 2000; Weinbaum, Allen, Blythe, Seidel, Simon, & Rubin, 2004; Wong-Fillmore, 1985). Their reflections are directly related to pre-service and in-service training for ESL and WL as well. The evidence-based consensus reached by these investigators suggests that key to high-quality teacher induction is its direct coordination with the goals of successful K-12 student achievement. We identify five characteristics of this fundamental tenet:

- Suitably rigorous academic challenges are for all—all students can learn.
- Active and collaborative student/student learning is essential.
- Teacher/student interactions foster thinking skills usage over yes/no responses.
- Enriching in-class and co-curricular educational experiences are foremost.
- Supportive community environments must exist.

Developing an exemplary WL/ESL methods experience means examining the patterns that undergird the methods program's content and intent, and aligning them with the relevant academic goals for K-12 WL and ESL students. Table 2 presents our summary of the heterogeneous attributes of the populations for whom future WL and ESL teachers in K-12 will design, plan, and implement curricular objectives.

In reviewing methods course syllabi to determine appropriate content for WL and ESL teacher candidates whose professional assignments derive from the features of Table 2, a neutral observer might erroneously presume that a static language methods student cohort might exist. It probably never did, although some WL and ESL methods syllabi or course descriptors, if considered in isolation, might cause their readers to conclude that the two methods student groups, WL and ESL, are embarked on career paths that will lead them to very similar future teaching assignments. Our experience and conversations with other methods instructors indicates otherwise. There is—and has been—no methods cohort whose needs are congruent. Today's language education majors enter the methods class with divergent career aspirations in mind;

Reflections on the combined WL/ESOL methods course

Table 2. Comparison of the English Learner With the World Language Learner, K-12

English Learners	World Language Learners
Attendance at school is compulsory	WL study is elective; mostly offered at Gr. 9-12
Multiple grade entry points are necessary	Fixed or controlled entry points prevail
Multiple calendar entries are necessary	Fixed or controlled entry points prevail
High transient rate of students	Low transient rate expected; stable cohort
L2 (English) required for life in the US	English is Ss' L1; L2 not required for US
L1 knowledge perceived as deficit by some	L2 education seen as a desideratum
L2 education perceived as deficit education	L2 desirable, no career disadvantage
Diverse learner styles affirmed; interest in using language learning strategies, focus on higher order thinking skills in evidence	Diverse learner styles affirmed; language learning strategies employed; higher-order thinking skills usage is less evident
Culturally, socio-economically and residentially isolated	Mainstream US citizenry, fewer minorities enroll in some areas of a high school's curricular offerings
L1 literacy may not exist	L1 literacy exists for the majority of students
Drop-out risk at the high school level is high	<i>Course</i> withdrawal after 2 years is frequent
Affirming parental or home support for learning exists, but is in L1; the lack of parental L2 skills may not often permit personal tutoring of the child or provide access to others to request assistance	Parental support for learning exists, but is different from the support found in EL families, due to the mainstream social, economic, and residential environments and traditions of American schooling that most WL students share
Learning must include L2 acquisition and content area learning on or near grade-level	Usually, language is taught as a series of forms and functions; aspects of structure and grammar prevail
Content/subject matter learning important because of promotion and high-stakes testing in various subjects at various grade levels	The WL is studied, work is not necessarily content-dependent, as in the case of an EL studying biology
High-stakes testing is mandatory	WL study not yet a high-stakes testing subject
Curriculum objectives are in a continual "catch-up" mode, and/or based on state requirements that often are insufficiently undifferentiated for ELs except by statutory accommodation; student-student interactions heavily relied upon, esp. in K-8. Skills-getting and skills-using are well-balanced	Curriculum is either wholly teacher-created (infrequently), textbook-mediated, and standards-driven. WL program may be sequential or articulated. Student-student interaction or activities are infrequent in teacher-fronted or teacher-directed lessons. Skills-using activities often predominate
Learner/teacher strategies are prevalent	Learner/teacher strategies are prevalent

4 skills taught + 1 (= American culture in general) + 1 (= American school culture, its rules, its written/unwritten sociocultural expectations)	4 skills + 1 taught (+1 = WL culture or cultures)
Register—the variety of language styles and usage that the L1 native speaker employs for different occasions, purposes, groups—must be taught and practiced. The difference between social and academic English is an important consideration for ELs to master as they attempt to learn English	Register is relatively less important in the development of WL students’ skill set than other basic structural aspects of the L2; student usage of formal or informal address varies, and is accepted as an “emerging” skill, and not socially penalized
Technologically behind, due either to family socioeconomic status (SES) or budgetary constraints in urban and rural school settings	Usually not technologically behind, due to their higher SES and (thus) access to technology; some budget constraints exist in most K-12 settings

more likely, the students enroll already conscious of vocational preferences. These professional aspirations may range from level uncertain to quite specific teaching and/or geographical preferences. The ESL methods student who has enrolled for the combined WL/ESL methods class, for example, may be an elementary education major whose graduation requirements include coursework and demonstrable proficiency in teaching the basic content areas of reading, mathematics, and science. Another registered student, a social science major, may contemplate teaching English learners to improve future employment prospects, and is willing even to teach non-English speaking adults abroad. Still another enrollee announces that she is a licensed veteran high school French/German teacher now opting to work with adult ELs. For the present, however, she is willing to consider teaching ELs at a middle school. Yet another student hopes to become an elementary school teacher in a Spanish immersion program. Their respective needs are substantial—and significantly different, which consequently dictates adjustments to class objectives, activities, and assignments—content and intent—by the WL/ESL methods instructor. We argue that such accommodations are necessary, despite affirming the contributions that are produced by the methods students’ particular practicum or previous teaching experiences and the completion of other education coursework. Their heterogeneous interests—and their future students’ language skills and needs—must be taken into account during course planning. We use Table 3 on the next page to illustrate the divergent potential WL and ESL teaching paths that the combined WL/ESL methods class students may embark upon.

Despite the lengthy enumeration of the many available career options in Table 3 on the next page, they remain the methods instructor’s starting point in decision-making. Equally clear is the corollary that we prepare for the methods cohorts’ divergent professional intentions (and their future students’ academic needs in K-12) by situating the combined WL/ESL methods course in the larger institutional context of the teacher preparation program. A responsible marriage of language education objectives (i.e., communicative skills and conversational gambits, listening comprehension activities, content-based instruction, cultural knowledge, and the manner or presentation of appropriate vocabulary are among them) with present and impending classroom

Reflections on the combined WL/ESOL methods course

realities such as grade level, type of teaching assignment, and location is vital in order to accommodate the complexities of ESL majors enrolled in a WL methods section.

Table 3. Potential WL and ESL Teaching Career Options

World Language Educator	English Learner Educator
1. Uncertain	1. Uncertain
2. K-5 FLES	2. Pull-out/Cluster/Center, ESL, K-5
3. 6-8 Middle School Language	3. Pull-out/Cluster/Center, 6-8 ESL
4. Secondary Language, 9-12	4. Pull-out/Cluster/Center, 9-12 ESL
5. Immersion, K-8	5. Sheltered Content, K-12
6. WL Exploratory Experiences (FLEX), K-8	6. Dual language, K-5/6-8/9-12
7. Post-secondary teaching, research	7. Adult ESL education
8. Heritage/Native speaker teaching	8. English as a Foreign Language (abroad)
9. <i>Au pair</i> employment in L2 setting	9. Post-secondary teaching and research

The profiles that emerge from this formulation are similar in their respective—and dissimilar—demographics. The preparatory experiences of each methods class student, including the related previous coursework, practicum experiences, and employment history, indicate that course presentation and the content the methods instructor conveys in the combined section are affected. Contrastive skill levels and educational career objectives, that is, require that we individualize the methods sequence for its participants even as we seek to produce cohesion for them. Does the ESL methods instructor work with the future adult learner educator about a “Business English” format and related vocabulary in a perfunctory manner, for example, or should K-12 students’ writing and reading skills be addressed in comprehensive detail? No such binary choice benefits both groups of methods students, unless the two distinctive topics can be purposefully and successfully coalesced—in this case, through demonstrating how sheltered instructional techniques are applicable to both ESL and WL teacher candidates’ concerns.

Such experiences are precisely the challenge encountered by the WL methods course instructor. This underlying predicament of variety with the ESL education-only methods students (dual immersion, adult education, English as a foreign language) is mirrored within the WL education-only methods section. One WL teacher candidate may be the traditional 20-22 year-old collegian, a non-native speaker intending to teach high school French, Spanish, or German. Two other enrollees are an empty-nester and a recently-retired member of the U.S. armed forces; they are native or heritage speakers of Spanish. The fourth student, just arrived in the United States a week before, is a teacher from Belgium. She has been contracted for a Kindergarten teaching position in a French immersion school, and is not knowledgeable of American education’s operational codes and systems. And so, in keeping with the desire to individualize instruction, the methods instructor makes decisions that address this diverse pre-

service population's preoccupations, backgrounds, and objectives (García, 1990, 2010; Johnson, 1994; National Association of District Supervisors of Foreign Language (NADSFL), 1999; Tedick, 2009; Tedick & Walker, 2005).

Each vignette (all taken from our own recent methods courses) raises two fundamental questions for our future endeavors as methods instructors. The first, "Why would we even consider how to combine these so disparate student populations that even within their own cohort they are so divergent?" has already been considered:

<p>"How, if we have 'seen this and done this' before, and are obliged to do so once again, can we do this yet again—but <i>better?</i>"</p>	<p>either the methods instructor in ESL or WL may be or has been the only available recourse and resource for all language educators at a certain institution, or, if the budget requires that there be a combined section, then the matter is moot. The second question is at the root of our concern. Its challenges are equally real-world but more confounding: "How, if we have 'seen this and done this' before, and are obliged to do so once again, can we do this yet again—but <i>better?</i>" The answers to</p>
---	---

these two queries address the needs of our methods students' future K-12 students. To illustrate the web of variegated teacher skill sets and pedagogical suggestions that the ESL and WL cohorts require of their methods instructor, we present two conditions, each drawn from the K-12 classroom teacher's perspective. First is the matter of entry points into a program. The second, appearing in tandem, is that of curricular content objectives.

For the K-12 WL teacher, there is normally little late enrollment in a language class. Except for the occasional child whose family circumstances dictates a move that could not be completed or delayed until the beginning of either the fall or the spring semester, late-entry WL class registration is infrequent. Consequently, other than perhaps some in-class peer tutoring or after-school help sessions, there is often little curriculum adaptation or revamping of activities to help the student achieve comparably with classmates. The typical new arrival may be an inter-district or intra-district transfer student. Despite language issues brought about by differences in textbooks, the K-12 student begins to acquire new WL vocabulary and structures within a reasonable time frame because of his or her background knowledge and reading and thinking skills. In addition, investigators have found that the knowledge of how secondary schools work helps. The school's structures, cultures, and routines become predictable to most students within a brief period. They come to know what the teacher expects during class time, and operate accordingly (Cushman, 2003, 2005; Goldwasser & Bach, 2007; Wilson & Corbett, 2001).

Contrastively, for the ESL teacher, the matter of a child's date of entry is not necessarily determined by the K-12 school year calendar or holiday periods. Instead, the EL may enroll whenever family economic needs have necessitated a move. The student may also be absent for an extended period of a month or more, depending upon family illness/caregiver responsibilities, an emergency trip abroad, or migrant work opportunities outside of the home area. It is important for the methods instructor to devote course time in assisting the ESL teacher candidate in how to deal with the educational consequences of the realities of EL transience. Assume, further, that the future teacher will have the contractual responsibility of a pull-out assignment

Reflections on the combined WL/ESOL methods course

(the child is excused, or pulled out, from one subject daily in order to attend the ESL classroom for a period). The teacher may work with a number of children simultaneously—potentially up to 10 to 15 or even more pupils per class. Each EL possesses limited skills and knowledge in English and academic content areas. The students then must compete with one another for the teacher's assistance in a 45-90 minute time frame regarding discrete assignments, sometimes about topics that the teacher is not familiar with. Simple arithmetic tells us that the minutes available for any one child are but few. The challenge here for the methods instructor is to assist the ESL teacher candidate working under such constraints to develop the requisite skills to work with tasks that are further compounded by another complication. That difficulty is the need to accommodate the students' varying levels of English, which can range from pre-emergent to early production to an intermediate stage [Haynes (1995; 2007), Peregoy and Boyle (2005), Ariza, Morales-Jones, Yahya, & Zainuddin (2010)].

To be sure, the combined WL/ESL methods class should not offer its students generalities. Practical, tangible, and relevant models and practices are required. As noted, the methods class does not exist in a vacuum. Rather, it thrives within the context of related academic courses purposely designed to facilitate and support pre-service educators across a broad spectrum. Classes on general methods, student behaviors, and multicultural perspectives, when combined with multiple practicum or field opportunities, afford the methods students much-needed learning experiences. Nevertheless, the language methods course and its instructor's experience and knowledge base become the juncture in teacher preparation when the methods student begins to develop a subject-matter consciousness as a (pre-service) *professional*. That awareness means, we believe, a sustained series of activities that require increased instructor expertise and the facilitation of observing teaching practices directly related to the methods students concerns for teaching ESL or WL. These last could be accomplished in part by critical viewing of the WGBH Educational Foundation series, *Teaching Foreign Languages, K-12* (2003), visiting area schools, working with ELs, and participating in group discussions with local K-12 instructional personnel, for example. Thompson's (2000) survey of ELs' perspectives on strategies that helped them learn can motivate methods students to determine their continuing validity, for instance. They might develop an action research project regarding Wong-Fillmore's (1985) recommendations for teacher-driven classroom language and behavior routines or review the application of listening comprehension activities for language learning (Asher, 1966, 1969; García, 1981; Krashen & Terrell, 1983; Reeds, Winitz, & García, 1977; Winitz, 1981; Winitz & Reeds, 1975)—all of which thus introduce the methods students to education research as a basis for successful teaching. These descriptive possibilities, when taken as part for the whole and operationalized within the greater framework, lead to our recommendations for the combined WL/ESL methods class.

To be sure, the combined WL/ESL methods class should not offer its students generalities. Practical, tangible, and relevant models and practices are required. As noted, the methods class does not exist in a vacuum.

Recommendations

Prospects seem to have improved of late that traditional language methods programs will continue to change for the better (Cummings Hlas & Conroy, 2010; García, Hernández, & Davis-Wiley, 2010). Contributing to this recent progress is the importance that instructors and WL/ESL teacher candidates now attach to fostering active K-12 learning environments. In such classes, the students become engaged in relevant, challenging assignments as the teacher ensures and employs multiple connections to the pupils' background and academic schemata. Walqui (2000) promotes this classroom context. In developing her argument from research on effective learning for ELs, she analyzes instructional strategies for teachers of immigrant students, from which she posits 10 criteria; we believe these principles are equally relevant for WL teachers:

- Students in class are considered a community of collaborating learners.
- Themes relevant to student curiosity are a mainstay of curricular planning.
- Involving students' backgrounds as an anchor is important.
- Previously-learned concepts are connected to new learning challenges.
- Appropriate context and subject matter presentation promote achievement.
- Explicit teaching of learner strategies is necessary for growth in critical skills.
- Tasks and assignments should engage the student in exploring the why.
- Interactive classroom activities predominate.
- Lessons should be applicable to the students' lives.
- Assessment activities/instruments are authentic and meaningful.

Walqui's advice regarding the implementation of teaching approaches can be supported by teachers in all discipline areas, not just ESL or WL. In K-12 classrooms, students co-invent knowledge. They respond to one another and their instructor through their classroom tasks. Performance or project activities are featured in the (K-12) teacher's lesson or unit planning.⁷ Such a strategic approach emphasizes student-teacher and student-student conversations, pair and group work, and the conscious acquisition and sophisticated use of critical higher-order thinking skills (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Oxford & Cohen, 1992), all of which techniques are essential for methods students to acquire and practice.

These aspects of classroom practices are correspondingly valid for characterizing either a successful Grade Two ESL lesson on apples—where readings about Johnny Appleseed and the growth cycle of plants are discussed as well as arithmetic problems on acreage measurements and orchard yields—or for secondary school WL students learning language and geography.

Two of the first author's WL methods students developed just such a model to meet the challenge of appropriate context and learning environment, as Walqui (2000) advocates. Purposefully aligning their ideas for teaching activities with the goals of SFL, they created a thematic unit for an envisioned second-year high school French class. Their unit, *Aidons-nous Haïti*, covered more than that nation's geological, cultural, and geographical profile; it also explored comparative topographical references and connections to the U.S. San Andreas and New Madrid fault lines. The Level Two

Reflections on the combined WL/ESOL methods course

French students would collaborate in their use of video clips, audio files, and primary print source materials in order to devise rubric-driven readings (brochures, posters, ads) and speaking opportunities (school public service announcements, club projects, PowerPoint or Flash presentations) as a means to persuade the school community that helping Haitian earthquake victims is a worthwhile volunteer enterprise. Their work also would prepare the students to respond to potential local calamities, whether or not their immediate region is designated as severe or moderate on seismic hazard activity maps or located in a tornado zone. The power of contextualization and scaffolded instruction through suitable thematic topics thus encourages the K-12 learner to grow intellectually and linguistically as he or she explores backwards in history and projects forward into the future. Based on contemporary subject matter as Beane (1997), Curtain & Haas (1995), and Freeman and Freeman (2000) argue for, the thematic unit assignment for methods course students working in small groups can provide interrelated subject content and language-building activities that align well with K-12 EL instructional goals and the SFL.

We contend that the successful evolution of language methods programming, whether combined WL/ESL or stand-alone, is nurtured by WL and ESL methods students themselves. Their experimentation in developing a curricular unit similar to the Haiti example promotes methods students' career growth while simultaneously giving validity and relevance to the methods course overall. Operationalizing the SFL and its goals thus becomes a primary vehicle for improving methods instruction. Class activities emphasize practical applications

We contend that the successful evolution of language methods programming, whether combined WL/ESL or stand-alone, is nurtured by WL and ESL methods students themselves.

for subsequent action research and implementation. Another valuable practice for methods students would be to devise task-based instructional examples, as Lee (2000) urges: these activities aim to increase K-12 student language proficiency. A related component for methods instructors to develop would be fostering technology implementation projects that simultaneously employ task-based learning and channel K-12 students' independent learning through the Internet and other electronic media. Approaches that contextualize or extend methods program activities into subject matter areas such as the social sciences advance teaching and learning. Finally, as methods instructors, we assist our students in realizing that not all of their future K-12 students will be motivated or "ideal" learners. Student progress in language will not be as rapid as their teachers' plans, materials, presentations, and techniques seek to promote. The WL student will not advance in an unbroken manner, for example, on the ACTFL oral proficiency index scale (OPI; Breinder-Sanders, Lowe, Miles, & Swender, 2000). Regressions in the learning curve occur, and thus thwart the teacher's expectations of seeing continuous student progress.

Methods courses do not and cannot thrive outside of their educational training context. Neither do recommendations for change exist in a vacuum.

Methods courses do not and cannot thrive outside of their educational training context. Neither do recommendations for change exist in a vacuum. They must be understood as interdependent constituents within general teacher education reform, and require the support of education stakeholders

outside our discipline. Our recommendations must address, first, several overarching demands that our nation's evolving educational and social phenomena have produced. These forces affect reform in general and language teacher issues in particular. They provide a basis for combined WL/ESL methods education if we affirm our role and responsibilities within the broader K-12 and teacher education panoramas. The development of a strong combined WL/ESL methods course encompasses four impediments to be overcome:

- Student enrollments and staffing shortages in specific academic and/or geographic areas together with budgetary crises influence the frequency of methods course offerings in the academic calendar. This condition must change. It is the responsibility of educators and the general public to do so through appropriate advocacy and legislation.
- Professional standards for accreditation or recognition include student assessment and achievement measures, which thereupon influence methods course content. This standard must be adhered to from the twin perspectives of language and pedagogy. K-12 WL and ESL teachers must become expert in their respective subject areas and demonstrate excellent teaching skills.
- The methods program, whose traditional 3-credit hour allocation is arguably perceived universally as insufficient by all WL and ESL methods instructors to permit the inclusion of all the requisite information desired by its stakeholders, will continue to vie with other pre-service courses for more class time. This will change when the inevitable realities of inadequate teacher induction force that credit-hour increase (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Compelled to feature too many topics in cursory fashion, therefore, and combined or not, the methods class is regarded as having become a general survey more than the explicit how to teach experience—which the language methods student will retrospectively deem as having been essential but unfulfilled. In an effort to ameliorate the complexities of the combined methods course, the instructor's consideration of reflections by former combined WL/ESL methods students is useful. Their opinions may well provide evidence to validate earlier research findings as well as detect recent, newer challenges.⁸
- The methods instructor's personal K-12 teaching experience and knowledge of contemporary school practices are factors in how the students' needs for pedagogical insights and direction are approached. The methods instructor's background must be broadened, as we have proposed elsewhere (García, Hernández & Davis-Wiley, 2010).

Despite the gravity of these and other local barriers, their existence implies that a quality combined WL/ESL methods program for tomorrow's teachers can nevertheless be created. We must understand the concerns of contemporary teacher induction, that is, while adhering to the greater aims of education in a democratic society. We do so by creating a praxis-oriented induction model for future combined ESL/WL methods courses that is predicated on 10 recommendations.

They are research-based propositions that are melded with both general calls for teacher education reform and our own methods class experiences regarding ESL

Reflections on the combined WL/ESOL methods course

and WL methods class practices. Formulating an appropriately combined ESL/WL methods course, that is, cannot occur without making use of other, extant components of teacher education. Some of our recommendations are new; others are not. It is their totality, not the matter of their novelty, which addresses the broader aspects of K-12 reform and satisfies the discipline-specific needs of WL and ESL teacher preparation. The 10 recommendations follow:

1. Develop a base of six to eight theoretical and practical similarities that the WL or ESL methods class participants' content fields have in common. These then serve as the conceptual course framework, or *course intent*. Much as the characteristics comparisons of Table 1, these topics, when fused with related activities outside of class and other teacher preparation courses, will provide the WL/ESL methods students a focused experience. Critical themes that are essential for inclusion and expansion in methods curricula are: the national standards and their application to classroom practice; communicative acts and their implementation; cultural differences and practices; learner motivation and learning strategies; model teaching; thematic lesson/unit planning; teaching reading for meaning; and technology.
2. Maintain the focus of the methods experience on EL/WL K-12 student learner outcomes. This is to be accomplished through interactive, communicative, and appropriate technology-supported pedagogy. Part of the similarities between ESL and WL includes charting the progress of all K-12 student language learners to focus on the development of higher order thinking skills. We meet this objective through measurable and authentic performance-based output that showcases student creativity rather than having the student complete textbook end-of-chapter questions, for example, or respond to short-answer tests.
3. Apply research findings on best practices that simultaneously promote K-12 student motivation and learning. It is important for WL/ESL methods students to examine, experiment, and learn how to motivate their K-12 students, as Hernández (2006, 2008, 2010) has demonstrated. The field of listening comprehension is a pertinent example, in that it addresses both learning and motivation. Methods class time that is dedicated to developing comprehension strategies for the classroom results in teaching and learning activities that advance motivation. Success begets continued success.⁹
4. Develop class activities for methods students that assist the future ESL/WL teacher in creating contextually rich thematic units that promote language usage that is anchored to visual, physical real-world activities. The application of theory to classroom practice also engenders a need for the methods to feature content-based learning as vocabulary builders. Socially or biographically rooted language (i.e., greetings, asking for information, rejoinders, games, riddles) should be woven together through appropriate realia, and adapted for classroom use into simple and abstract academic content area topics. K-12 students studying the solar system, for example, could design a small scale model of the planets and asteroids from knitting yarn and different size spheres, use previously learned vocabulary (from a geography unit, for

- instance) to present the sizes and relative proximity of the planets and their orbits in a game or riddle format. The use of comparatives and superlatives in the language thus becomes an interdisciplinary vehicle for science learning that is content-based (Stryker & Leaver, 1997).
5. Promote the appropriate conditions for quality field opportunities in both ESL and WL. Augment them with multiple approaches in the contexts of service learning experiences, debriefings between the instructor and the methods students (Bouillion & Gomez, 2001; Springer & Collins, 2008), and focused exchanges between the latter with diverse stakeholders in K-12 education. This means that the methods instructor facilitates initiatives that benefit his or her students within and beyond the formal course setting. Pertinent examples would be: to aid in refining the criteria used to select cooperating K-12 ESL/WL teachers for the practicum experience; expanding connections to local ethnic, cultural or professional organizations; arranging for invitations to in-service teachers to present activities to the methods class students, interviewing recent graduates who now teach K-12 ESL or WL students. Each of these activities reinforces the need for language methods students to understand first-hand that being part of the greater education community in which he/she will teach is an indispensable facet of their own future teaching role.
 6. Implement sheltered content area instruction as an approach for WL/ESL methods students to employ. Structured to meet the linguistic and age-appropriate developmental needs of second language learners (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2007), this model of teaching WL or ESL through integrating language into subject matter content should be a fundamental course component prior to and during the methods students' observation and co-teaching opportunities, and thus benefits their respective future teaching assignments.
 7. Utilize class time (approximately 6-9 hours) to explicate the role that performance measurement instruments play for K-12 EL students' achievement, their teachers, and their schools. By providing sample activities for analysis and review, show how high-stakes testing for ELs (Echevarria, Short, & Powers, 2006) differs from traditional WL evaluation activities in quality, extent, and consequences. This means that the methods students' reflections on ESL and WL assessment should involve experiences, data, and information about test preparation to be gleaned from interviews with appropriate post-secondary faculty, administrators representing K-12 schools, and visits or observations of students and teachers. The teacher candidate thereby conceptualizes K-12 achievement as substantive and relevant to our times—and a professional characteristic for which the methods student—soon to become-educator—assumes a responsible role. The methods instructor provides the combined methods students with insights into a critical component of K-12 education that helps in the understanding of this abiding concern and its ramifications for the K-12 schools.
 8. Develop class activities that demonstrate to ESL and WL methods students the importance of teaching their future students how the K-12 *students*

Reflections on the combined WL/ESOL methods course

themselves can increase their repertoire of learning techniques. Highlighting successful language learning strategies contributes to the pupils' preparation for learning in other disciplines, as Oxford (1990) illustrates. In her chapter on direct strategies, she explains three groups of techniques, *memory*, *cognitive*, and *compensation* (p. 37). Memory serves as a means to help students store and retrieve language knowledge—words, tense markers, structures, and phrases—through images, associations, sounds, contexts, keywords, physical responses and sensations, and mechanical techniques (pp. 39ff). Oxford's arguments encompass a wide range of useful language classroom suggestions that benefit all students who otherwise might rely upon a modest set of strategies for learning that they already know. This recommendation means that the methods instructor should create or share language strategy models with the methods class, and ensure that the objective of some course assignments is to assist the K-12 language learner in acquiring new knowledge through strategy practice.

9. Advocate an increase in the number of credits assigned to the methods course from the traditional and wholly inadequate 3 to at least 6, or preferably even 9 hours. This means that the methods instructor, with the support of methods colleagues and affiliated faculty, should design a combined ESL/WL methods sequence model that fosters a thorough grounding by methods students in how to employ effective approaches in the classroom. As described earlier, learning strategies, assessments, listening comprehension, and sheltered content learning techniques contribute to improved learning environments in K-12 settings.
10. Investigate, employ, or otherwise present innovative techniques for K-12 teaching. This means that the instructor helps the WL and ESL methods students in learning how to utilize print and screen media materials (including wall displays of artifacts and chalkboard work) in addition to non-print mediums (e.g., electronic white boards). Of great significance for the next years will be the methods instructor's own professional development to that stage where he or she can engage course enrollees in working with models of new technology-assisted approaches to teach ESL or WL (Ally, 2009; van Olphen, 2010) to their K-12 language learners. In this way, the beginning language teachers and their methods instructor become lifelong learners whose habits of mind and inquisitive behaviors reflect their habits of teaching.

Conclusion

*"Our future may be beyond our vision, but
it is not completely beyond our control."*

Senator Edward M. Kennedy

(Eulogy for Robert F. Kennedy, June 6, 1968)

In the Mayan *Popul Vuh*, we read: "Don't wait for strangers to remind you of your duty, you have a conscience and spirit for that. All the good you must do must come from your own initiative" (Menchu, 1984, p. 141). Mindful of this exhortation, we who prepare future language educators must consider its motivational implications. We

must seek avenues to resolve the issues produced by the combined WL/ESL methods class for the next decade and beyond, and engage in solid research activities that inform a viable course of action. Although we believe that it is better to offer language methods sequences that are individually directed at the WL and ESL pre-service educators, we recognize that for some institutions, the dual methods class section may become the only viable option.

We believe that our teacher education candidates will teach in K-12 schools that are reconfiguring their roles in an evolving society. Reform and change are stable components of teacher preparation as well. Language and culture studies will be increasingly vital, as the US Secretary of Education has declared (Duncan, 2010). Our language learners in K-12 WL understand this through the work of their teachers. ELs and their teachers bear an additional responsibility, that of the K-12 ELs integration into the American dream—which most WL students are already part of. Both EL and WL student populations are partners in our common American goal of maintaining our nation's intellectual and economic successes. They will do so in multiple languages. Despite the importance of English as an international language, the knowledge of other tongues remains a critical national need, and this is an area of K-12 education that our WL/ESL methods course students will contribute to as future language teachers. How we address their professional needs is our continuing challenge.

Notes

1. The enrollees in English as a Second Language learner (ESL) or English Learner (EL) or English Language Learner (ELL) K-12 programs are found in all grade levels. For this paper, we use the three terms interchangeably, acknowledging the impreciseness in fact and usage (English may not be a “second” but a third language for some). EL is the most recent appellation, ESL the more traditional. Note 3 also addresses this and related topics.

Other challenges face language teacher education; one is the nexus between WL methodology and the growth of Chinese language study. Support must be found to encourage research on how to teach Chinese in the US. We must simultaneously address the attendant concern of how to prepare a domestic cadre of future Chinese language teachers who will be invested in establishing lasting school programs—and thus teacher longevity in position. Reliance on a program's staffing needs being dependent on visas, international exchange agreements, and the subsequent issuance of short-term contracts for visiting teachers is frustratingly complex, and by no means a long-term solution. The demonstrable evidence is the example of language immersion staffing; it remains a critical concern years after the immersion programs have been established (García, 1990; 2009).

2. The genesis of this paper resulted from discussions between the authors and other language methods instructors at the 2009 annual meeting of ACTFL in San Diego. Session attendees had witnessed the growth of combined WL/ESL methods courses at their own or near-by institutions (from California to Indiana, Ohio, Florida, and the Northeast), thereby confirming our experiences in this regard. The participants also noted the increasingly frequent student enrollment pattern that converted their course into a *de facto* combined ESL/WL methods section. Online investigation

Reflections on the combined WL/ESOL methods course

showed that several universities offer combined methods sections, a fact that became evident upon inspection of course syllabi and descriptors such as those found on the discussion group FLTEACH (<http://www.cortland.edu/flteach/syllabi/>). There was an entry, for instance, of a two-semester methods sequence at the Virginia Polytechnic University and Institute (VT) titled “Teaching Languages.” In addition to listing a required text for VT’s WL methods students, a parallel, alternative required text for ESL methods students was given. In the case of recently developed online world language methods course materials from the University of Texas (<http://www.coerll.utexas.edu/methods>), information offered to others—methods instructors elsewhere—emphasizes the multiple areas of expertise represented by the teaching faculty. Notably, some modules recommend resources for students that relate uniquely to ESL. The program planning and these readings suggest a de facto acknowledgement of combined WL/ESL methods sections’ existence.

3. Three points require detailed explanation: nomenclature, the ubiquity of ELs in our nation, and EL school population size. First, EL or ELL is an appropriate usage; they affirm that there are both immigrant and American-born students who need special assistance in acquiring mainstream US English (Lippi-Green, 1997). Traditionally, ESL connoted foreign-born learners of English. Second, K-12 EL populations are no longer located exclusively in urban schools or industrialized areas and in southern or southwestern states, as Maxwell (2010) has documented. They are enrolled in rural districts—wherever employment opportunities for their parents exist. Third, the actual number of K-12 ELs is imprecise. Keigher advises prudence regarding use of the population numbers drawn from her Table 2 (p. 8) because of the measurable (15%) non-reporting by state agencies that occurred. She calculates it is possible that the figures have an error factor of 30%, which thus causes the population estimate of 5.4 million ELs to range between 3.8 and 7.0 million. Keigher’s warning is commendable, especially when we consider another recent and equally comprehensive study from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Aud et al. (2010) conclude that the 5.4 million estimate will be adjusted up rather than down as additional comprehensive state and local data sets are revised and submitted for inclusion into NCES common core data. In addition, see Aud, Fox, and Kemal Ramini (2010) as well as Plotts and Sable (2010) for additional data on public school district populations and ethnic/racial changes in the US K-12 population. Hernández (1996) and NCELA (2006, FAQ 6) both offer brief summaries of the legal statutes governing EL education policies.
4. These two phenomena often produce a third, one that is obscured from public consciousness: the registration in an ESL methods class (combined with WL or not) by currently-serving WL teachers. They enroll in order to add an English Language Learning endorsement to their teaching certificate, and thus enhance their ability to remain employed at their school or district setting during times of personnel cutbacks. Contractually guaranteed transfer rights for teachers are based upon licensure endorsements, tenure, and seniority; all play a role in matters of staff reallocation or reductions. Miller’s (2010) report offers an historical overview of teacher shortages in ESL and WL, and underpins several reports published by professional associations, which note the critical need for WL teachers [Ballantyne,

Sanderman, & Levy, 008; Jackson & Malone, 2009; Joint National Committee on Languages/National Committee on Languages & International Studies (JNCL/NCLIS), 2009].

5. We have not mentioned speaking proficiency in this context, although it is as an important topic for WL and ESL teacher education, and certainly pertains to the domain of methods class activities. Level checks or benchmarking interviews to measure proficiency, such as those we have suggested elsewhere (García, Hernández & Davis-Wiley, 2010), should be considered prerequisites for admission into methods and extended field experience or student teaching activities. Skills achievement and related licensure standards persist as a mutual concern for language programs and teacher education preparers (Cooper, 2004; García and Petri, 2000; Koike and Liskin-Gasparro, 1999; Pearson, Fonseca, Greber, and Foell, 2006; Schulz, 2000; Tedick, 2009). For further information on oral proficiency measures, see <http://www.actfl.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=3642#speaking> for WL and Breiner-Sanders, Lowe, Miles, and Swender (2000). For ESL guidelines, see http://www.tesol.org/s_tesol/seccss.asp?CID=95&DID=1565.
6. Typically, WL teachers teach native K-12 English speakers how to use the target language, whereas ESL teachers have as their student audience K-12 pupils whose home language is not English. Although WL and ESL teachers both stress cultural knowledge in their classrooms, WL teachers—teachers of Spanish excepted—are concerned with non-US cultures, and ESL teachers help students learn about American cultural traditions and practices. Although both are concerned with assessment matters, the ESL teachers must become versed in the many local and state instruments required of the ELs to determine not only their English language achievement, but also their knowledge of different subject areas. K-12 WL methods students and WL teachers do not. Even though commonalities exist for ESL and WL teachers, the WL educators' aim, arguably, is to teach a second language for students' enrichment. EL teachers instruct ELs and enrich their students' lives too, but their teachers do more. They affect the student's economic and social future, and so prepare them for productive lives in the English-speaking community.
7. This is not to imply that textbooks play only a modest role in learning. They are important; their centrality as a singular source of knowledge is now diminished, however. For related discussions, see Allen (2008) and Bragger & Rice (2000).
8. We did not interview past methods class students, whose sense of dissatisfaction with the inherent issues of the combined methods course may well have been summarized by evaluations of a combined WL/ESL methods course that Professor Lee Wilberschied (Cleveland State University) graciously shared with us. Her former students' comments support our position that the 3-credit combined methods course is over-burdened by too many competing objectives:
 - “Too many different interests – some ESL, some EFL are within this group; you have elementary, junior high, high school and college. Not enough focus.”
 - “ It seems like there are too many populations in this class and so the course lacks some focus on specific for Methods of Teaching ESL. It has become too general for this level.”

Reflections on the combined WL/ESOL methods course

- “I feel that the integration of ESL with foreign language does not help those who are in the foreign language program much. I find a difficult time relating to it.”
9. Our recommendation for increased attention to listening comprehension and visual learning is derived from research performed during the 1960s and after by Asher (1966); Coady and Huckins (1997); Cook (1986), Flowerdew and Miller (2005); García (1981); Krashen (1985); Krashen and Terrell (1983); Postovsky (1974; 1977; 1982); Reeds, Winitz, and García (1977); Terrell (1977, 1986); Winitz (1981); Winitz and Reeds (1975); Winitz, García, and Frick (1985), and Winitz, Reeds, and García (1986). Listening comprehension and memory storage have roots in the field of psychology, as evidenced in Winitz and Reeds’ (1975) references to Miller (1956) and Osgood (1953), especially Chapter 12, “Serial and Transfer Phenomena.” Examples of recently published materials that emphasize visual learning combined with listening comprehension activities are found at tprstorytelling.com, rosettastone.com, and eurotalk.com/us/.

References

- Acosta, B. D., Rivera, C. & Shafer Willner, L. (2008). *Best practices in state assessment policies in the accommodation of English language learners: A Delphi study*. Retrieved from <http://ceee.gwu.edu/AA/BestPractices.pdf>
- Adger, C. T., Snow, C. E., & Christian, D. (Eds.) (2002). *What teachers need to know about language*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Allen, H. W. (2008). Textbook materials and foreign language teaching: Perspectives from the classroom. *NECTFL Review*, 62, 5-28.
- Allen, L. (2002). Teachers’ pedagogical beliefs and the standards for world language learning. *Foreign Language Learning*, 3, 518-528.
- Ally, M. (Ed.) (2009). *Mobile learning: Transforming the delivery of education and training*. Edmonton: Alberta University Press.
- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). (2002). *ACTFL/NCATE program standards for the preparation of foreign language teachers*. Retrieved from <http://www.actfl.org/files/public/ACTFLNCATEStandardsRevised713.pdf>
- Ancess, J. (2003). *Beating the odds: High schools as communities of commitment*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ariza, E., Morales-Jones, C., Yahya, N., & Zainuddin, H. (2010). *Why TESOL? Theories and issues in teaching English to speakers of other languages in K-12 classrooms*. (4th ed.). Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt.
- Asher, J. J. (1966). The learning strategy of the total physical response: A review. *Modern Language Journal*, 50, 79-84.
- Asher, J. J. (1969). The total physical response approach to second language learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 53, 3-17.
- Asher, J. J. (1972). Children’s first language as a model for second language learning. *Modern Language Journal* 56, 133-139.

- Aski, J. M. (2005) Alternatives to mechanical drills for the early stages of language practice in foreign language textbooks, *Foreign Language Annals*, 38, 333-343.
- Aud, S., Fox, M., & Kemal Ramani, A. (2010). *Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic groups*. (NCES 2010-015). Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2010/2010015.pdf>
- Aud, S., Hussar, W., Planty, M., Snyder, T., Bianco, K., Fox, M., & Drake, L. (2010). *The condition of education*. (NCES 2010-028). Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2010/2010028.pdf>
- Ballantyne, K.G., Sanderman, A.R., & Levy, J. (2008). *Educating English language learners: Building teacher capacity*. Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. Retrieved from http://www.ncele.gwu.edu/practice/mainstream_teachers.htm
- Beane, J. 1997. *Curriculum integration: Designing the core of democratic education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bouillion, L. M., & Gomez, L. (2001). Connecting school and community with science learning: Real world problems and school-community partnerships as contextual scaffolds. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 38, 878 -898.
- Bragger, J. D., & Rice, D. (2000). Foreign language materials: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. In R. M. Terry (Ed.), *Agents of change in a changing age*. Northeast Conference Reports. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.
- Breiner-Sanders, K. E., Lowe, P., Miles, J., & Swender, E. (2000). ACTFL proficiency guidelines-speaking, revised 1999. *Foreign Language Annals*, 33, 1, 13-18. Also available at <http://www.actfl.org/files/public/Guidelinespeak.pdf>
- Brynes, H. (1998). Constructing curricula in collegiate foreign language departments. In H. Brynes (Ed.), *Learning foreign and second languages: Perspectives in research and scholarship* (pp. 262-295). New York: Modern Language Association.
- Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL). (2006). *Growth of Total and Partial Immersion Programs in the U.S., 1971-2006*. Author. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/resources/immersion/Doc/GrowthofTotalandPartialImmersionProgramsinUS.pdf>
- Clark, R.M. (1988). *Critical factors in why disadvantaged children succeed or fail in school*. New York, NY: Academy for Educational Development.
- Coady, J. & T. Huckin (Eds.). (1997). *Second language vocabulary acquisition: A rationale for pedagogy*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, V. (Ed.) (1986). *Experimental approaches to second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Cooper, T.C. (2004). How foreign language teachers in Georgia evaluate their professional preparation: A call for action. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37, 37-48.
- Cummings Hlas, A., & Conroy, K. (2010). Organizing principles for new language teacher educators: The methods course. *NECTFL Review*, 65, 52-66.
- Curtain, H., & Haas, M. (1995). *Integrating foreign language and content instruction in Grades K-8*. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/int-for-k8.html>
- Cushman, K. (2003). *Fires in the bathroom: Advice for teachers from high school kids*. NY: The New Press.

Reflections on the combined WL/ESOL methods course

- Cushman, K. (2005). *Sent to the principal: Students talk about making high school better*. Providence, RI: Next Generation Press.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). How teacher education matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 166-173.
- Dhonau, S. and McAlpine, D. (2005). An electronic portfolio for the ACTFL/NCATE teacher program standards in the second language methods course. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38, 1, 69-76.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Language two*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Duncan, A. (2010). *International engagement through education: Remarks by Secretary Arne Duncan at the Council on Foreign Relations Meeting, May 26, 2010, New York*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/international-engagement-through-education-remarks-secretary-arne-duncan-council-forei>
- Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Powers, K. (2006). School reform and standards-based education: A model for English-language learners. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(4), 195-210.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. J. (2007). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model*. (3rd Ed.) Boston: Pearson Allyn & Bacon.
- Flowerdew, J. & Miller, L. (2005). *Second language listening: Theory and practice*. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.
- Freeman, D., & Freeman, Y. (2000). *Teaching reading in multilingual classrooms*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Freeman, D. (2002). The hidden side of the work: Teacher knowledge and learning to teach. A perspective from North American educational research on teacher education in English language teaching. *Language Teaching*, 35, 1-13.
- Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32 (3), 397-417.
- García, P. A. (1981). Comprehension training in a high school setting. In H. Winitz (Ed.) *The comprehension approach to foreign language instruction*. (pp. 277-300). Rowley, MA: Newbury.
- García, P. A. (1990). Five easy pieces: Staff development for immersion. In G. C. Lipton (Ed.). *National FLES* Commission Report*. (pp. 44-56). Urbana: AATF.
- García, P. A. (2009). Considerations, constraints and joys: Remembering the future of language immersion in the U.S. *The TFLTA Journal*, 1, 1, 15-32.
- García, P.A. (2010). What every beginning language teacher needs to know...And begins to learn. In G.C. Lipton (Ed.) *Practical handbook to elementary FLES programs*. (5th Ed., pp. 425-430). Kensington, MD: National FLES* Institute.
- García, P.A., & Petri, E. (1999, November). *Teachers for tomorrow—And today*. Paper presented at the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Dallas, TX.
- García, P.A., & Petri, E. (2000, March/April). Reshaping the future of language teaching. *American Language Review*, 26-30.
- García, P.A., Hernández, T.A., & Davis-Wiley, P. (2010). Preparing tomorrow's world language teacher today: The case for seamless induction. *NECTFL Review*, 65, 22-51.

- Goldwasser, M. & Bach, A. (2007). *High school and the 3Rs: Students' perspectives on "Good Work."* Occasional Paper Series #6. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Consortium for Policy Research in Education. Retrieved from http://www.cpre.org/images/stories/cpre_pdfs/HS3Rs_Occasionalpaper.pdf
- Graves, M. F. (2009). *Teaching individual words: One size does not fit all*. New York; Newark, DE: Teachers College Press; International Reading Association.
- Grosse, C. U. (1991). The ESL methods class. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(1), 29-49.
- Grosse, C. U. (1993). The foreign language methods class. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77(3), 303-312.
- Haynes, J. (1995.) *Stages of second language acquisition*. Retrieved 7-12-10 from http://www.everythingsl.net/in-services/language_stages.php
- Haynes, J. (2007). *Getting started with English language learners: How educators can meet the challenge*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Hernández, H. (1996). *Teaching in multilingual classrooms*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Hernández, T. A. (2006). Integrative motivation as a predictor of success in the intermediate foreign language classroom. *Foreign Language Annals* 39, 605-617.
- Hernández, T. A. (2008). Integrative motivation as a predictor of achievement in the foreign language classroom. *Applied Language Learning*, 18, 1-15.
- Hernández, T. A. (2010). The relationship among motivation, interaction, and the development of second language oral proficiency in a study abroad context. *Modern Language Journal* 94, 1-18.
- Horwitz, E. K. (2008). *Becoming a language teacher. A practical guide to second language learning and teaching*. Boston: Pearson.
- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium INTASC Foreign Language Standards Committee (2002). *Model standards for licensing beginning foreign language teachers: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Jackson, F.H., & Malone, M. E. (2009). *Building the foreign language capacity we need: Toward a comprehensive strategy for a national language framework*. College Park, Maryland: National Foreign Language Center. Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/resources/languageframework.pdf>
- Johnson, K. E. (1994). The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of preservice English as a second language teachers. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 10, 439-452.
- Johnson, D., Malone, M.E., Peyton, J.K., Pufahl, I., & Rhodes, N. (2009). Developing language skills for success in the 21st century: Work in progress at the Center for Applied Linguistics. *The TFLTA Journal*, 1(1), 32-41.
- Joint National Committee for Languages & National Committee for Languages and International Studies (JNCL/NCLIS). Author. (2009). *Foreign language education, strategies, and goals*. Retrieved from <http://www.languagepolicy.org/documents/Foreign%20Language%20Education%20Policies%20Needs%20and%20StrategiesFINAL.pdf>

Reflections on the combined WL/ESOL methods course

- Keigher, A. (2009). *Characteristics of public, private, and bureau of Indian education elementary and secondary schools in the United States. Results from the 2007-08 Schools and Staffing Survey*. (NCES 2009-321) National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/2009321.pdf> [Keigher's Table 2 is also found at: http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/2009321/tables/sass0708_2009321_s12n_02.asp
- Koike, D.A., & Liskin-Gasparro, J.E. (1999). What is a near-native speaker? Perspectives of job seekers and search committees in Spanish. *ADFL Bulletin*, 30, 54-62.
- Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T.D. (1983). *The natural approach*. Hayward, CA: Alemany Press.
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). The input hypothesis: Issues and implications. London: Longman.
- Lange, D.L., & Sims, W.R. (1990). Minnesota foreign language teachers' perceptions of their pre-professional preparation. *Modern Language Journal*, 74, 297-310.
- Lee, J. F. (2000). *Tasks and communicating in language classrooms*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Lee, J. F., & VanPatten, B. (2003). *Making communicative language teaching happen* (2nd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Levine, A. (2006). *Educating school teachers*. Washington, D.C.: Educating Schools Project. Retrieved from <http://www.edschools.org/pdf/EducatingTeachersreport.pdf>
- Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *Language with an accent*. New York: Routledge.
- Marzano, R. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Maxwell, L. (2010, January 8). Shifting landscape: Education transforms communities. *Education Week*, 28, 1.
- Meier, D. (1995). *The power of their ideas: Lessons for America from a small school in Harlem*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Menchu, R. (1984). *I, Rigoberta Menchu: An Indian woman in Guatemala*. E. Burgos-Debray (Ed.). A. Wright (Trans). London: Verso.
- Met, M. (1991). Learning language through content: learning content through language. *Foreign Language Annals* 28 (4), 281-295.
- Miller, G. A. (1956). The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review*, 63, 81-97.
- Miller, M. (2010). *Teacher shortage areas: Nationwide listing*. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Post-Secondary Education. OMB-0595. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/pol/tsa.pdf>
- National Association of District Supervisors of Foreign Language (NADSFL). (1999). *Characteristics of effective instruction*. Retrieved from <http://nadsfl09.wikispaces.com/file/view/NADSFLbrochure111209Final2.pdf>
- National Capitol Language Resource Center (NCLRC). (n.d.). *The essentials of language teaching*. National Capitol Language Resource Center. Retrieved from <http://nclrc.org/essentials>

- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA). (2006). *What legal obligations do schools have to English language learners (ELLs)?* Author. Retrieved from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/faqs/view/6>
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA). (2010). *How many school-aged limited English proficient (LEP) students are there in the U.S?* Retrieved from <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/faqs.view/4>
- National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (NSFLEP). (2006). *Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century.* (SFL). Lawrence, KS: Allen Press.
- Omaggio Hadley, A. (2001). *Teaching language in context.* (3rd Ed.) Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Language strategies in second language acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Osgood, C. E. (1953). *Method and theory in experimental psychology.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every language teacher should know.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Oxford, R., & Cohen, A.D. (1992). Language learning strategies: Crucial issues of concept and classification. *Applied Language Learning*, 3, 1-35.
- Payán, R. M. & Nettles, M. T. (2007). *Current state of English-language learners in the U.S. K-12 student population.* Princeton (NJ): Educational Testing Service. Retrieved from http://www.ets.org/Media/Conferences_and_Events/pdf/ELLSymposium/ELL_factsheet.pdf
- Pearson, L., Fonseca-Greber, B., & Foell, K. (2006). Advanced proficiency for foreign language teacher candidates: What can we do to help them achieve this goal? *Foreign Language Annals*, 39, 507-519.
- Peregoy, S. F., & Boyle, O.F. (2005). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL.* (4th ed.) New York: Longman.
- Plotts, C., & Sable, J. (2010). *Characteristics of the 100 largest public elementary and secondary school districts in the United States: 2007-2008.* (NCES 2010-0349) National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2010/2010349.pdf>
- Postovsky, V. A. (1974). Effects of delay in oral practice at the beginning of second language learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 58, 229-39.
- Postovsky, V. A. (1977). Why not start speaking later? In M. Burt, H. Dulay, & M. Finocchiaro. (Eds.) *Viewpoints on English as a second language* (pp. 17-26). New York: Regents.
- Postovsky, V. A. (1982) Delayed oral practice. In R. W. Blair (Ed.) *Innovative approaches to language teaching* (pp. 67-76). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Raimo, A., Delvin-Scherer, R., & Zinicola, D. (2002). Learning about teachers through film. *The Education Forum*, 66, 314-323.
- Raymond, H.C. (2002). Learning to teach foreign languages: A case study of six preservice teachers. *NECTFL Review*, 51, 16-25.

Reflections on the combined WL/ESOL methods course

- Reeds, J. A., Winitz, H., & García, P.A. (1977). A test of reading following comprehension training. *IRAL*, XV, 307-320.
- Rhodes, N., & Pufahl, I. (2010). *Foreign language teaching in U.S. schools: Results of a national survey*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Schulz, R. (2000). Foreign language teacher development: MLJ perspectives 1916-1999. *Modern Language Journal*, 84, 496-522.
- Shafer Willner, L., Rivera, C. & Acosta, B.D. (2009). Ensuring accommodations used in content assessments are responsive to English-language learners. *The Reading Teacher*, 62 (8), 696-698.
- Shrum, J. L., & Glisan, E. W. (2010). *Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction* (4th Ed.). Boston: Thomson Heinle.
- Sizer, T.R. (1984). *Horace's compromise*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sizer, T.R. (1996). *Horace's hope: What works for the American high school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Springer, S., & Collins, L. (2008). Interacting inside and outside of the language classroom. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(1), 39-60.
- Stryker, S. B., & Leaver, B. L. (1997). *Content-based instruction in foreign language education: Models and methods*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Swaffar, J. K., & Woodruff, M. S. (1978). Language for comprehension: Focus on reading. *Modern Language Journal* 61, 27-32.
- Swender, E., & Duncan, G. (1998). ACTFL performance guidelines for K-12 learners. *Foreign Language Annals*, 31, 479-491.
- Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). (2006). *Pre K-12 English language proficiency standards*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). (2010). *TESOL/NCATE standards for the recognition of initial TESOL programs in P-12 ESL teacher education*. Alexandria, VA.: Author.
- Tedick, D. J. (2009). K-12 Language teacher preparation: Problems and possibilities. *Modern Language Journal*, 93, 263-267.
- Tedick, D. J., & Walker, C. (1995). From theory to practice: How do we prepare teachers for second language classrooms? *Foreign Language Annals*, 28, 499-517.
- Terrell, T. D. (1977). A natural approach to second language acquisition and learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 61, 325-37.
- Terrell, T. D. (1982). The natural approach to language teaching: update. *Modern Language Journal*, 66, 121-32.
- Terrell, T. D. (1986). Acquisition in the natural approach: The binding/access framework. *Modern Language Journal*, 75, 52-63.
- Thompson, G. L. (2000). The real deal on bilingual education: Former language-minority students discuss effective and ineffective instructional practices. *Educational Horizons*, 78, 128-140.
- U.S. Department of Education of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2011). *Digest of education statistics, 2010*. (NCES 2011-015), Chapter 2. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=84> and http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10/ch_2.asp

- van Olphen, M. (2010). Four skills plus viewing. In G.C. Lipton (Ed.) *Practical handbook to elementary FLES programs* (5th Ed., pp. 459-460). Kensington, MD: National FLES* Institute.
- Vélez-Rendón, G. (2002). Second language teacher education: A review of the literature. *Foreign Language Annals*, 35, 457-467.
- WGBH Educational Foundation, with the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2003). *Teaching foreign languages K-12: A library of classroom practices*. Boston: Author. Retrieved October 30, 2010 from <http://www.learner.org/resources/series185.html>.
- Walqui, A. (2000). *Strategies for success: Engaging immigrant students in secondary schools*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics. *ERIC Digest* (ED442300). Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/0003strategies.html>
- Weinbaum, A., Allen, D., Blythe, T., Seidel, S., Simon, K., & Rubin, C. (2004). *Teaching as inquiry: Asking hard questions to improve teacher practice and student achievement*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Wilbur, M.L. (2007). How foreign language teachers get taught: Methods of teaching the methods course. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40, 79-101.
- Wilson, B. & Corbett, H.D. (2001). *Listening to urban kids: School reform and the teachers they want*. Albany, NY: State University Press.
- Winitz, H., & Reeds, J. A. (1975). *Comprehension and problem solving as strategies for language training*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Winitz, H. (1981). *A reconsideration of comprehension and production in language training. The comprehension approach to foreign language instruction* (pp. 101-140). In H. Winitz (Ed.). Rowley, MA: Newbury.
- Winitz, H., Reeds, J. & García, P.A. (1986). Teaching German to college students through the comprehension approach: A 4-semester program." In Cook, V. (Ed.). *Experimental approaches to second language learning* (pp. 127-148). Oxford: Pergamon.
- Winitz, H., García, P.A. & Frick, R. (1985). Teaching language through listening comprehension. In P. Westphal (Ed.) *Meeting the call for excellence* (pp. 14-23). Skokie: National Textbook.
- Wong-Fillmore, L. (1985) When does teacher talk work as input? In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 17-50). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Reflections on the combined WL/ESOL methods course

Appendix A

WL and ESL Methods Course Topics, Rank-Ordered by Level of Importance

Most Commonly Taught Topics	
WL Methods Classes	ESL Methods Classes
Culture	Traditional/innovative methods
Testing	Theories/language learning
Methods	Writing
Developing oral proficiency	Reading
Planning lessons	Speaking and pronunciation
Theories/language learning	Grammar
Writing	Testing
Listening	Listening
Grammar	Curriculum design
Reading	Vocabulary
Oral proficiency movement	Methods in general
Receptive skills	Classroom management
Context	Culture
Technology	Communicative approach
Materials evaluation	History of teaching WLs
Language & context	Accuracy/errors
Materials evaluation	Error analysis
Professional development	Technology innovations
Pronunciation	English/specific purposes
Classroom management	Integrating the four skills
Vocabulary	Bilingual education
Motivation/attitudes	Cognitive (student learning) styles
	Professional development

Source: Grosse, C. U. (1993). The foreign language methods course. *The Modern Foreign Language Journal*, 77(3), p. 307.

