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From the Dean’s Desk:

Chicago State University College of Education is one of the oldest professional schools in Illinois and has housed one of the oldest Illinois education journals, the *Illinois Schools Journal* (ISJ). ISJ is a peer-reviewed journal in the field of education which we hope will be attractive to our colleagues worldwide who care about issues in P-16 settings. We hope that ISJ will be a venue for research that addresses issues that plague our educational system. ISJ provides a useful forum where education professionals from around the world can share educational research, ideas and developments.

I am particularly proud of this edition as it addresses the many diverse issues that pre-service and in-service teachers encounter in the classroom. In the article *Reading Motivation as the Imperative: An Action Research Study of Kindergarten Readers and Teacher Effectiveness* the authors provide results from an action research study told by a teacher candidate about a kindergarten teacher’s work with disadvantaged beginning readers. This article examines reading instruction and describes motivation as an imperative for observed reading instruction. The article *Gay Rights in Schools* addresses the serious issues of bullying and harassment of gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and questioning students in elementary and secondary schools. Relevant statues and cases are reviewed with a view to provide positive suggestions for school leaders to meet their obligation to provide an equal opportunity for education to all students.

Part 2 of the journal deals with a very important topic in education, Bilingual Education. In general language is thought to be the primary agent for the communication of thought and for the transmission of culture. Human experiences are displayed through language and help to develop language identities which set parameters for membership in groups. Therefore persons from all over the world are identified by languages that reflect their inclusion in territorial, cultural and social groups such as families, religions, countries, and societies. The article *Bilingual Transformation: The Effects of Globalization on Bilingual Education* looks at bilingual education from a global perspective while the article *Is Bilingual Education Moving...*
Forward or Backward? looks at the past and future of bilingual education, new legislations, and the implementation of new programs.

In summary the articles in this edition address many issues that have been in the forefront of educational discourse; however, have not been remedied. Conversations about best reading instructional practices, effective ways to support culturally and linguistically diverse students and educational reform initiatives have inspired the field of education to examine best instructional practices for all students.

Satasha L. Green, Dean
A Note from the Editor:

Welcome to the fall 2013 issue of Illinois Schools Journal. This issue is divided into two parts. Part 1 has manuscripts that cover a wider variety of topics. First is an action research report from a student-teaching experience. Second is an article on the issue gay rights in schools, focusing on the legal issues that surround this topic. Third explores the issue of "highly qualified" teachers from alternative certification programs.

Part 2 is the selected proceedings of the Illinois TESOL Bilingual Education (ITBE) Conference. This conference is held every February, and it features research, theory, and pedagogy to English Language Learners (ELLs). ELLs are a growing population in all educational settings, in both K-12, higher education, and non-school settings. This section begins with comments from Miguel Fernández, the guest editor and current president of ITBE. Articles featured in this section focus on all aspects of ELLs. There are two articles that focus on research and theory, and there are two articles that focus on pedagogy.

Many manuscripts were submitted, for both parts. However, of those submissions, these seven manuscripts passed the rigors of our peer reviewers. I want to thank all of our peer reviewers for the wonderful job they are doing. Their insight and knowledge is invaluable. As a result of their participation, my job is easier.

If you would like to submit a manuscript, please review the submission guidelines on page 171. All educational topics are welcome, and while many of the submissions have focused on research, Illinois Schools Journal is open to pedagogical manuscripts, book reviews, and informed opinion pieces. Every manuscript is blind reviewed by 2-3 people, and authors receive the feedback from the reviewers. If you have any questions, please contact the Editor-in-Chief, Byung-In Seo, at bseo@csu.edu. I look forward to hearing from you.

Byung-In Seo, Editor-in-Chief
Reading Motivation as the Imperative: 
An Action Research Study of 
Kindergarten Readers and Teacher 
Effectiveness

Brian Walker Johnson  
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Abstract

Qualitative research can describe the affective transactions between teachers and students that motivate reading in a kindergarten classroom. This action research study is a story told by a teacher candidate about a kindergarten teacher’s work with disadvantaged beginning readers. Describing how motivation was the imperative for observed reading instruction, the candidate used observational methods modified for the field experience. These methods included participant observation, constant comparative data collection, and analytic induction over three weeks of participatory clinical practice and three weeks of recursive data analysis. The instructional story that emerged identified three core motivation patterns: 1) reading motivation occurs when beginning readers can choose to read a variety of books; 2) reading motivation occurs when teachers and beginning readers engage in aesthetic read alouds; and 3) reading motivation occurs when teachers connect reading to content area subjects. The teacher candidate also applied three action research principles—researcher autobiography, observer-informant reciprocity, and time in the field, which created broader landscapes for describing the teacher’s work than hypothesis driven paradigms that deduce expertise from standardized research protocols or achievement tests (Bumpus, Johnson, & Marshall, 2007). Findings of this study rendered naturalistic descriptions of instruction that illustrate affective reading pedagogy for disadvantaged beginning readers. From this study, implications for teacher educators are included.
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Introduction

The following autobiographical statement belongs to a teacher candidate, Sarita. Sarita’s action research in a kindergarten classroom was supervised by the first author of this article. Her statement below illustrates the affective nature of beginning reader motivation, and it precedes the literature review, methods, and results that follow. Reading motivation was a personal imperative for Sarita because she was not particularly motivated as a young reader. Sarita’s experience with kindergarten readers and their teacher became the story of her emerging grasp of reading motivation.

Before I began my formal study of reading in kindergarten, I was unsure about how students begin to read at an early age. I was aware that kindergarten students begin to decode words and their meaning through their study of phonetics, semantics, and pragmatics. I was also aware that students in kindergarten learn about syntactic structure—spaces between words, words written from left to right, and end punctuation (Graves, Juel, Graves, & Dewitz, 2010; Watson, Burke, & Goodman, 1996). However, I was not knowledgeable about how or when students could be encouraged to read books on their own.

Growing up in Spain, I was never exposed to independent reading while I attended elementary school. I remember first grade phonics instruction. However, I was never given a book to read on my own until I reached fifth grade. In fifth grade, I read a small portion of The Little Prince by Antoine de Saint Exupéry (1943). Everyone in my fifth grade class was supposed to read this book. The teacher did not offer students like me a choice to read something we really wanted to read. I did not like The Little Prince because I did not understand what the book was about. I got lost in the words and became very frustrated with the assigned reading. So I stopped reading The Little Prince. Although I was a fluent
reader, I did not understand the book’s meaning, and it became pointless for me to read something I knew nothing about. My memories of reading in elementary school tell me that I established a strong foundation in the technical act of reading—the phonetics and the syntactics, but I did not learn enough about how to understand an unfamiliar book as my own. As I look back on my experience now, I realize that it would have been helpful to have been exposed to reading books at an early age. I was given the first book to read on my own in the fifth grade, and I failed to complete the task.

Reading motivation does not have to be set in the stones of difficult early reading experiences. Unfamiliar books can become familiar when the motivation to read them is taught. Disinclination to read can yield to humane and moral principles of a close reading community where affective constructs for reader motivation, comprehension instruction, and teacher effectiveness are understood.

**Affective Instruction and Reader Motivation: A Literature Review**

In the Greek myth of Pygmalion, the king describes his love for the sculpture of a woman named Galatea, a love that inspired the goddess Aphrodite to break Galatea out of the stone and give Pygmalion the human being who became his friend and spouse (Graves, 1993). The “Pygmalion Effect” (Jussim & Harber, 2005; Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1992; Rosenthal & Rubin, 1978) explains how teachers and students are motivated to read through the love they have for one another, love born of the same humane expectations Pygmalion believed Galatea could fulfill. In a concrete and engaging way, the Pygmalion myth illustrates how beginning readers and their teachers do not become effective by presenting, receiving, and practicing isolated reading skills and strategies. Instead, effective reading instruction is motivated by teacher-student relationships that care about readers’ ideas, value readers’ literacy choices, set relevant
expectations for these choices, and fosters unconditional love for learning.

Recent findings in the area of early vocabulary instruction illustrate the affective power of the Pygmalion effect (McKeown, Beck, & Sandora, 2012). The vocabulary development of kindergarteners placed in control, repetitive skill instruction, and rich interactive instruction groups was assessed in an initial study, and a second independent study replicated the original findings. Unlike the repetitive instruction group that simply practiced words with a teacher, the “rich interactive” instruction focused on affective relationships between teachers and students. Researcher descriptions of the rich interactive instruction conditions explain this difference further. In the interactive experimental group, kindergarteners made choices about what words they learned and how they learned them. Teachers were encouraged to ask why and how their students made these choices, and the kindergarteners were asked to tell their teachers stories about the chosen vocabulary words. The relationships these “rich interactive” protocols created between teachers and students produced significant findings. Kindergarten readers in reciprocal relationships with teachers and other readers learned to address questions requiring knowledge of words that: 1) characterize texts across domains and 2) exist well beyond the lexical bar of spoken words. What McKeown, Beck, and Sandora (2012) called “Tier Two” words for beginning readers, words such as familiar, satisfied, revealed, and extraordinary, not only became cues for “rich interactive” reader responses to comprehension questions, but these words also became part of these kindergarteners’ productive vocabulary for telling stories.

Findings of beginning reader studies like those reviewed by McKeown, Beck, and Sandora (2012) demonstrate that effective reading teachers are affective reading teachers. The affective pedagogy that characterize the McKeown, Beck, and Sandora (2012) protocols depends upon humane arts which include love, hope, caring, kindness, respect, appreciation, and promises kept (Ayers, 2010; Cohn, 1992; Freire, 1974; Greene, 2001; Macedo & Friere, 1987). Affective education is also guided by humane principles which include life, truth, dignity, democracy, forgiveness, diversity, and human rights (Ayers, 2004; Dewey, 1916; Griffin, 1992). These arts and principles have guided decades
of successful school reform across multiple grades and content areas (Anyon, 2011; see also Anyon, 2005). In the area of reading research, effective reading instruction has yet to be separated in any convincing way from the prior knowledge, interests, and social contexts that motivate readers and their teachers (Allington, 2002; Allington & Walmsley, 2007; Johnston, 2012; Johnston & Allington, 2002; Smith, 2011). Although myriad ways and forms of divorcing reading behavior and teacher effectiveness from affective instruction continue (Flesch, 1955; Hirsch, 2002; Hoover & Gough, 1990; Skinner, 1971), these technical approaches have lacked a meaningful knowledge base for over forty years (Anderson, 1977; Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000; Brewer, 2010).

Fifty years ago, educational psychologists began to publish the first psychometric models of motivation and learning (Bandura & Kupers, 1964; Brophy, 1983; Zimmerman, 1977). Thirty years ago researchers began to apply this general research to the cognitive task of learning to read (Afflerbach, 1990; Brown, Palincsar, & Armbruster, 1984; Paris, Cross, & Lipson, 1984; Schunk & Rice, 1987). Like McKeown, Beck, and Sandora’s (2012) research with beginning readers, the findings of these post-modern researchers did not advocate external transmission of isolated skills and strategies from teachers to readers. Contradicting previous descriptions of motivation as external to reader cognition (Durkin, 1973; Flesch, 1955), they demonstrated that reader motivation was self-regulated by internal sub-processes including self-observation, self-judgment, and self-reaction (Schunk, 1989). When these internal processes were fostered in laboratory and classroom studies to generate metacomprehension strategy—the personal, reflective, concerted and strategic use of reading skills through teacher-reader dialog—disadvantaged and developing readers repeatedly demonstrated significant gains in efficient and accurate reading (Graves, et al., 2010; Lysynchuk, Pressley, & Vye, 1990). These results were dramatic, and they continue to guide reading instruction and assessment today (Bronzo & Afflerbach, 2011). Perhaps the most significant gift these reading researchers have given is the way they unified reading behavior to the affective experiences of readers and teachers. Reading researchers at the turn of this century used verbal reports and other stories to generate and test their hypotheses.
These new ways of knowing put affective relationships at the very heart of reading inquiry and instruction.

The need for instructional stories that help teachers to pursue affective, motivating relationships with beginning readers continues to be crucial to reading achievement. Basal readers, for example, now include scripts to encourage teacher and reader talk in kindergarten classrooms. However, rich, qualitative descriptions of teacher and reader behaviors are still needed to put laboratory research about affective reading instruction into practice. For example, consider the following statement that introduces a kindergarten teacher’s edition of a current popular basal reader series. The source of this statement will remain uncited not only out of courtesy to its authors but also because similar statements may be found in most basal reader series:

The National Reading Panel (NRP) issued a report in response to a Congressional mandate to help teachers, parents and policymakers identify the skills and methods most crucial to reading achievement...[Our Basal Reading Series] thoroughly addresses all seven categories [for comprehension instruction in kindergarten]. The strategies of monitoring, questioning, and summarizing narrative and expository texts are all included, with an instructional model that provides for teacher modeling, teacher-student interaction, and student modeling...[Our Basal Reading Series] delivers evidence of effectiveness based on scientific research.

Who is in charge of the affective relationship between kindergarten teacher and student according to this statement? The U.S. Congress has been given much power through its “Congressional mandate.” The NRP has determined what kindergarten comprehension instruction is, even though most of the “scientific” NRP comprehension instruction categories emerged from primary grade reading research that does not apply to kindergarten (Majors, 2009). Finally, the basal series itself claims that its “instructional model” will “deliver evidence of effectiveness based on scientific research.” What authority does a teacher and student have to question instruction? To think through a text together on their own terms? To learn together? Where is
there room for any affective value other than scriptural adherence to a teacher’s manual?

Presley’s (2011) examination of kindergarten and first grade basal reader series in California reviewed survey data by Shannon (1991) that demonstrated how teacher edition scripts deskill meaningful teacher-reader transactions. Presley also provides compelling survey data by Baumann and Heubach (1996) that suggests reading teachers are “discriminating consumers,” see basals as one instructional method, and do not give up instructional control to basal scripts (p. 511). Limitations of both studies were considered: Shannon’s survey data was limited to one school district while Baumann and Heubach’s were limited to International Reading Association members. While reading teachers may affirm or deny that basal scripting impedes meaningful interactions with readers, classroom studies that unpack what these survey statements mean are needed (Presley, 2011).

Majors’ (2009) study of four popular first grade basal series also identifies proscriptive teacher scripts, as well as “erratic” sequencing of comprehension instruction, as questionable models for beginning reading instruction. The findings of this study identify that scripted instruction can “impede the creativity and independence of those teachers who understand the dynamics of the reading process” (p. 167). A particular concern Majors (2009, p. 161) expressed was lack of space for reader talk in the basal scripts. Although most of the four basal series’ lessons examined for beginning reader instruction included teacher “think-alouds” similar to the “repetition instruction” condition described by McKeown, Beck, and Sandora (2012), none included the hallmark of affective methods that foster comprehension: scaffolding instruction to reduce teacher talk and increase reader talk (Brown, Palincsar, & Armbruster, 1984; Pressley, 2002). Majors (2009) also called for classroom studies that describe how teachers and beginning readers interact as they read together, and Wright and Neuman’s (2013) more recent study of teacher scripts for kindergarten vocabulary instruction echoes this request. By telling stories about methods a cooperating kindergarten teacher used to motivate readers, Sarita, the teacher candidate who conducted this study, described naturalistic instructional landscapes for other teachers. This kind of storytelling has become a useful alternative to proscriptive curriculum school teachers may use
to guide instruction (Ayers, Quinn, Stovall, & Scheiern, 2007; Clandinin, 2013).

Instructional stories help teachers to pursue affective, motivating relationships with beginning readers, and these stories can be crucial to bridging achievement gaps between advantaged and disadvantaged readers. The effects of disadvantaged kindergarten readers’ home environments have been a subject of study for decades (Clay, 1977; Guthrie & Greaney, 1996; LoCasale-Crouch, Moritz-Rudasill, Sweeney, Chattrabhuti, Patton, & Pianta, 2012). Kindergarten transition from home to school is crucial to reading, and socioeconomic advantages and disadvantages can determine the success or failure of this transition. Levels of parent education, access to books, access to a library, and leisure opportunities for parents and children to read books have been correlated to early motivation and early ability for reading in school. However, reading researchers are also beginning to learn that this socioeconomic influence does not have to determine reading ability in school. Purcell-Gates (1997) found that some beginning readers with socioeconomic disadvantages and low achievement test scores understood early reading concepts. Looking into this finding further, Duke and Purcell-Gates (2003) demonstrated that socioeconomics may hinder beginning reader achievement because texts in disadvantaged homes differ significantly from texts used in schools. This line of research concludes that schools bear an ethical responsibility to bridge differences between home and school literacy interests (Duke & Purcell-Gates, 2003). Greater student choice of books, deeper interaction with teachers, and opportunities to share reading with others—the affective, motivating relationships with people and texts illustrated in studies like those of McKeown, Beck, and Sandora (2012)—can level the socioeconomics of early reading achievement (see also Invernizzi, 2002; Silverman, 2007; Duke & Carlisle, 2011). The focus of this qualitative study of kindergarten reading instruction is an example of what Purcell-Gates (1997) and others (LoCastle-Crouch, et al., 2012; Payne, 2005) have envisioned. By documenting naturalistic observations of her cooperating teacher’s interactions with disadvantaged beginning readers, the teacher candidate’s stories add this important social dimension to her instructional landscape map.
Methodology

This action research study uses methods adapted to the work of teacher candidates with student populations that have achievement test score gaps. Introduced by Bumpus, Johnson, and Marshall (2007), these methods were initially used to focus a teacher candidate’s inquiry into assessment of an individualized fourth grade reading curriculum. Like Sarita, the teacher candidate who conducted this fourth grade study was from Principia College, one of three model institutions among 74 institutions reviewed by the State of Illinois between 2002 and 2008. In addition to examining kindergarten reader motivation, Sarita’s study illustrates how the three action research principles introduced by Bumpus, Johnson, and Marshall (2007) helped her to engage in reciprocal mentoring with an experienced reading teacher. “First, the study is autobiographical—focusing on the life experience of the teacher candidate” (Bumpus, et al., 2007, p. 116). By sharing a life story, Sarita builds trust and transparency with the cooperating teacher. The autobiography explains who Sarita is and what she wants to learn. In this way, any cooperating teacher perceptions of hidden agendas or impositions are reduced. Trust building has continued to change the instructional behavior of teachers in disadvantaged classroom settings (Ayers, et al., 2007; Cohn & Kottkamp, 1993; Scheiern, 2012; Smith & Geoffrey, 1968; Zeichner, 2012), and using autobiography to build trust was a crucial method in this study.

“Next, the study proceeded from a reciprocal model of mentor teacher and teacher candidate proficiency” (Bumpus, et al., 2007, p. 116). As a teacher candidate, Sarita depends upon her cooperating teacher as a practical guide for reading instruction, and the cooperating teacher depends upon Sarita to generate new ideas for instruction. Thus, a reciprocal relationship is established. Reciprocity continues to be associated with teacher change, student achievement, and social justice in classrooms (Ayers, Klonsky, & Lyon, 2000; Scheiern, 2012). Reciprocal teaching has improved the reading instruction of early elementary reading recovery teachers (Lyons, Pinnell, DeFord, & Clay, 1993; Beck, et al., 2002), as well as the instruction of middle and high school teachers who read with disadvantaged students (Kucan & Palincsar, 2013).
“Finally, the study that follows includes recommendations specific to the 120 hours the teacher candidate spent with the cooperating teacher in her school and classroom learning how to teach” (Bumpus, Johnson, & Marshall, 2007, p. 117). Sarita’s time in the field occurred over a three-week, full-day clinical practice placement. Significant time in the cooperating teacher’s classroom gave the candidate’s ideas the authority of shared practice. This authority was enhanced in this study when Sarita spent three additional weeks after the clinical practice internship analyzing data and revising claims and recommendations. Focusing on theories of reflective practice, Zeichner’s (2012) research review demonstrates how shared instructional practice makes ideas practical for teachers (see also Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Schon, 1983).

Teacher candidate study of reading instruction would not be possible without partnerships between schools and teacher certification programs (Pankratz, 2012). Principia College has continued its strong partnership with the Roxana, Illinois, Community Unit School District #1 for over twenty years. Both the college and the school district continue to be grateful for this learning community of teachers, college faculty, administrators, parents, and other professional educators. The strength of this community allows for educational research that is transparent. Full permission to share information about Sarita, the cooperating teacher, Roxana Central Elementary School, and Principia College, was given to encourage readers of this article to contact partnership members at any time. At the same time maintaining confidentiality for other teacher candidates, P-12 students and education professionals who participated in this action research study is important. The focus of this action research study was limited to the cooperating teacher and Sarita. Specific data sources, along with dates of the study proper, have been deleted from published study descriptions. The manuscript of this action research study was reviewed by the Roxana Community Unit School District #1 assistant superintendent for curriculum to assure its ethical conduct and publication.

**Research Design**

The cooperating kindergarten teacher, whose reading instruction was the phenomenon of interest for this study, was chosen for Sarita’s three-week clinical practice internship.
Although this choice was a result of principal recommendations based upon student achievement test scores that met or exceeded annual yearly progress, the candidate’s action research did not determine cooperating teacher expertise from pre- and post-test measures of kindergarteners’ reading abilities. This cooperating teacher’s instruction was not a model for analysis. Rather, it was a phenomenon to investigate and describe. This naturalistic approach to understanding reading teacher effectiveness differs from experimental and control group analysis within laboratory teaching studies (Lincoln & Denzin, 2012). It also differs from statistical analysis of additivity or trends to interpret student achievement test scores (Ravitch, 2011). Laboratory study and statistical sampling are useful ways to test instructional hypotheses, but they do not generate broader, naturalistic descriptions of reading instruction that are needed right now for the study of kindergarten reading and, arguably, throughout K-12 school curriculum (Ayers, et al., 2007; Wright & Neuman, 2013). Thus, qualitative data was collected in ways designed to provide naturalistic descriptions of instruction.

The qualitative research design of this study also presents an alternative approach to gauging kindergarten teacher effectiveness. Deducing teacher effectiveness from kindergarteners’ standardized test scores is typically not a useful way to generate meaningful descriptions of emergent reading instruction. Darling-Hammond (2007) offered an extensive research review of the Value Added Measure (VAM) protocols federal and state officials now use to set annual yearly progress standards for disadvantaged readers. The review explains that statistical weighting of standardized achievement test scores to measure progress from one year to the next confounds judgments about teacher effectiveness: “Different teachers appear effective depending on whether student characteristics are controlled, whether school effects are controlled, and what kinds of students teachers teach (for example, the proportion of students with special needs or English language learners)” (Darling-Hammond, 2007, p. 16; see also Braun, 2005).

More recent and comprehensive considerations of statistical contradictions emerging from VAM are now available (Startz, 2012; Ravitch, 2011), and the general message remains the same. Current standardized test score
measures of reading teacher effectiveness do not even work within the questionable terms of student “annual yearly progress” state and federal officials have mandated, especially for teachers who work with disadvantaged students. For us as authors of this study, this particular limitation of statistically additivity begged for qualitative action research that addresses lurking questions about teacher effectiveness. If affective constructs, like reading motivation, cannot be described by a standardized test score, must they simply cease to exist? Is there some other way? What if affective paradigms became imperatives for reading teacher effectiveness? How might action research studies like the one that follows describe these phenomena in ways that foster this effectiveness rather than simply judging teachers according to their students’ test scores?

In addition to its naturalistic descriptions of kindergarten reading instruction, this study illustrates a methodology for assessing reading teacher effectiveness that may: 1) address consistently low reading proficiency among disadvantaged U.S. and international students for almost fifty years in ways hypothesis-testing research paradigms have not pursued (Akiba, 2013; Kozol, 1985; Perie, Moran, Lutkus, Tirre, 2005; UNESCO, 2006); 2) be a viable alternative to judging teachers by their students’ standardized test scores (Jacob, 2011); 3) be applied across multiple school settings. The relationships between qualitative, action research and teacher effectiveness stem from work that investigates how teacher candidate action research fosters student learning (Caro-Bruce, Flessner, Klehr, & Zeichner, 2007; Carroll, Featherstone, Featherstone, Feiman-Nemser, & Roosevelt, 2007). Examination of teacher candidate effectiveness with students and cooperating teachers is also supported by private accreditation agencies such as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Private institutes including the National Network for Educational Renewal (Goodlad, 2011) and The Renaissance Group (Pankratz, 2012) also value teacher candidate work with cooperating teachers to help all students learn. Methods that fully describe teacher candidate effectiveness are still not fully developed (see Farenga, Ness, Johnson, & Johnson, 2011; Johnson, Johnson, Farenga, & Ness, 2005), but even skeptical researchers are open to deeper thinking about how teacher candidates and cooperating teachers can assess their effectiveness together.
Teacher Candidate Autobiography

At first, the teacher candidate, Sarita, believed early readers needed certain skills to read independently. In an autobiography prior to the study proper, Sarita wrote that decoding words was an essential skill for early readers. She also believed early readers needed to know multiple strategies for decoding and comprehending. These strategies included seeing relationships between sounds and letters within words, looking at book illustrations for meaning, and examining sentence structure to infer what a word may mean. Finally, Sarita stated that early readers needed to understand reading as a pathway to literacy that benefits them.

Based on her experience, first as a child in Spain and later as a U.S. college student, Sarita was already interested in how elementary school students were introduced to reading. However, the kindergarten reading instruction she observed did not proceed as she originally believed it would:

*When I came to my Roxana, Illinois, kindergarten classroom, few of the kindergarteners demonstrated skills I thought were prerequisite to reading books, and I thought the instructional focus would be on these missing skills. This explicit skill instruction did occur. However, I also observed the cooperating teacher spending a great deal of instructional time surrounding students with books and talking with them about what they read, even though their reading was often just looking at book illustrations. This instructional landscape was different from what I had experienced or expected. And so I began to see how reading transactions between teachers and students would lead me to think critically about reading motivation.*

Given this perspective, Sarita began to see kindergarten reading instruction and the cooperating teacher’s effectiveness from the standpoint of what McKeown, Beck, and Sandora (2012) called the “rich interactive” instruction that motivates reading. Although Sarita was not aware of affective approaches to reading instruction at this time, naturalistic descriptions of the cooperating teacher’s work would emerge as a match for these methods of teaching.
Study Site and Participants

Roxana Central Elementary School is a public school located in Roxana, a rural industrial town in the State of Illinois. The school of 445 students is predominantly Caucasian with just a few African, Hispanic, and Asian Americans constituting 2% of the school population (Assistant Superintendent S. Oertle, Personal Communication, June 10, 2013). The majority of the people who live in Central’s school community are employed by industrial work in ammunition factories and two oil refineries. Those who work at these factories and refineries typically receive higher salaries than those who work elsewhere in the community, but these same workers often have educations that do not exceed a high school or trade school diploma. Thus, their “higher” salaries are often just enough to put them at the margins of middle class living. The poverty rate in Roxana is lower than it used to be. However, 53% of the students at Central qualified for free or reduced-price lunches at the time of Sarita’s study (Assistant Superintendent S. Oertle, Personal Communication, June 10, 2013). Kindergarteners Sarita taught came from a population that struggles with poverty.

Test score data on Central’s website report card demonstrated the achievement gap that professional educators in the Roxana School District thought could exist between the school’s kindergarteners and more advantaged students in other Illinois schools (Assistant Superintendent S. Oertle, Personal Communication, June 10, 2013).

Sarita completed a three week internship with a kindergarten class of twenty-three students, all of whom were Caucasian between the ages of five and six years old. There were thirteen boys and ten girls in the classroom. According to the Illinois State Board of Education’s Division of Early Childhood Education, kindergarten teachers were responsible for including the following subject areas in their curriculum: language arts, mathematics, science, social science, physical development and health, fine arts, foreign language, and social/emotional development. Sarita reported that the cooperating teacher used the Harcourt basal series books for language arts and mathematics. To meet science objectives, the cooperating teacher created original lessons and incorporated them into learning centers for students. Most of the required subjects were integrated with one another. For example, the cooperating teacher’s theme study of African animals not only included science centers but also social...
science community study, art projects, language study, writing assignments, and reading activities. Not one kindergarten learning objective the cooperating teacher taught existed apart from any other.

Five students in the kindergarten class had Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) for speech or language delays. These five students met with a speech therapist three times a week. Besides the students with speech IEPs, many students in the class had different learning needs and reading ability levels. Thirteen students attended pre-school where they were introduced to the letters of the alphabet and learned how to write their names. For the rest, kindergarten was their first year of school. The thirteen students who attended preschool also received reading support from families who read with them and helped them to write at home. Interviews with professional educators at Central Elementary identified six of the ten kindergarteners for whom school was a new experience as students who received inconsistent reading support at home. These differences in kindergarten reader ability led the cooperating teacher and Sarita to use scaffolding techniques in all of their lessons, allowing their language for reading instruction in all subject areas to match kindergarteners’ varied zones of proximal development (Brown, et al., 1984; Pressley, 2002; Vygotsky, 1962).

Data Collection

Sarita’s interest in reading motivation emerged as she saw how social disadvantages had already affected her kindergarteners’ reading abilities:

*My cooperating teacher pointed out to me that a few of the students in her class were going to be held back from first grade the next year because they were not going to meet requisite state and federal benchmarks. I became very interested in learning more about reasons why some students were more advanced in reading than others. I also became interested in finding ways to motivate students to read regardless of their reading ability. My initial inquiries about reading motivation began an on-going dialogue about reading with my cooperating teacher and my kindergarten students,* as
well as other teacher candidates, teacher educators, professional educators, and elementary school faculty who worked with me in Roxana Community Unit School District #1.

Through these extended conversations, Sarita collected and analyzed a variety of data for this action research study.

I collected data about reading motivation in multiple ways. My main sources of data were summary observations, factual summaries written the day a classroom event or interview took place; field observation notes written during or directly after a classroom event or interview; and summary retrospective observations written more than one day after a classroom event or interview. Given differences in the way my data was collected, summary observations and retrospective observations contained more of my own inferences, interpretations, thoughts, and feelings than the field note data that I took on the spot. My data also included artifacts of student reading.

The core patterns Sarita discovered about reading motivation did not change much during this action research study. She articulated these patterns for the first time during a seminar meeting with education faculty and teacher candidates at Principia College, a meeting that occurred midway through the study. Here, Sarita and other teacher candidates in her clinical practice cadre discussed their areas of interest for action research. They also helped each other look at their collected observation, interview, and artifact data in order to identify core patterns of behavior. At the end of this midway analysis session, Sarita’s core categories were: 1) Students become motivated to read when they choose the books they read; 2) Students become motivated to read when a teacher reads aloud to them; and 3) Students become motivated to read when a teacher is interested in students’ learning of the subject. After another seven days of collecting more data, as well as an additional three weeks of analyzing all of the data
with her cooperating teacher and other Roxana educators, the core categories were more accurately stated as follows: 1) Students become motivated to read when they are provided with a variety of books to read on a daily basis; 2) Students become motivated to read when a teacher reads aloud to them; and 3) Students become motivated to read when a teacher expresses an interest in a content area subject as well as the students’ learning of the subject.

During the final seven days of Sarita’s school placement, and for three weeks following the experience, she continued to review her data. At this time, she rewrote titles for the core categories to guide her data collection. She also narrowed her observation to create accurate and final summary statements for the core behavior patterns. To accomplish this goal, Sarita wrote down definitive statements about the behavior categories she saw. Then she reexamined all of her data, categorizing all observation, interview, and artifact data according to the core pattern statements she had written. Finally, she rewrote these statements as needed to align them with the data she collected and analyzed as she was narrowing her observations for the purpose of creating final summary statements. This analytic induction process enabled Sarita to organize, analyze and present her data in ways that focused on reading motivation in her kindergarten classroom (Lincoln & Denzin, 2012).

**Results**

By reviewing and refining naturalistic observations of kindergarten reading instruction, Sarita was able to map her observations across three core patterns of reading motivation. The following core patterns summarize Sarita’s classroom experience:

**Core Pattern #1: Motivation from Reading a Variety of Books**

Sarita discovered that the kindergarteners she observed became motivated to read when they were provided with a variety of books. Many of the kindergarteners came from families with economic and/or educational disadvantages, and these disadvantages limited access to school texts. It became critical for the cooperating teacher to provide students with as many school books as possible to foster reading motivation in school at an early age.

There was, also, a pattern of kindergarteners frequently taking books out of activity buckets and looking
through them. Many days, especially the inclimate ones when recess occurred inside, kindergarteners chose to read choice books with partners or in a group. Several students came to Sarita at different times and asked her to read their books with them during their inside recess or learning center time. Interviews with the cooperating teacher showed that book variety and choice was a reading motivator. The cooperating teacher often described how she placed buckets of new books in front of the classroom each week that related to the content area theme students were studying. Sarita’s cooperating teacher also pointed out that her students checked out books from the library to take home with them.

Core Pattern #2: Motivation and Reading Aloud

During her three weeks of clinical practice, Sarita noticed that her kindergarteners became engaged every time she read books aloud to them. She usually asked students to sit in a circle, close to her and the book, so everyone could see the print and pictures, a technique Sarita’s reading methods textbook called the “lap method” (Graves, et al., 2010). In *Teaching Children to Care*, Charney (2002; see also Charney, Davis, & Shapiro, 2011) emphasizes the importance of circling for motivational as well as instructional purposes. Charney claims that circles teach children to care about everyone. Anyone can sit anywhere in a circle, regardless of who a neighbor might be. The motivation generated by this simple idea was quite significant for the Roxana kindergarteners:

> Students consistently listened and paid close, quiet attention to the book illustrations and print I read to them. By observing students’ posture and body language, I could infer that they were motivated to keep listening to the stories I read. It is very difficult for kindergarteners to sit still, but my reading aloud appeared to freeze them in place.

The cooperating teacher also informed Sarita that books on tape were an important variation of read aloud methods that motivate student reading. Books on tape have the additional benefit of allowing developing readers to repeatedly associate the sounds of reading with letters they see on a printed page. Unlike teachers, tape recorders do not get
tired at the end of the day or have other tasks to do. The cooperating teacher also emphasized the importance of kindergarten students reading to one another in pairs, a technique Sarita’s reading methods textbook called “paired reading” (Graves, et al., 2010).

Core Pattern #3: Motivation and Content Area Reading

As Sarita reviewed the kindergarten reading lessons she and her cooperating teacher taught, Sarita came to see how critical it was for all teachers to embed reading instruction into the content areas they teach. When kindergarteners were engaged in content area reading, they expressed more motivation to read and participate in content area activities. The cooperating teacher often embedded reading into morning “bucket” activities. There were always two buckets of books at the front of the classroom about the content area theme studied during any particular week. One bucket with content area books of enduring interest for the kindergarteners rotated to student tables each day. Books were also incorporated into learning centers which, at the time of this study, focused on science instruction.

Teacher Candidate Discussion of Findings and Teacher Effectiveness

By studying reading motivation in Central Elementary School’s kindergarten classroom, Sarita concluded that the following ideas could be used to improve teaching and learning: 1) provide more independent reading time; 2) circle during read alouds; 3) use aesthetic reading activities during read alouds; 4) continue all current methods of kindergarten reading instruction; 5) continue to value the life-changing effects of this reading instruction.

I believe kindergarten reader motivation will improve if students have more time to read their choice books. Although I have firsthand experience with the packed kindergarten schedule at Central Elementary, I believe my cooperating teacher could provide additional independent reading time at least three more times per week for twenty minutes. This change will affect the daily schedule, but the potential growth in reading motivation would be worth the effort.
I also suggest that my cooperating teacher adopt the practice of circling up with students when reading aloud. This practice will help her students become even more engaged in reading as a communal experience. While sitting in a circle and reading aloud to students, I also think that it would be helpful to use puppets or other aesthetic devices to make books come alive for the kindergarteners. Reading methods texts are full of these activities (Graves, et al., 2010).

Sarita’s final recommendation encouraged her cooperating teacher to continue the instruction observed during the three week internship, putting an exclamation point on this recommendation by emphasizing how her cooperating teacher’s focus on reading motivation and shared teacher practice was changing lives:

Friere (1974) explains how new winds of freedom blow where caring teachers walk, and this praxis of caring and reading has had a powerful effect among the kindergartners I studied. These students are not simply being taught to read. They are motivated to read more. This disposition, perhaps more than any reading skills they are taught, will bless them with a love for learning that will transform their lives.

As a result of conducting this action research, my life as a teacher has also been changed. I have learned that examining instruction in schools is essential, especially because very few people have the chance to observe the meaningful transactions that students and teachers have together each day. This particular research study has enabled me to understand that I, as a teacher candidate, need to promote students’ motivation to read from an early age. I value this understanding because it has come through a mentoring process that addressed the effectiveness of what my cooperating teacher, and I have done
together. Action research methods forged professional relationships for me that included teacher candidates, teacher educators, professional educators, and, of course, my kindergarten students and mentor teacher. These relationships developed my understanding of how kindergarteners become motivated readers. Beyond the findings of this particular study, this way of learning how to teach and understand the effectiveness of other teachers will always be helpful to me.

Implication for Teacher Educators

There are multiple implications this study has for teacher educators and their teacher candidates. First, it demonstrates that principles of action research for teacher candidates introduced by Bumpus, Johnson, and Marshall (2007) may be applicable to learning about instruction in early, as well as later primary grades. Action research projects can establish strong, reciprocal relationships between teacher candidates and mentor teachers in elementary schools that may foster effective reading instruction. These in-depth projects also introduce a cadre of elementary teacher candidates to professional educators and one another as fellow researchers seeking to improve student learning.

Next, teacher candidate action research removes education professors from the questionable role of simply telling elementary teacher candidates and cooperating teachers what effective instruction is instead of investigating instructional practice in relevant classroom settings. Through action research, the education professor, like the teacher candidate and cooperating teacher, becomes a co-investigator of teaching and learning by asking questions, explaining choices for inquiry methods, and putting findings in larger contexts.

A significant finding that has emerged from this action research study and its Bumpus, Johnson, and Marshall (2007) predecessor is the importance of three qualitative research principles that build trust, establish reciprocal mentoring, and reflective thinking: 1) teacher candidate autobiography; 2) observer-informant reciprocity; 3) time in the field. Autobiography in both studies led to a genuine
research question and built trust with cooperating teachers. The reciprocity that resulted from teacher candidate sharing fostered the development of the research question to include professional development school interests, allowing the cooperating teacher and other school professionals to work with the teacher candidate. Finally, time in the field, in Sarita’s case a full-day, three-week school placement, allowed her and her cooperating teacher to share teaching practice together. In this way, core qualitative research principles became the bone and sinew for reflective classroom inquiry. Teacher candidates and educators, in both this study and its predecessor, articulated how action research led to more collaborative, reflective understandings of teaching and learning.

It is also important to note that qualitative research principles can be difficult to apply, especially at a time when financial considerations may govern curriculum development in colleges of education. Perceived cost saving from use of adjunct education faculty to teach methods courses often means standardizing action research in ways that do not match school professionals’ interests. Perceived cost savings from separating methods instruction from clinical practice internships often means sending candidates to a classroom for brief periods during a school day, or limiting candidate-mentor time to a few school days per week. These pedagogical practices may occur at the expense of meaningful action research projects, and they may also be fueled by an education professorate that is still making up its mind about the praxis between educational research and professional practice.

Schulman, Golde, Bueschel, and Grabedian (2006) describe in detail the confused purposes graduate schools can have for preparing practitioners and scholars in education. By separating Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees in the education professorate, neither understandings of educational research or professional practice are done well. This line of inquiry suggested by Schulman, Golde, Bueschel, and Grabedian (2006) is important to consider for those in the education professorate who want to prepare themselves, their colleagues, and their academic administrators to bring action research—a praxis between educational research and professional practice—to teacher candidates and cooperating teachers. Action research is more than forging strong relationships between professional educators and beginning teachers. It
also requires an understanding of how phenomena in the classroom can be encountered and understood. Similarly, action research requires more than a static comprehension of research methods. Without grounded knowledge of school pedagogy, education professors, cooperating teachers, and teacher candidates may be left attempting to "paint a moving train" of classroom activity whose meaning appears to have no static hypothesis. Both research and professional practice must be done well for action research to be successful, and institutions of higher learning in education need to assess, and perhaps reclaim, the knowledge, skills, and dispositions at their disposal for this work.

**Conclusion**

Sarita’s action research with her cooperating teacher at Central Elementary School has provided a naturalistic description of affective reading instruction in kindergarten that is congruent with a number of laboratory research findings about emergent literacy. Sarita describes how informational text motivates kindergarteners to read, and the findings of her action research echo recent reviews of emergent reader comprehension studies that have valued informational texts for young readers (Duke & Carlisle, 2011). Sarita also discovered that affective instruction includes aesthetic instruction including role play with puppets or other artistic experiences. This finding resonates with Silverman’s (2007) work with English language and English only emergent readers whose reading vocabulary grows as a result of this kind of interactive, multidimensional vocabulary instruction (MVI). Findings by Beck, McKeown, and Kucan (2002; see also McKeown, Becket al., 2012) about “robust” and “rich interactive” vocabulary instruction also support interactive play with books and words. Invernizzi’s (2002) suggested “diet” for emergent readers of concept development through repeated reading of informational texts, encouraging letter-sound relationships and concept-of-word in print is also apparent in Sarita’s findings (see also Bear, Invernizzi, Templeton, & Johnston, 2011). Sarita learned that she and her cooperating teacher could provide informational texts to kindergarteners who had limited access and time with these texts at home. As a result of her cooperating teacher’s bucket brigade of books and focus on read-aloud instruction, emergent readers at Central Elementary School appreciated and gravitated towards school texts. They became motivated
to take their first major steps towards school literacy in ways that rendered practical descriptions of emergent literacy.

Sarita’s work as a teacher candidate also provides lessons for undergraduate teacher education. Action research is not an activity that has to be reserved for educators to learn in graduate school. The simple qualitative research principles of autobiographical transparency, participant-researcher reciprocity, and time in the field can foster beginning teacher development if teacher educators envision this work as a reflective practice, rather than a technical, scripted exercise, of the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that support student learning (Zeichner, 2012). To make action research work, teacher educators must trust that teacher candidate abilities emerging from reflective inquiry will be congruent with what students need to learn. Sarita’s research is one piece of evidence that demonstrates this trust may be well founded. Her findings about reading motivation matched those of a number of successful laboratory teaching studies.

At a time in U.S. education when student achievement scores are becoming predominant measures of teacher effectiveness, Sarita also learned to gather and analyze her own data about student learning and teacher effectiveness. This self-assessment of instructional effectiveness is crucial. When expectations for reading teachers’ effectiveness are reduced to standardized test events, instruction may remain a dead, technical exercise, a place where “safe” instruction sticks to a script (Wright & Neuman, 2013). However, Sarita and her cooperating teacher have demonstrated how this barrier to genuine teacher effectiveness can be cracked. A reflective apprentice can help a professional teacher see ways and means of improvement that may not be evident at first, and this second sight can restore affective inquiry to reading instruction. With students’ needs rather than test objectives in mind, professional teachers can mentor teacher candidates to individualize instruction, respond to reader interests, and motivate reading behavior. In this moment of reciprocal mentoring, the heart of affective reading inquiry beats again. In this moment, the love, joy, and reward of reading may become the instructional imperative in schools.
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Abstract
This article addresses the issue of bullying and harassment of gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and questioning students in the elementary and secondary schools. Relevant statues and cases are reviewed with a view to providing positive suggestions for school leaders to meet their obligation to provide an equal opportunity for education to all the students.
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Introduction
In theory, gay people in America have exactly the same constitutional rights as their non-gay fellow citizens. In practice, however, there are State constitutions and statutes, as well as the federal Defense of Marriage Act, which restrict the rights of gays. The semantically improper phrase, “gay rights” should more correctly be identified as “violations of the civil rights of gays,” indicating situations, times and places, and institutions where the civil rights of gays are routinely ignored or violated. Also the history of education in America, unfortunately, indicates that one of the situations, places, and institutions where the rights of gays are violated has been the schools (Violence Prevention Works, 2013). As a result, gays and lesbians have turned to the legislatures and the courts for relief from discrimination, in order to achieve the access to equitable education promised to all children. These court cases and state statutes have substantially influenced the role of the school administrator and imposed new obligations on schoolteachers, leaders, and boards.

In order to explore and elucidate these new obligations, this essay proposes to review some of the relevant court cases involving the violation of gay and lesbian rights in schools, to analyze the appropriate legislation in Illinois regarding bullying and harassment, and to review the research on the incidence of gay and lesbian bashing in the schools. A concluding section will offer some suggestions for current and
future school administrators of the Land of Lincoln, in pursuit of their obligation to provide a free and appropriate education for all children.

**History**

Anecdotal evidence of widespread harassment and bullying of gays and lesbians in schools has been available for many years (Riese, 2003). A scientific study, which attempted to systematically document the abuse of gays in schools, was conducted from October, 1999, to October, 2000, by researchers from the Human Rights Watch, a gay rights advocacy organization. The findings of the Human Rights Watch study published in May of 2001 under the title, *Hatred in the Hallways* (2001). The researchers visited schools in eight states and interviewed 140 students between the ages of 12 and 21 years old, as well as 130 school personnel including teachers, counselors, administrators, and parents.

The Human Rights Watch researchers were well aware that their activity could endanger a potential interviewee by “outing” a student or calling attention to his/her sexual orientation. Working through local service organizations such as Parents and Friends of Gays and Lesbians to identify potential interviewees, researchers invited potential subjects to a general meeting to hear the purpose of the study and decide whether they wanted to participate. Both in the general session and in individual interviews, the Human Rights Watch interviewer reminded the participants that the activity was strictly voluntary, that they were free to answer or not answer any questions asked, and that they could terminate the interview at any time.

The *Hatred in the Hallways* report clearly stated that the interviewees cited in the report do not constitute a representative sample of gays and lesbians in the schools. The populations cited are Gay, Lesbian, Transgender, Bisexual, and Questioning youngsters who were identified by a service organization and who, after hearing the general presentation, agreed to be interviewed. Human Rights Watch researchers indicated that after the general sessions, about a quarter to a half of the students would drift away and not volunteer to be interviewed (Human Rights Watch, 2001).

Despite the small size of the study and despite the fact that the sample is not representative, the impact on the
reader of *Hatred in the Hallways* is like the last paragraph of Remarque's *All Quiet on the Western Front* (1929). It is a stunning emotional experience, which induces a profound sense of outrage. Not one of the 140 students interviewed indicated that the anecdotal stories about harassment and bullying of gays were exaggerated. They consistently testified to experiencing depths of hatred, levels of verbal abuse, and acts of violence that are shocking to the conscience.

One thing leads to another. The sequence described by the gay and lesbian interviewees runs something like this: first, the student's sexual orientation is outed to the peer group; this “revelation” might happen by accident or by the student disclosing his/her sexuality to a few friends who then promptly post the outing on the internet or Facebook. At this point, it does not seem to matter whether the student actually is gay; what is important is that peers perceive the student to be gay. The American Civil Liberties Union reports several cases of non-gay students bullied severely because they “seemed” to be gay or lesbian (ACLU, 2013).

The second step now commences, consisting of some leering stares and subtly suggestive gestures aimed at the student, “weird looks” in the hallways. Faced with this embarrassing and uncomfortable situation, the student now complains to the teachers and school leaders. At this point, the school leadership has an opportunity to quash the sequence by taking firm action against the insulting words and gestures, but if this squashing does not happen, then step three is reported to have occurred: loud yelling at the student with insulting words such as “faggot,” “queer,” “dyke” in the hallways, the gym, and sometimes in the classroom. This verbal hostility can extend outside school and may include insults and threats against the student's siblings and parents. Again, if there is no leadership intervention, next is step four, and now it becomes physical: pushing, shoving, slamming into a locker, tripping down a flight of stairs, throwing ketchup bottles and trash in the cafeteria. Again, if no leadership intervention occurs, there is step five, serious physical harm in the form of beatings, knife attacks, and death threats. Somewhere in this sequence, the student's grades have begun to slip downhill, and in the last stage the student's final response is to either request a transfer to another school or to drop out of school altogether because of the sheer terror. A significant number of gays and lesbians at this point opt for
suicide as the only sure surcease of the pain and horror (GLSEN, 2013).

The Human Rights Watch report does not paint a pretty picture of American schools. Fortunately, since its publication in 2001, many States and school districts have taken actions to respond to the charges by adopting anti-bullying policies and providing in-service workshops for staff members, as well as sanctioning Gay-Straight Alliances and similar organizations. The next section will examine the efforts of the Illinois State legislature and Illinois school districts. However before leaving this section, a word of caution: because progress has been made, does not mean that all problems are solved. In a February 3, 2013, piece in the Chicago Sun Times, Mary Elizabeth Williams documented the recent case of an Oregon high school sophomore who hanged himself after being continually harassed for being gay (Williams, 2013). “It does get better,” Williams states, “and a whole lot of things in this country have gotten better, but as long as kids are dying because hateful creeps are pushing them around, we have miles and miles to go.”

**Illinois Law**

Lawmakers in Illinois became so concerned with the repeated incidents of bullying and harassment in schools that in 2010 they added to the School Code Public Act 96-952, incorporated as Section 27-23.7 of the Code, Bullying Prevention. The statute requires every school district in the state, and every non-public, non-sectarian school to adopt, implement, publicize, and report the results of a policy on bullying. The policy must minimally prohibit bullying on the basis of “race, color, religion, sex, national origin, ancestry, age, marital status, physical or mental disability, military status, sexual orientation, gender related identity or expression” (Illinois School Code, 2013). The statute specifically mentions verbal, physical, digital, and electronic activities in the definition of bullying, which includes any action which would result in...

- placing the student or students in reasonable fear of harm to the student's or students' person or property;
- causing a substantial detrimental effect on the student's or students' physical or mental health;
- substantially interfering with the student's or students'
academic performance; or
- substantially interfering with the student's or students' ability to participate in, or
- benefit from the services, activities, or privileges provided by the school.

The statute then lists the many instances and varieties which bullying takes, and lists extensively the school personnel who are obliged to report and follow up on bullying activities, from the Superintendent and administrators all the way to cafeteria workers, custodians, and bus drivers. The district or school is obliged to publish its policy to students, parents, teachers, administrators, and all the mentioned auxiliary personnel. Also, staff is required to attend mandated in-services in which the policy is published and explained. The statute then concludes with a paragraph in which it declares that nothing in the law is intended to restrict anyone's First Amendment rights of free expression and rights of religious freedom (Illinois School Code, 2013).

A couple of comments are in order on the Illinois statute. First, the law continually uses the phrase “student or students,” which would seem to be a clear signal that a school district, which failed to protect one child from bullying, would be out of compliance with the law. Second, the statute was set to take effect immediately upon the signature of the governor, and in fact, the statute went into law on June 28, 2010, as soon as Governor Quinn signed the bill. This kind of immediate implementation usually signals the urgency felt by the lawmakers and the seriousness with which they approached the issue of bullying. This urgency immediately checkmated by the final section of the law, which declared an exemption to the Illinois Mandates Act, so that school districts are obliged to implement the law immediately without any program reimbursement coming from Springfield. A final comment is that the Illinois Bullying Prevention law, although not specifically about gay rights, does include “sexual orientation and gender identity and expression” in its list of protected activities and characteristics (Illinois School Code, 2013).

What can be made of the final words of Public Act 96-952, which state that the statute is not intended to suppress anyone's First Amendment right of free expression and religion? Is this smoke and mirrors, a hidden message to conservative religious groups, that gay-bashing, for example, is permitted if the negative expression arises from a religious
tenet that holds homosexual activities to be sinful? Gay rights activists who read this statute must be worried—why did the legislature feel obliged to insert an assurance of First Amendment rights into the Anti-Bullying law? Is it the legislative intent to condemn bullying and harassment except in cases where the denigrating words or offensive actions arise from religious belief?

The Illinois Statute on Anti-Bullying starts out very strong in its condemnation of all forms of bullying and harassment, and very strong in its comprehensive list of bullying activities and extensive list of personnel obliged to implement it. Then, the Statute seems to waver with no promise of any fiscal or leadership resources from Springfield—instead of building support for the program in the school districts, the law now has the Superintendents slapping their foreheads over yet another unfunded mandate. The final section apparently dilutes the impact of the law by hinting that the legislators are really serious about punishing those who break this law, unless of course they do it for religious reasons.

Case Laws

Gay rights and gay marriage cases now fill the courts, and in March, 2013, the Supreme Court of the United States has agreed to review some of the important state cases which test the constitutionality of permissive state gay marriage laws (or conversely, the state's prohibition of gay marriage.) Clearly, public opinion on gay and lesbian rights has shifted dramatically in the past few years. The issue arises: do the courts provide any clear directions for school officials in providing leadership in the matter of preventing gay bashing and bullying? In pursuit of this knowledge, analyses of three cases are presented: one United States Supreme Court case, a much publicized New York case, and a recent Illinois case. These cases have been chosen for review because they are most instructive for school leaders who must apply the principles of contemporary case law in their day-to-day management of the schools.

Davis v Monroe County

LaShonda Davis, of Monroe County, Georgia, endured bullying, harassment, groping, sexual innuendos, humiliating insults for so long and with no relief from the
Monroe County School District, that the Supreme Court found the school district guilty of “deliberate indifference.” The *Davis v Monroe* (1999) case documents a year-long horror in which LaShonda was stalked, humiliated, and intimidated by an in-school predator classmate, who, aided by the silence of the school authorities, terrorized LaShonda until her grades deteriorated and her physical and mental health were in jeopardy. Although the case is not a situation of gay harassment, *Davis v Monroe* is a landmark case which must be read in any analysis of bullying and harassment because it marks the watershed of the “boys will be boys” philosophy.

The ordeal of LaShonda Davis, a fifth grade girl, began in December of 1992 when a classmate, G.F., attempted to touch her genitals and breasts and stated that “I want to get in bed with you.” LaShonda reported the incident to her teacher, but the school took no action to curb the harassment. This pattern repeated itself over the following five months. G.F. would engage in harassing and threatening behavior, LaShonda would report the incident, and the school authorities would do nothing. In 1993, the harassment escalated from verbal to physical. In gym class G.F. placed a doorstop in his pants and approached LaShonda with sexual movements. The escalation continued unabated, and the inaction of the school authorities continued until LaShonda's grades had deteriorated badly. After three months of torture, LaShonda's request to move her seat was granted—she had been required to sit next to G.F. during the escalating attacks. In April, LaShonda's father discovered a suicide note. Her ordeal finally ended in May of 1993, when G.F., a fifth-grader who had harassed and stalked other girls besides LaShonda, was arrested on charges of sexual battery and pleaded guilty. LaShonda's parents went to court on her behalf, seeking compensatory damages under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, for the academic and psychological damage done to LaShonda. The case wound its way to the United States Supreme Court, which ruled in favor of LaShonda.

Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, in writing the majority opinion for the Supreme Court, noted in chastising the Monroe County School District that the authorities had been “deliberately indifferent” to the harassment in spite of repeated reports by LaShonda and other girls and despite repeated requests by her parents, and that the school district's failure to protect her had deprived LaShonda of the
opportunity for the education which is promised by the constitution of the State of Georgia. The school district, O’Connor noted, had no policies with regard to harassment and bullying, and had not even provided the staff and faculty with minimum in-service workshops on how to respond to reports of sexual harassment and bullying. In declaring the Monroe County School District liable for claims of monetary compensation because of their deliberate indifference, the Supreme Court sent a clear signal that educational institutions which did not protect their students from harassment and bullying were going to be punished. The days of “boys will be boys” were over, as far as the court was concerned.

**J.L. v Mohawk Central School District**

If *Davis v Monroe* called attention to the issue of bullying in schools, *J.L. v Mohawk Central* (2010) called the attention of the nation to bullying of gays, in this upstate New York case. The *J.L.* case again presented a situation of persistent persecution of a boy who had “come out,” which included verbal and physical attacks, death threats, and continuous harassment aided and abetted by the silence and inaction of the school leadership. The irresponsible performance of the Mohawk Central School District became such a nation-wide scandal that the New York Civil Liberties Union and even the United States Justice Department intervened on behalf of J.L. to protect him from his tormentors.

J.L.’s troubles began in his seventh grade year, 2007-2008, when he came out as a gay male. His classmates began calling him “pussy,” “faggot,” and accused him of being “girly” and suggested that he have a sex-change operation. Near the end of the school year, J.L.’s iPod was taken from him, stepped on, and thrown over the railing of the school stairs. J.L. and his father spoke with the principal on several occasions, but no action was taken by the school.

The situations escalated in J.L.’s eighth grade year. He himself began the escalation by beginning to dye his hair and wearing make-up. The verbal abuse heightened, with slurs hurled at J.L. in class, in hallways, and in the cafeteria including “bitch,” “cocksucker,” and “homo.” J.L.’s classmates now stoked the rumor mill, spreading word that he was masturbating at his locker and having sex with other boys in the school. The abuse got physical: J.L.’s clothing was
stolen from his locker and stuffed in a trash can, his cell phone was grabbed and stepped on; J.L. was pushed down a flight of stairs resulting in a serious leg injury, serious enough that he received permission to use the faculty elevator to get to class.

Eventually the verbal abuse began to reach the level of death threats and insults to his family. In November, a classmate stated to J.L., “I’m glad your dad has cancer, I hope he dies soon, he’s probably a faggot too, so why don’t I go and suck him off.” This humiliating speech was followed by another conference with J.L.’s father and the principal. The principal gave J.L. permission to carry a cell phone and to use a “safe room” if he felt threatened, but in practice, no teacher would give him permission to go to the safe room, and he actually never enjoyed the privilege that had been granted. A student who shouted, “Tell your faggot son to keep away from me,” and “When I catch your son alone, I am going to kick his ass,” accosted J.L.’s mother and sister, on their way to a school concert with J.L.

In December, J.L. was again pushed down a flight of stairs, nearly going over the railing. Also in December, his science teacher told J.L. that he should be ashamed of himself for being gay and that he should “hate himself every day until he changed.” Another conference with the principal produced no action, the principal denying that the science teacher would have said such a thing.

In spring 2008, the abuse continued unabated and increased, with particular problems in the cafeteria, where classmates now routinely threw food, trash, and ketchup bottles at J.L. One student brought J.L. a banana, stating, “Here, now you don't need a boyfriend, suck on that.” When J.L.’s father spoke to the principal about the banana incident, the principal told the father that “it was not his job to cater to homosexuals.”

By April of J.L.’s eighth grade year, the abuse had reached the death threat level. A student stated to J.L., “If you don't die, I will make the world's dream possible,” and another said to J.L., “Do the world a big favor and die because no one would miss you.” The threats culminated in June when a student brandished a knife during class and threatened to stab J.L., stating that he intended to, “string his faggot ass up from the flagpole.” At this point J.L., in total terror for his life, requested and received permission to stay out of school for the
last two weeks of the academic year, except for the final exam days.

J.L.’s father, step-mother, and mother now briefly considered home schooling J.L., finally opting to transfer him to another school district. Somewhere in this summer they made the decision to file suit in federal court and enlisted the aid of the lawyers for the New York division of the American Civil Liberties Union. Also, over this summer of 2009, the United States Justice Department became aware of the situation of J.L. at Mohawk Central school district and prepared to intervene in the case as a friend of the court, joining the case on the side of J.L. as a “Plaintiff-Intervenor” (J.L. v Mohawk Central School District: Memorandum of Law in Support of United States' Motion to Intervene).

The New York Civil Liberties Union presented J.L.'s case in the federal District Court for Northern New York, and documented for the court the two years of abuse, bullying, harassment, and terror which he had endured. The complaint accuses the Mohawk Central School District, the Superintendent, the Principal, and the Equal Opportunity Compliance Officer of deliberate indifference for their failure to protect J.L. from his abusers, in violation of the Mohawk Central School District's anti-harassment policy, the Equal Protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the Federal Constitution, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the New York Human Rights Law, the New York Civil Rights Law, and New York Common Law (J.L. v Mohawk Central School District: Amended Complaint).

The J.L. case reads like an object lesson from the report of the Human Rights Watch (2001) because the pattern is repeated: an ugly incident occurs, J.L. and his family report the incident to the principal, the administrator does nothing, and the abuse escalates. A haunting line repeats itself over and over in the complaint after each conference with the Principal, “Upon information and belief, no action was taken to investigate the incident or to address the harassment.” This sentence appears thirteen times in the Amended Complaint. Fifteen years after LaShonda Davis suffered deliberate indifference at Monroe County, Georgia, and thinking the days of “boys will be boys” were over, a school district took no constructive actions to prevent serious, continuous, and life-threatening harassment of a gay student that went on for
more than two years. Given the huge preponderance of evidence against the school district and its representatives, the Mohawk Central School District took the wise course to avoid a trial and indicated its willingness to settle the matter out of court.

The out-of-court settlement of the *J.L.* case was reached on March 29, 2010, by which time J.L. had transferred to another school district. The settlement allowed the Mohawk Central School District and the accused administrators to put the situation in the past without admitting to any guilt or suffering any personal punitive damages. In the settlement the school district agreed to pay a sum of $50,000.00 to the “J.L. 2010 Fund” to settle the grievances of J.L. and his family, as well as $25,000.00 to the New York Civil Liberties Foundation in settlement of all legal fees (*J.L. v Mohawk Central School District: Stipulation and Settlement Agreement*). In addition, the school district was obliged to pay for counseling/therapy services for J.L. in the amount of $100.00 per week until June 30, 2013, a total of $16,600.00, if J.L. met with the psychologist or therapist every week.

In its intervention, the United States Attorney General's Office had raised the issue of the welfare and safety of other gay and lesbian students in the Mohawk Central School District. As a result, the settlement agreement of the *J.L.* case included a commitment by the school district to hire an expert in the prevention of school-based bullying and harassment; to review the district's policies and procedures, and to provide ongoing in-service for faculty and staff members in the effective observation, prevention, and reporting of situations of bullying and harassment. The district also agreed to engage the Anti-Defamation League to provide staff and faculty training. In addition, the settlement agreement obliged the Mohawk Central School District to present annual reports of progress in the development and implementation of its anti-harassment policies and procedures to the United States Department of Justice and to the New York Civil Liberties Union Foundation until June 30, 2013.

The *J.L.* case appears to have settled on a positive note. In the press release accompanying the settlement the school district promised to launch all-out efforts to overcome its past deficiencies. In March 2013, the Mohawk Central website has a quick link to “Bullying/Harassment” in which
the anti-bullying policies are clearly set forth. The work of administrators and committees is outlined, and anonymous links are provided for a student or parent to report an observed instance of gay-bashing or other bullying (Mohawk Central School District, 2013). For J.L. and his family, this change comes much too late, but the Mohawk Central School District seems to be making a serious effort to undo its previous “deliberate indifference” by taking the initiative toward preventing a rerun of J.L.’s years of terror for any other student.

**Zamecnik and Nuxoll v Indian Prairie School District**

This Illinois case is based on alleged gay-bashing incidents, which occurred at Nequa Valley High School in Naperville, Illinois, during the 2006-2007 academic year. The case was settled (so far) in 2011 in the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh District (*Zamecnik and Nuxoll v Indian Prairie School District*). The terms of the court's decision have become very disturbing to gay-rights activists, for reasons, which will be made clear.

This case raises the issues of First Amendment rights of students and how far public schools can go to control the expressions of opinions, beliefs, and views of its students. Specifically in question are the limits of the power of school administrators to suppress students' negative expressions toward the opinions/beliefs/views of others (students, faculty, administration). The facts of the case are these: the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network sponsors an annual “Day of Silence” to respect the rights of gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, and questioning students and to call attention to instances of harassment or bullying of gays. In spring 2007, the Nequa Valley High School faculty and administration allowed and encouraged the observance of the Day of Silence, and permitted students to wear T-shirts with the slogan, “Be who you are.” According to court records, the faculty members themselves observed the day, asking few questions in class, keeping a low profile demeanor, and respecting the silence of the occasion.

Heidi Zamecnik and Alexander Nuxoll were Nequa Valley students who objected to homosexuality on religious grounds, and who came to school the following day wearing T-shirts which read on the front, “My day of silence, straight alliance,” and on the back, “Be happy not gay.” School
officials did not allow these T-shirts and either sent the student home for another garb or, in one case, blotted out the words, “not gay.” The administrators acted in fulfillment of a District 204 rule, which forbids “derogatory comments which...refer to race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or disability.” Heidi's and Alexander's parents sued the school district for violation of their children's First Amendment rights of free expression.

The United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh District held in favor of the students, stating that school administrators had crossed the line in suppressing student expression and thus violated the First Amendment rights of Heidi and Alexander. A lower court had issued an injunction forbidding the school from disallowing the “be happy not gay” T-shirts, and the Court of Appeals upheld the injunction.

The Appellate Court's reasoning behind this decision falls into four categories:

1. The “marketplace of ideas” argument: high schools, the court reasoned, may not keep their students in a “bubble” where they are exposed to only approved ideas and expressions. To quote the court, “a school that permits advocacy of the rights of homosexual students cannot be allowed to stifle criticism of homosexuality.”

2. The “impact of the words” argument: the court reasoned that the phrase “be happy not gay” is “only tepidly negative,” not derogatory nor demeaning, and therefore not “fighting words” which might be something like “gays go to hell” or “I will not approve what God has condemned.” Both Heidi and Alexander conceded in their statements that the latter would have been “fighting words.”

3. The “Tinker” argument: referring back to the landmark Tinker v Des Moines (1969) case on student speech rights, the court stated that the school administrators had failed to show a connection between the “be happy not gay” T-shirts and any real or potential disruption of the educational activities of the school. One could argued, in fact, that the Day of Silence itself, when teachers amended their classroom activities, precipitated more disruption of the regular school procedures.
4. The lack of evidence argument: the school district had called an expert witness who testified about the thousands of instances nation-wide in which gays and lesbians are bullied in schools, but the expert witness did not testify to any specific instances of gay bashing or bullying at Nequa Valley High School, (which might have justified the actions of the administrators in suppressing the wearing of the “be happy not gay” T-shirts.)

Some comments on each of the court's rationes decidendi are in order. The marketplace of ideas argument harkens back to Thomas Jefferson's ideal of the public school as a place in which ideas would flourish, and in which healthy open debate would give opportunity for all points of view to be expressed. Practically every educator in America would subscribe to President Jefferson's ideas about expanding knowledge through open discussion, but no one takes the “marketplace of ideas” as an absolute or unlimited principle. The Appellate Court's statement that if a high school allows advocacy for a certain position, it must allow criticism of that position, seems particularly troublesome, since no one would argue that, since the school promotes patriotism by the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance, it must therefore provide speakers who would advocate the overthrow of the government; or that since the school curriculum teaches about the civil rights movement and celebrates Black History Month, that it must then tolerate speakers who urge a return to slavery or Jim Crow. No educator would argue that if a school celebrates the deeds of Italian-American athletes, for instance, Joe DiMaggio or Rocky Marciano, that the school must then allow speakers who denigrate Italian-Americans as low class crooks. This line of reasoning would say that if the social studies department has a unit on the successes of Irish-American politicians, for example, the Mayors Daley of Chicago or the Kennedys of Massachusetts, then the school must tolerate speakers who denounce the Irish-Americans for drinking too much.

Gay rights websites point out these arguments and conclude that in almost every other instance, for example, ethnicity, religion, color, gender, age, social class, or income, society would be quick to condemn the hateful speech. No one would approve a “be happy not Catholic” T-shirt or a “be happy not Black” T-shirt or a “be happy not Polish” T-shirt.
Only in the case of homosexuality, the websites point out, are such smears tolerated, with ongoing marginalization of gays and lesbians (Bullyingstatistics.org, 2013). The Appellate Court's decision itself would seem to present prima-facie evidence that the discrimination continues and is endorsed at the highest levels of the federal courts.

The impact of words argument, offered by the Court to protect the actions of Heidi and Alexander, narrowly defines the meaning of “hateful speech” and “fighting words.” To refer back to some of the previous examples, everyone would agree that “be happy not Lutheran” or “be happy not Mexican” are hateful words, fighting words which denigrate members of a particular religion or ethnic group. The court seems to have taken the tack that Heidi and Alexander did not intend their words as “fighting words,” and ignored the fact that gays and lesbians received the words as fighting words which denigrate their sexual orientation and sexual identity expression. However, school administrators, trying to manage a building of 2,000 adolescents, cannot spend time trying to figure out speakers' intentions; they have to act based on the possible impact of the words on the people who are the object of the words, and judging by the reaction of gays to the Appellate Court's decision, gays have indicated that they consider “be happy not gay” to be, in fact, hateful, fighting words (QUEERTY, 2013). The outrage runs deep, as blogger number eight indicated, “This ruling can only be described as judicial malfeasance and the justices who ruled in the majority should be removed from the bench and disbarred” (QUEERTY, 2013).

In its third argument, the Appellate Court referred back to the landmark case, Tinker v Des Moines, from 1969. The Tinker case, adjudicated at the height of the Vietnam War, established and defended the First Amendment rights of students in school, who had worn black armbands to protest the war. The Supreme Court recognized, however, that the rights of speech and expression are not unlimited, and indicated that administrators can suppress speech and expression which result in a likely disruption of the learning environment of the school. In applying the Tinker standard at Nequa Valley High School, the Appellate Court sided with the two students since the wearing of the 'be happy not gay' T-shirts did not produce, and was not likely to produce a “clear and present” danger of school disruption. This conclusion
would seem to be in conflict with Illinois' 2010 anti-bullying statute, which implies clearly that the violation of one student's rights to an opportunity for an education is forbidden, and so essentially a “disruption” of the climate for learning for the one student.

The Appellate Court's final ratio, that the school district provided no evidence of gay-bashing or bullying at Nequa Valley High School, must have come as quite a surprise to the leadership of Indian Prairie District 204. The School Board had previously approved anti-bullying policies, which specifically included sexual orientation and sexual identity as protected items, and had allowed the Day of Silence in response to requests from gay and lesbian students. Under these circumstances, it would be naïve, at best, to assume that no incidents of anti-gay bullying or harassment had ever occurred at Nequa Valley High School, and the Board evidently felt no pressure to give these details in court. This omission proved to be a tactical mistake since the Appellate Court was not satisfied with the generalized testimony of the expert that gay-bashing and harassment were rampant nation-wide (Bullyingstatistics.org, 2013).

Would Heidi's and Alexander's “be happy not gay” T-shirts be protected by the Illinois anti-bullying statute's guarantee about First Amendment religious freedoms? For an Illinois school administrator, this question is most perplexing about the 2011 case. Even if the District had presented evidence of prior gay bashing at Nequa Valley High School, even if the administrators had shown a nexus to likely disruption, even if the words were shown to be fighting words, the students might find refuge in the fact that their anti-gay attitudes and words were learned in church and stemmed from what seemed to be a central tenet of the beliefs of that particular church, namely, that homosexuality is sinful and to be condemned. Zappos online marketers actually identify the 'be happy not gay' T-shirt which they sell as a “Christian” T-shirt, graphically connecting the phrase “be happy not gay” with religious belief (Zappos.com, 2013).

Legislators in the congress or in the state legislatures or judges in the court system need to get out ahead of this situation and figure out a way to close this loophole. Evil acts committed in the name of religion have a very long and very violent history. More than 3,000 years ago, the army of Israel
under Joshua stormed and captured the town of Jericho. As the army entered the town, “they enforced the ban on everything in the town, men and women, young and old, even the oxen and sheep and donkeys, massacring them all.” The atrocity was supposedly justified because the town was “dedicated to Yaweh” (Joshua 6:21). In the Middle Ages, the First Crusaders broke through the walls of Jerusalem and murdered every man, woman, and child in the city, then went to pray at the shrine of the Holy Sepulchre (Asbridge, 2004). The September 11, 2001, hijackers used four aircraft to murder more than 5,000 people in the name of holy war to honor Allah. Alexander and Alexander call religiously-rooted violence...“one of the most troubling and historically insoluble issues facing world peace” (2012). Exercising religious freedom to ridicule, mock, denigrate, persecute, marginalize, or harm other citizens was not the intent of our Founding Fathers when they adopted the First Amendment in 1791. Their intent was quite the opposite, to safeguard the rights of the everyday person. Intolerant attitudes and negative behavior learned in church are intolerant, and these behaviors cannot be countenanced any longer by a diverse multicultural and multi-religious society, certainly not in the “common schools,” one of the major agencies for holding the body politic together.

School Leaders: Solutions

The key lessons for school administrators from these cases and statutes are the same as the nine pages of recommendations from the Human Rights Watch report of 2001 (Hatred in the Hallways, 2001). The major ones are:

- The school or district should have clearly articulated policies which outlaw bullying and/or harassment of any person in the school community; in Illinois this articulation is mandatory, prescribed by the anti-bullying statute. The policies must be published to all members of the school-based community.
- The school or district should have regularly scheduled in-services for all faculty and staff on recognizing and reporting instances of bullying and/or harassment. In-service workshops must address, among other important topics, the issues of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender youngsters and the special dangers which they face in the teen sub-culture. The school or district should have clear
lines of delegation of responsibility for investigating, reporting, and following-up on instances of bullying and/or harassment; personnel in charge of such duties are to be specifically identified. The school or district should list sanctions, which are enforced for serious violations of the anti-bullying policies. Unfortunately, in this litigious age, there are parents who have sued school districts under the Fourteenth Amendment because no specific school rule forbade the youngster’s negative behavior (J.S. v. Blue Mountain School District).

Beyond the legal remedies, school administrators and faculty should concentrate great efforts on creating and maintaining a positive climate for learning in the school community. Effective schools research of the 1980s demonstrated a consistent correlation between the institutional climate provided by the leadership and the academic performance and psychological maturation of the students (Brookover, 1982). Contemporary research has confirmed and solidified the findings of Brookover (Fawcett, 2008). Effective school leaders of the 21st century are not just curriculum and discipline specialists, they are the ethical and moral icons who lead by example in creating a community in which every member is accepted, cherished, and empowered (Noddings, 2003). Litigious parents have forced school leaders to concentrate on what is legal and constitutional, but school leaders must also focus on the broad ethical and social purposes of the school. Not everything that is legal is necessarily positive to society. The National Rifle Association claims that everyone has the right to purchase and possess an AK-47 automatic weapon, but what social or moral purpose would be served by carrying my constitutionally protected weapon onto the campus of Lewis University? There are some activities which are legal, but they are also counterproductive for an orderly society. The role of school leaders is to help our future adults to develop attitudes and pursue actions which are morally inspiring, socially appropriate, and just plain astute, and to help them to understand that legality is one thing, propriety is another.

In the business world, companies which are “high-tech” have been pioneers in “high-touch” work atmospheres. The greater the level of technology utilized by the company, the greater are the efforts by management to build
interpersonal ties through “ringi-groups,” work teams, and after-project squads (Levi, 2007). It is not a mere coincidence that the big computer hardware and software giants were the first to institute “informal Fridays.” This change is akin to what needs to happen in educational institutions. As the teaching enterprise relies more on innovative technologies, greater the efforts are needed by leadership to build the interpersonal ties of a learning community. The school law books are full of cases in which a student, in the anonymity of his/her home and using a computer or iPod, posts a nasty rumor, a threat, or a rant against a classmate, teacher, or administrator. However, this behavior is less and less likely to happen if the student has a caring/cared-for relationship with the classmate, teacher, or principal (Noddings, 2003).

The proposal advanced here recognizes that human beings are capable of very nasty and negative behavior, including bullying and harassment of gays and other vulnerable members of the community. The impersonal nature of the new technologies has precipitated a greater psychological distance between the students and their schoolmates and teachers, which magnifies the scope and extent of the bad behavior. This new reality can not be controlled by an encounter with punishment as Dostoevsky contended, (1866) but only by an encounter with humanity as Sergiovanni contends (1996). Effective leadership concentrates on the creation of a community in which diversity is accepted and celebrated, and in which students, teachers, administrators, and parents are working together to solve the problems of the school. Collaboration in working toward worthy goals is the antidote to prejudice and hate.

Consistent lessons from the Human Rights Watch report and from the court cases are that bullying and harassment escalate in the face of administrative inertia, and conversely, that administrative initiatives can lead to a reduction in the number and the intensity of such incidents. The very best leaders must put forth energies to mobilize the strength of the entire community. School administrators’ prime goal must establish an institutional culture that respects the identity of every member of the school community and invites each one to take a part in pursuing the highest moral and human values that can be attained.
Postscript

On June 26, 2013, the Supreme Court of the United States, in *United States v Windsor* (2013), invalidated the portion of the federal Defense of Marriage Act which denied gay marriages federal recognition. On the same day the Court dismissed a California appeal of a decision by the United States Appellate Court for the Ninth Circuit, thus restoring the validity of gay marriage in California. As of July, 2013, gay marriage is recognized in thirteen states, the District of Columbia, and five Native American tribes. However, 37 states still either do not recognize gay marriage or specifically forbid it by constitution or statute. It seems evident that the issue of “gay rights” will be one of the main topics in public discourse for some time to come. It seems evident, as well, that the schools, as major institutions for social stability and for human progress, will continue to be one of the main arenas of contention.

References


*J.S. v. Blue Mountain School District, 650 F.3rd 915; U.S App. (3rd Cir. 2012).*


Zamecnik and Nuxoll v. Indian Prairie School District 204.
Retrieved from www.zappos.co

Dr. Moses is a professor emeritus in the Educational Leadership program at Lewis University in Romeoville, Illinois. For 46 years, he was a teacher, school administrator, superintendent and professor. His research interests have been concentrated on school law and school finance, and the concomitant skills, knowledge, and dispositions needed by the successful principal.
Fostering the Dialogue/In Response To:
Participants in Alternative Certification Programs and the "Highly Qualified" Standard: The Continuing Controversy

Theresa A. Quigney
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One of the most influential pieces of educational legislation in recent years has been the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, passed in 2001 (Michigan Education Association, 2007). It is not only comprehensive in its coverage, it is perhaps one of the most controversial points of focus in the educational reform movement. Although very few would argue with the philosophical perspective of the law, many have issues with various facets of its practical implementation. As Congress is supposed to reauthorize the law every five years (National Education Association (NEA) and National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE), 2004), NCLB is considerably overdue for reauthorization, a fact which has only added to the debate and enhanced the search for alternative routes for achieving educational goals, such as Race to the Top and the Teacher Incentive Fund, both programs funded through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 (Laine, Potemski, & Rowland, 2010).

Moreover, there have been a number of states who have sought relief from some of the tenets of NCLB through waiver applications to the U.S. Department of Education. In fact, more than half the states have obtained approval for waivers (Klein, 2012a). These waivers, more formally known as options for ESEA Flexibility, “provide educators and State and local leaders with flexibility regarding specific requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) in exchange for rigorous and comprehensive State-developed plans” (U.S. Department of Education, 2012, para. 1).
It is clear that there is much dispute and examination surrounding the implementation and reauthorization of NCLB in general, and a comprehensive deliberation in this regard is beyond the scope of this conversation. There is, however, one area of NCLB which this discussion will emphasize, as it has had a substantial impact on the educational reform agenda and continues to be a point of contention for many in the field, namely, the “highly qualified teacher” (HQT) standard. Although it is true that the aforementioned conditional waivers may afford some states flexibility from many of the HQT conditions “as long as they adopt a system of teacher evaluations that takes student achievement into account” (Klein, 2012a, para. 14), there still appears to be a lack of consensus on certain aspects of the HQT issue, including its determination for teachers pursuing licensure through alternative certification (AC) routes. The controversy surrounding HQT and AC will be the specific focus of the remainder of this discussion.

Taken as individual matters, AC and HQT can often be viewed as contentious in the educational arena, but in combination their relationship appears to be markedly controversial. There is a divergence of opinions on whether teachers in AC programs should be considered HQT, particularly when one considers the issues of preservice personnel preparation and job placement. While these areas of educator training and instructional position assignment will be addressed from an educational perspective subsequently, one should first be familiar with the governing justification of HQT status for teachers in AC programming.

**Regulatory Foundation of HQT Status for Teachers in Alternative Routes to Certification**

To obtain HQT status according to NCLB, the individual will have a bachelor's degree, hold full certification, and prove competency in the content areas taught (King-Sears, 2005). It is vital that teachers obtain HQT status, from both a legal and pedagogical perspective. NCLB required that teachers of core academic subjects obtain HQT status by the conclusion of the 2005-2006 academic year (Smith, Desimone, & Ueno, 2005). Moreover, as the instructors in core areas of academics, teachers must exhibit subject matter knowledge in said areas (Smith, Desimone, & Ueno, 2005). Although the law clearly requires teachers to be fully certified
to qualify for HQT status, a regulation in regard to the law from the Department of Education during the Bush administration permitted teachers involved with recognized AC programs to obtain HQT status even if they had not yet completed the certification program (Klein, 2012b; Shah, 2012). Predictably, this situation engendered some discord and resulted in *Renee v. Duncan*, a case brought before the 9th Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals (Klein, 2012b).

In August 2007, Public Advocates and Goodwin Procter, representing Californians for Justice, California ACORN and several parents and students, sued the United States Department of Education and the Secretary of Education for violating the teacher quality provisions of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. In the first lawsuit of its kind, the coalition argues that a Department regulation has created a major loophole in NCLB that defies the will of Congress and harms students nationwide by defining intern teachers-in-training as “highly qualified.” (Public Advocates, n.d., para.1)

While the specific evolution of *Renee v. Duncan* is beyond the scope of this discussion, one may summarize its path as somewhat convoluted. A decision was made in 2009 which did not support the standing of the Plaintiffs, but a reversal in 2010 resulted in a withdrawal of prior opinions and a decision in favor of the Plaintiffs. In December 2010, Congress addressed this decision in a Continuing Resolution for government funding, by including an amendment that temporarily codified the aforementioned regulations from the Bush administration, thus once again affirming teachers in AC programs as HQT through the 2012-2013 academic year (Public Advocates, n.d.). As this deadline is fast approaching and there is still no universal resolution to the issue, Congress has again passed a Continuing Resolution, this time for six months for the Fiscal Year of 2013, which included a policy rider regarding the highly qualified status of teachers involved in but who have not yet completed their AC programming (Council for Exceptional Children, 2012). The resolution permits teachers participating in AC programming to be HQT through the 2013-2014 academic year (Conneely, 2012; Klein, 2012c). The resolution also requires a report from the Department of Education by December 31, 2013, noting numbers and categorizations of students who are being instructed by teachers considered HQT because of their
participation in AC programming (Council for Exceptional Children; Conneely; Klein, 2012c).

Two Particular Issues of Controversy

Needless to say, there is no shortage of opinions on both sides of this argument, as already evidenced by both the legislative and judicial involvement. Those who support AC programming as a viable option for preparing highly qualified educators may have their backing based on the premise of a shortage of teachers in key instructional areas, a shortage which is all too true (Honawar, 2007; Nichols, Bicard, Bicard, & Casey, 2008; Shaw, 2008; Walsh & Jacobs, 2007). Proponents of AC programming also emphasize the contention that AC has had considerable success in recruiting a diverse population of teachers (Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007; Jacobson, 2005; Peterson & Nadler, 2009; Rosenberg, Boyer, Sindelar, & Misra, 2007). On the other hand, those who have concerns about the efficacy of AC programming note the variability of programming in structure, content and rigor. There has been a lack of agreement on substantive issues, aspects of implementation (Humphrey & Wechsler) and length of program (Dai, Sindelar, Denslow, Dewey, & Rosenberg, 2007). Opponents to AC have also expressed concerns regarding the lack of a research base regarding the efficacy of teacher training approaches with decreased requirements prior to the teaching experience (Boyd, Grossman, Lankford, Loeb & Wyckoff, 2005).

Clearly, there is a considerable amount of controversy surrounding the practice of teachers in AC programming obtaining HQT status. Resolution to this debate will involve critical consideration of both legislative options and assurances of rigor in AC approaches. As a background for the discussion of these legislative and programmatic avenues, the two particularly controversial issues of personnel preparation and teacher placement will be highlighted.

Pre-Service Personnel Preparation

A number of practices associated with AC programming have been regarded as questionable in the professional literature and instructional systems, particularly when compared to more conventional teacher preparation approaches, and/or as a basis for the legal standing of HQT. Unlike traditional university-based teacher preparation
programs, AC approaches generally progress at an accelerated rate involving abbreviated course requirements and training (Constantine et al., 2009; Sindelar, Daunic & Rennells, 2004; Strauss, 2012). AC programs have often been depicted as quick entry options into teaching, some providing little instruction or experience before being placed in a classroom environment. This is generally different from more conventional teacher training options which often involve authentic classroom-based activities and multiple field experiences/internships before students are eligible for applying for a teaching license or becoming the instructor of record. Consequently, with AC programming there may be an increased potential for premature entry to the classroom as coursework is often completed while the candidates are concurrently in the instructional environment (Tissington & Grow, 2007), instead of the more traditional approach of being exposed to a wide range of pertinent material prior to assuming full classroom responsibility.

It is obvious that AC programming is generally considered to be a more accelerated and condensed approach to obtaining teaching certification than would be experienced in a traditional teacher preparation approach. The brevity of AC approaches, however, does bring into question the content covered and the comprehensiveness of this coverage. While some AC approaches address pedagogy and methodology, others reflect the perspective that content expertise is sufficient (Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2003). Certainly content knowledge in core subject matter areas is a critical component of effective instruction, but knowing what to teach is only half of the instructional equation. A teacher must also know how to instruct the students and be skilled in such areas as classroom management skills and differentiated instructional techniques.

Many examples of support for pedagogical practice and knowledge may be found in the professional literature (e.g., Boe, Shin, & Cook, 2007; Bornfreund, 2012; Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2003; Rosenberg, Sindelar, Connelly, & Keller, 2004; Wenglinsky, 2002; Wilson, Floden, & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001). Preparation in the areas of pedagogy and methodology has been a hallmark of conventional teacher training programs. If in fact some of the teachers participating in AC programming have minimal or reduced exposure to essential pedagogical skills and methodology-related activities
prior to entry into the classroom, there may be a strong disconnect between the current legislative standard of affording HQT status to teachers in these accelerated programs and the teachers’ preparedness for meeting the reality and the demands of the educational setting.

Job Placement—Inequitable Distribution of AC Participants

An additional point of controversy, and a major issue in the aforementioned Renee v. Duncan case, relates to the fact that the federal rule permitted a disproportionate number of educators still completing their certification requirements to teach in schools with large populations of low-income and minority students (Dunn & Derthick, 2011). As Kini (2011) notes, the 2010 Congressional amendment regarding AC and HQT resulted in novice educators continuing to be disproportionately dispersed to educational environments which included populations, such as students with low socioeconomic status, minority students, students learning the English language, and students with disabilities. As the current Continuing Resolution passed by Congress extends HQT status to participants in AC programming through the 2013-2014 academic year (Conneely, 2012; Klein, 2012c), the potential for this situation of disproportionate distribution of AC teachers persists.

Resolution to Debate

The controversy surrounding the topic of participants in AC programming obtaining HQT status is clearly something that must be addressed. The equitable and efficient education of our students is too important to simply accept the status quo instead of actively addressing this issue of concern. Moreover, the integrity of the teaching profession demands that such controversies be examined. The approach that has been implemented thus far of periodically extending existing contentious regulations is a temporary response to an enduring dilemma.

Teachers must be qualified to be instructors. That is an indisputable truth. There are also qualified teacher shortages in key instructional positions, another undeniable fact (Honawar, 2007; Nichols et al., 2008; Shaw, 2008; Walsh & Jacobs, 2007). Moreover, AC programs as well as their number of graduates have dramatically increased since the 1990s (Feistritzer, 2007). Whether or not one supports the
existence and growth of AC options, the fact is that many teachers are gaining entry into the classroom with this type of educational training. Furthermore, the legislation at the center of the HQT controversy is considerably overdue for reauthorization and/or revision. With all of these facts as a backdrop, the question becomes one of pragmatic application. What are some possible avenues which should be explored to reach a consensus, or at minimum less discord, on the topic of participants in AC programming obtaining HQT status?

**Legislative Options**

One of the approaches employed thus far has been that of advocating for resolution through contact with pertinent legislative personnel. While this method may not always be considered successful, it is nevertheless one that will no doubt continue to be employed. Perhaps one of the most noteworthy endeavors in this regard was a letter sent to Chairman Denny Rehberg (R-MT) and Ranking Member Rosa L. DeLauro (D-CT) of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, dated July 16, 2012, written on behalf of the Education Task Force of the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities. The Task Force noted its objections to extending the amendment to the NCLB (Elementary and Secondary Education Act) which focused on the HQT issue in the Continuing Resolution in Fiscal Year 2013 (Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities, 2012, July 16).

A second and perhaps more obvious path to pursue for resolution to the controversy is for Congress to formally address the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)/No Child Left Behind Act. As it has been a preeminent piece of educational legislation, and long overdue for legal review, it requires attention and some type of action to be executed. Although the aforementioned *ESEA Flexibility* waivers (U.S. Department of Education, 2012) may provide some clarification to the topic of effective teaching, the Continuing Resolution for Fiscal Year 2013 continues to support the highly qualified status of participants involved in but have not yet completed their AC programming (Council for Exceptional Children, 2012). A more comprehensive and cohesive legislative approach to delineating the meaning of HQT and/or effective teaching, instead of relying on waivers and extensions of continuing resolutions, would no doubt go a long way toward clarifying the situation. Although his
department is overseeing the waivers, Education Secretary Arne Duncan (2012) appreciates the importance of a legislative approach to educational issues:

Even as we work with states to offer flexibility from existing law, the Obama administration will support a bipartisan effort by Congress to create a law that supports a well-rounded education while holding schools, districts and states accountable for results (Duncan, 2012, para.12).

Ensuring that AC Programming Is Appropriate and Rigorous

AC programs have been increasing in number (Feistritzer, 2007) in response to a number of realities. As is evidenced in the preceding discussion of personnel preparation, some of the major points of controversy surrounding participants in AC programming obtaining HQT status relate to the length, type and rigor of the teacher training. If required acceptable standards are established for these issues and enacted comprehensively across AC program options in order for the participants to obtain alternative certification and HQT status, there would no doubt be less likelihood of questions such as that posed by Strauss (2012): “Should someone with five weeks of teacher training be considered a highly qualified teacher?” (para.1).

A discussion of the specific content and particular associated practices comprising acceptable standards for AC programming leading to HQT status is beyond the scope of this article. Yet some general guidelines for approaching such a task relate to some of the concerns noted previously, such as variability in AC programming’s content and structure (Dai et al., 2007; Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007). Although flexibility should still be integrated into the program’s structure based on specific contexts, a focus on evidence-based practices and appropriate curricular content could provide a commonly accepted basis for the program’s implementation. Specific program components should be researched (deBettencourt & Howard, 2004) which can then lead to a delineation of the most crucial features of effective teacher training to be incorporated into AC programming. The existence of a common foundation upon which to build the specific aspects of particular AC options should lessen variability in AC
programming and provide more focus on the essential aspects of teacher preparation.

Commonly accepted criteria, content, and structure for AC programming should also allow for ample coverage of pedagogy and methodological issues, sometimes lacking in some AC options (Laczko-Kerr & Berliner, 2003). Moreover, a strong foundation in specific aspects of these topics should precede classroom entry so that the teacher will be knowledgeable in such topics as classroom management, instructional practices, and curricular orientations before working with students. This will not only be advantageous to the students but to the teachers, as evidenced by the work of deBettencourt and Howard (2004) who found that AC special educators’ lack of exposure to behavior management and instructional strategies prior to entering the classroom resulted in feelings of less preparedness and perceptions of inadequacy. Further, even with more coverage of key ideas and practices prior to teaching, ongoing mentoring and feedback once classroom placement has been made, are essential for participants in AC programming.

If recommendations such as these are implemented, and participants in AC programs are recipients of consistent and rigorous training, the issue of the impact of the disproportionate distribution of AC participants in particular instructional settings (Kini, 2011) may potentially be affected, as the preparedness of AC participants for the classroom would hopefully be intensified. While this author does not pretend to believe that this disproportionate distribution issue will be completely remedied by such recommendations, rigorous preparation practices and ongoing mentoring opportunities for AC participants may, at minimum, represent beginning points for a discussion of equitable educational practice.

**Conclusion**

The granting of HQT status to participants in AC programming continues to be a practice surrounded by controversy, even though it has been addressed from both a legal and judicial perspective. This controversy has been exacerbated by concerns involving AC programming related to program content and structure (e.g., Dai et al., 2007; Humphrey & Wechsler, 2007). In addition, issues of disproportionate distribution of AC teachers with HQT status
in particular educational environments persist (e.g., Dunn & Derthick, 2011; Kini, 2011) in concurrence with the increased existence of teachers trained through this option (Feistritzer, 2007).

Resolution to this controversy should become a priority in both the legislative and academic domains of influence. Legislation focusing on HQT status should be reviewed and revised, and aspects of some AC programming should be re-evaluated and modified according to standards of rigor and appropriateness. It is hoped that this discussion has contributed to the dialogue which is accompanying the controversy surrounding the provision of HQT status to participants in AC programming. Providing a band-aid approach of legal extensions to a disputed practice is only a short-term response to an enduring quandary. Long-term resolution to this controversy is essential as the quality of the education of our students is at the center of the debate.
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Selected Proceedings from the Illinois Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages-Bilingual Education (ITBE) 2013 Conference

A Letter from the Guest Editor:

Illinois Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages-Bilingual Education (ITBE) is a professional, non-profit organization for the strengthening, at all levels, of instruction and research in the teaching of English to speakers of other languages and in bilingual education through the promotion of scholarship, the dissemination of information, and advocacy. The Association, with more than 40 years of history, is an affiliate of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).

On February 22-23, 2013, ITBE celebrated its 39th Annual convention in Lisle, IL. The conference, chaired by Vice President Dr. Miguel Fernández, offered numerous talks, tech shows and featured sessions, as well as a Friday evening reception, Friday and Saturday luncheons, Special Interest Group (SIG) meetings, and publisher exhibits.

The conference theme, “Looking Back, Thinking Forward,” offered the opportunity to look at the past as a reference and to explore exciting new terrain in the field of ESL and Bilingual Education. Special guests for the conference were the keynote speakers. They provided an important overview of the past, present and future of topics in the field. Dr. Linda Zacarian opened the convention with a presentation that focused on academic language as a support for student achievement. Friday’s closing plenary featured Dr. Keith Folse, who questioned the nature of grammar and vocabulary as past or future in the field. On Saturday, Kori Stamper, Associate Editor for Merriam-Webster, talked about the past, present, and future of several English words and
constructions. Finally, Dr. Elaine Gallagher closed the convention with a presentation about successful classes in the 21st Century.

The four selected papers, from a total of seven submitted manuscripts, have been organized into two thematic units: Bilingual/ESL Issues and Research.

In the first article of the Bilingual/ESL Issues section, plenary speaker, Elaine Gallagher, presents a global view of how the worldwide transformation occurring in bilingual/multilingual education revolves around the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). Her paper describes the different proficiency levels adopted by the CEFR, how CLIL supports bilingualism and how it can be implemented in the classroom to help ELLs be successful.

Next is a paper by Miguel Fernández, Cynthia Valenciano and Maria Isabel Garcia, where they focus on both the past and the future of bilingual education in America. The first part of their article spotlights historic court cases and policies that have shaped bilingual education through the development of foundational laws, funding, special education support and services, equal opportunities, and community. The second part projects what the future of bilingual education will strive for in the United States, and what progression—forward or backward—will likely be seen after an analysis of past and current mile markers in bilingual programming.

The thematic unit of Research begins with a paper by Vanessa Armand, Janice Ball and Claudia Kupiec. In their article, the authors present a study on vocabulary retention. In their investigation, a group of students in a class was given a list of words to learn. A percentage of students who were in another teacher’s writing class were instructed to use the words in an essay. Subsequently, the whole Speaking Class was tested to see if the writing class students did better on the final vocabulary quiz than students who were not encouraged
to use the words in writing an essay. The conclusions show that the incorporation of “pushed-output” activities in the teaching of vocabulary is necessary, and integrating writing into these activities can prove advantageous for learners’ retention of targeted words.

In the second paper of the Research section, Robin Gay Wakeland presents a study in which a group of students completed an assignment to give an oral presentation to the class, using future tense, complete and correct sentences, and showing at least two images from the internet about an assigned country outside of USA. This activity fulfilled a competency requirement of retrieving information from various media, and using future tense. The study demonstrates that computer technology, together with students’ success researching the visuals, has a positive effect on task goals.

I would finally like to express my gratitude to the people involved in completing this project, especially to Dr. Sylvia Gist, former Dean in the College of Education at Chicago State University, Dr. Satasha Green, current Dean in the College of Education, and Dr. Byung-In Seo, Editor in Chief of Illinois Schools Journal. On behalf of ITBE, I would like to extend my appreciation to them for allowing the association to publish the Selected Proceedings in this special issue of the journal. Likewise, I would like to thank all the authors who submitted their papers for consideration.

It is my hope that readers will find this issue interesting, useful, and thought provoking.

Miguel Fernández, Guest Editor
Bilingual Transformation: The Effects of Globalization on Bilingual Education

Elaine Gallagher
UNO International

Key Words: Bilingual education, globalization, Common European Framework of Reference, Content and Language Integrated Learning

Introduction

The worldwide transformation occurring in bilingual/multilingual education revolves around two areas: Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). Fifty countries, since 1991, have adopted these two movements as part of their national plan (Council of Europe, 2001). The United States is one of the major countries that has not yet unified objectives of bilingualism. The political debates in the United States concerning "English-only" and immigration are simply "too hot" to deal with in a logical, sane manner. Meanwhile, our children are cheated of a complete education. This situation seems ironic because the United States supposedly has been the world's "melting pot".

Being bilingual used to be for some highly motivated immigrants, or for people who needed a second or third language for a job, or for people in countries, such as Switzerland, who have no specific language in their country and needed to learn the language (French, Italian, and German). In mainstream USA, someone who is bilingual is different, an immigrant, or someone who is gifted in languages. However, more than half of the world's population is bilingual (Grosjean, 2010).

Background

What is generally known about education, general learning and bilingualism is not new. The main problem most of the time is that what we know about learning and what we actually do are not closely related. Recent brain studies are
supporting work of Montessori and Piaget from over fifty years ago when such instruments were not available. However, the practices being used in education in 2013 are still far behind what is known from accumulated knowledge and research.

Works of Vygotsky, Krashen, Collier, Bloom, Gardner, and others who support bilingualism and promotion of critical thinking, are not being implemented in U.S. schools. It is important to know about and utilize an eclectic approach to bilingual education if positive results are wanted. What results and goals should be sought? Meeting the dual goals of oral fluency and academic expertise in two or more languages are the results should be advocated, not simply "passing" multiple choice exams based on the two lowest levels of Bloom's Taxonomy.

**Bloom’s Taxonomy**

Bloom’s Taxonomy is a hierarchy of six levels of cognitive thought, developed by Dr. Benjamin Bloom in 1954. It demonstrates how humans best learn to develop critical thinking skills. It is not a new idea, yet no one has come with a more effective way to show how to raise performance levels on the basis of critical thinking, so it is still in use to develop critical thinking, especially useful in second language acquisition.

Simply by changing a verb in a lesson's activity, the teacher can raise the level of students' thinking. Bilingualism requires communication skills. When higher levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy (1954) are used, students remember better and learn more deeply. The two lower levels are based mainly on memory (knowledge, comprehension). The four higher ones depend on critical thinking (application, analysis, evaluation, synthesis). When teachers use the four higher levels, students learn better, and second languages are more easily acquired.

**Vygotsky’s Social Development Theory**

Vygotsky’s *Social Development Theory* (1978) is one of the foundations of constructivism, and supports second language teaching/learning. It asserts three major themes:

1. Social interaction. It plays a fundamental role in the process of cognitive development. In contrast to Jean Piaget’s understanding of child development (in
which development necessarily precedes learning), Vygotsky felt social learning precedes development. He stated: “Every function in the child’s cultural development appears twice: first, on the social level, and later, on the individual level. First, between people (inter-psychological) and then inside the child (intra-psychological)” (pp. 20-24).

2. The More Knowledgeable Other (MKO). The MKO refers to anyone who has a better understanding or a higher ability level than the learner, with respect to a particular task, process, or concept. The MKO is normally thought of as being a teacher, coach, or older adult, but the MKO could also be peers, a younger person, or even computers.

3. The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). The ZPD is the distance between a student’s ability to perform a task under adult guidance and/or with peer collaboration and the student’s ability solving the problem independently. According to Vygotsky, learning occurred in this zone. Vygotsky focused on the connections between people and the sociocultural context in which they act and interact in shared experiences (Crawford, 1996).

According to Vygotsky, humans use tools that develop from a culture, such as speech and writing, to mediate their social environments. Initially, children develop these tools to serve solely as social functions, ways to communicate needs. Vygotsky believed that the internalization of these tools led to higher thinking skills.

Cognitive development results from a process whereby a child learns through problem-solving experiences shared with someone else, usually a parent or teacher, but sometimes a sibling or peers. Initially, the person interacting with the child assumes most of the responsibility for guiding the problem solving, but gradually this responsibility transfers to the child. Language is a primary form of interaction through which adults transmit to the child the rich body of knowledge that exists in the culture. As learning progresses, the child’s own language comes to serve as his or her primary tool of intellectual adaptation. Eventually, children can use internal language to direct their own behavior.

Vygotsky impacts language learning in three ways:
1. Curriculum. Since children learn much through interaction, curricula should be designed to emphasize interaction between learners and learning tasks, projects, pair work, teamwork, and cooperative learning experiences.

2. Instruction. With appropriate adult help, children can often perform tasks that they are incapable of completing on their own. With this idea in mind, scaffolding – where the adult continually adjusts the level of his or her help in response to the child’s level of performance – is an effective form of teaching. Scaffolding not only produces immediate results, but also instills the skills necessary for independent problem solving in the future.

3. Assessment. Assessment methods must take into account the zone of proximal development. What children can do on their own is their level of actual development and what they can do with help is their level of potential development. Two children might have the same level of actual development, but given the appropriate help from an adult, one might be able to solve many more problems than the other. Assessment methods must target both the level of actual development and the level of potential development.

Contributions from Neuroscience on Bilingual Education

Researchers and neuro-medical studies are reporting that children who are bilingual have an intellectual advantage (Baker, 1993; Bialystok, 1991; Gonzalez, 1999; Shaffer, 1999). By being bilingual, children will have various mental advantages. There is more plasticity in the brain, allowing faster learning. When a brain is fluent in two or more languages, for example, needing to choose between English and Spanish, the cortical circuits that hold both languages become active. The prefrontal cortex must step in to decide... man or hombre. The workout the prefrontal cortex gets in bilingualism carries over to other functions, such as problem solving, attention switching, and postpones dementia by at least 5 years (Weber-Fox, Leonard, Hampton Wray, & Tomblin, 2010).

Ultimately, study after study indicates that bilingualism changes and affects the human brain and how students learn. There is sufficient neurological research indicating that bilingual children can have more intelligence and cognitive strengths than monolingual children (Diamond, 2010)
Theory of Multiple Intelligences

Teachers have been hearing much about Multiple Intelligences the past 25 years, not because it is new, but because they are discovering that the theory offers a clear explanation of the many ways in which students learn. In 1983, Dr. Howard Gardner published *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. It was a book originally written for psychologists. Classroom teachers, however, were the ones who embraced the theory, recognizing that it gave a logical explanation of why some students did well in school and others, with similar I.Q. (intelligence quotient), did not.

Gardner's theory challenged the traditional psychological view of intelligence as a single capacity that is evidenced by verbal ability, and logical and mathematical thought. Instead, Gardner proposed that all individuals possess eight independent intelligences. These, in combination, enable people to solve problems or fashion products with varying levels of skill. Gardner's simplified definition of intelligence is "the ability to solve problems" (Gardner, 1983, p. 16). The eight "intelligences" (learner preferences) presented by Dr. Gardner are:

1. Verbal-Linguistic
2. Logical-Mathematical
3. Musical-Rhythmic
4. Visual-Spatial
5. Bodily-Kinesthetic (including gross and fine motor skills)
6. Interpersonal
7. Intrapersonal
8. Naturalist

Verbal-Linguistic and Interpersonal Intelligences are most closely connected to the acquisition of a second or third language. Gardner identified these various intelligences using biological and psychological studies. The use of Multiple Intelligence (MI) activities helps teachers and students in many different ways:

- It encourages teachers to use a wide variety of activities, in music, art, critical thinking, kinesthetic, logic puzzles, brain-teasers, and cooperative learning activities.
- It promotes or justifies education in diverse forms.
- It encourages teachers to work in teams, complementing their own strengths with those of their colleagues.
• It encourages schools to devise rich educational experiences for children from diverse backgrounds.
• It allows children to see their abilities and skills, that are diverse, and their strengths can be developed.
• Parents will be able to recognize strengths in their children that may not have been noticed before if they had been concentrating on only traditional "intelligences".
• Using a wide variety of MI activities keeps the students more involved and interested in academic work. Furthermore, one intelligence can help to strengthen another. For example, a student weak in reading may enhance skills by using music lyrics or a sports rules book in order to grow in reading skills. Second language acquisition, L2, is enhanced.

Techniques, ideas, and research supporting the advocacy of a 21st century transition in bilingual education, lead to the urgency and necessity of implementing 180-degree changes in educational practices, some of which are based on recent neuro-educational studies. These implementations need to be based on an eclectic combination and use of CEFR, CLIL, and research by Vygotsky, Bloom, Gardner, and many others.

Recent Challenges of Bilingual Education in the United States

Current "pullout" language classes, or the gradual implementation of English, have proven to be a failure. The fact is that 47% of native Spanish-speaking students who have been enrolled in public schools "bilingual programs" do not graduate from high school. They are the disenfranchised (American Legislative Exchange Council, 1994). However, 91% of students whose parents denied them entrance into a bilingual program (instead choosing all-English classes) graduate (Berman, 1992). These signs should be glaring, yet states still continue the unattainable quest of using antiquated, obsolete, unsuccessful methods to attempt to reach a goal of English fluency that could easily be attainable, as proven with millions of students in other countries.

The United States is isolated, provincial, and far-removed from what is occurring in the rest of the world. Most of our English teachers, as well as teachers of English as a Foreign Language (EFL), English as a Second Language (ESL), English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), and whatever other acronyms are used in the field, are teaching
English the way Latin had been taught 90 years ago, using memorization of vocabulary, verb conjugations, and translations. Forgotten is the fact that Latin was taught this way because the Romans have been dead for 2,000 years, so there was no one to talk to in Latin.

In the 21st Century, any educated person needs to be bilingual, with English being one of the two languages. Why English? Because it is the universal language (the *lingua franca*) of technology, medicine, businesses, the arts and economy. In the United States, Spanish could be a second language (L2) because it has the highest number of speakers, after English. There are more Spanish speakers in the United States than there are speakers of Chinese, French, German, Italian, Hawaiian, and the Native American languages combined (United States Census Bureau, 2011).

Supposedly, by 2034, there will be more people speaking Spanish in the United States than English. It behooves universities and education departments to forget politics and movements for "English only," and its closed, discriminatory policy. Instead, the United States must emphasize fluency in two or more languages for all students, so they will be prepared for the near future.

Apart from the politics and economic necessities of knowing two languages in the United States, English and Spanish, much more important is that various brain studies and documented research in neuroscience are supporting that people who are bilingual have a more agile brain.

**From Globalization to CEFR and CLIL**

Because the prime language in the United States, for now, is English, citizens ignore, and even reject, the acquisition of Spanish as a needed skill. Being able to communicate in the first language (L1) of 37% of the United States population is a valid skill, not to mention the brain studies showing bilingual students perform better on cognitive skills.

However, it is important to remember that in the 21st Century, with international world travel common for work and pleasure, with globalization promoting out-sourcing to other countries, and with English becoming more and more the *lingua franca*, bilingualism is essential for economic, professional, and social success. Globalization has led to the
necessity of bilingualism, which, in turn, led to the development of the Common European Framework.

Without clear designations of language levels, teachers worldwide, had to use multiple-guess exams, low-level-thinking tests, or vague estimates, to decide students' language levels. "Beginning," "Basic," "Intermediate," or "Advanced" were terms used to group students or to label texts. Newspaper listing job vacancies asked for "80% English", or "75% French", or "100% Spanish." What did those arbitrary percentages mean? Did they mean that someone understood 80% of an English dictionary? Or that they understood 80% of a movie? Obviously, the percentages made no more sense than "Intermediate English."

**The Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR)**

In the late 1980s, more than twenty European countries began to research and document what skills and abilities needed to be exhibited to demonstrate language knowledge, in reading, writing, speaking, and listening, under various situations: social, professional, family, academic, and professional, etc.

After much work, in 1991, in Switzerland, a consortium of language educators and linguistic specialists presented their findings and recommendations in a 265 page document, named *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*. What they succeeded in doing was to specifically list observable actions and characteristics, which would exhibit language ability under a variety of circumstances and at various levels.

They divided language abilities, for any language, into six classifications: A-1, A-2, B-1, B-2, C-1, C-2, with A-1 being the basic level and C-2 the most proficient level. Tables 1 and 2 provide a clearer picture of the CEFR.
Table 1.
Alignment between Grade levels and CEFR levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>CEFR Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A1 Basic English User</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4</td>
<td>A2 Basic +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>B1 Independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 8, 9</td>
<td>B2 Independent +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10, 11</td>
<td>C1 Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>C2 Proficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice that first grade level of primary is not included, because most young children do not have the smoothness, vocabulary level, or fluency that A-1 would exhibit.

Once the CEFR was established and accepted in 1991, and publishers were required to eliminate the traditional designations of "Advanced," "Intermediate," and "Beginning" levels, language learning and teaching began to change. Publishers in Europe now have to indicate on the covers of their language teaching books the language level, such as "A1" or "B2", etc.
Table 2

Framework of Levels of Reference for Language Acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proficient User</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read. Can summarise information from different spoken and written sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express him/herself spontaneously, very fluently and precisely, differentiating finer shades of meaning even in more complex situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognise implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent User</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialisation. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. Can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. Can produce simple connected text on topics, which are familiar, or of personal interest. Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes &amp; ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic User</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment). Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the CEFR was in effect, schools and teacher-preparation programs had a dilemma: how do we teach languages to students so they will reach the levels of the CEFR? This problem was serious, because since the CEFR emphasized oral fluency, multicultural knowledge, projects, small group activities and lifelong learning, among other
things, schools were not prepared. Most language courses were traditional, with memorization, translations, workbooks to complete, grammar emphasis, phonics, fill-in-the-blanks, copying, and language patterns to complete; all of which presented fake, artificial communication styles. Conjugating verbs such as "I am... you are... he is... she is... we are... you are... they are..." doesn't lead anyone to language fluency. No one talks that way, so it was obvious that the traditional way of language teaching would not obtain the desired results of oral fluency, the kind of ability needed in the 21st Century.

**Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)**

Linguistic experts and language educators began to meet in Finland at the University of Jyvaskyla, in Helsinki from 1991-1994. The diverse group of educators, from more than 20 countries, headed by Dr. David Marsh, investigated language teaching programs in order to plan what they would recommend to the European Union supporting CEFR levels.

The linguists researched approximately 40 second-language programs, looking at what worked and what was not so successful. Their goal was to implement a teaching philosophy for the acquisition of a second language. They decided to establish a philosophy, based on the best practices of how languages are best learned. They called this philosophy **Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)**. Much of the research on the "Natural Approach to Language Learning", by Dr. Stephen Krashen, and others, from the United States, such as Dr. Virginia Collier's research with dual language programs, also were incorporated into the framework of CLIL philosophy.

**How does CLIL support bilingualism?**

In order to better understand CLIL, the following must be considered:

- CLIL is a philosophy of how we language is learned. It is not a program or a method.
- Knowledge of the language becomes the means of learning content.
- Language is integrated into the broad curriculum.
- This broad, complete, curriculum is taught, using 100% in English.
- Long-term learning is planned for nearly native-like English.
Fluency is the prime goal, with students using English to communicate.

Errors are a natural part of language learning.

Fluency is emphasized, not grammatical structures.

More focus is on the process of learning, and less emphasis on the final product.

Reading and oral production are the essential skills.

Content is used to expand vocabulary and fluency in speaking and reading.

CLIL has become the umbrella term describing both learning a content subject, such as physics or geography, through the medium of a second language, and learning a second language by studying a content-based subject.

**CLIL in the Classroom**

One of the most important notions in teaching a second language is that the teacher needs to use the second language 100% of the time, making it a necessary and essential communication tool. They need to vary materials; use visuals; plan team and pair activities; have lots of oral production; use critical thinking; and include music, arts, crafts and physical activities, all in the target language. They accept that recognition precedes production. Teachers need to accept that errors are O.K and part of the learning process.

There is no doubt that learning a language and learning through a language are concurrent processes, but implementing CLIL requires a rethink of the traditional concepts of the language classroom and the language teacher. The immediate obstacles seem to be:

- Opposition to language teaching by subject teachers may come from language teachers themselves. Subject teachers may be unwilling to take on the responsibility.
- The lack of CLIL teacher-training program suggests that the majority of teachers working on bilingual programs may be ill equipped to do the job adequately.

The need for language teaching reform will make CLIL a common philosophy by many education systems in the near future.
Some teachers may think that subject material will be weak if it is not in the L1, and students will not learn as much and will become confused. Studies support that CLIL is effective, not only in language acquisition, but also in the acquisition of academic knowledge in various subjects. Studies from Finland, Denmark and Austria are exhibiting that students are performing better in subject areas when they are taught in an L2 sing CLIL philosophy (Poisel, 2008).

One of the guiding principles of CLIL is that teachers have to select the most important information to teach, based on the following question: Of all the things that COULD be taught, what MUST be taught? When the CLIL philosophy is implemented, teachers tend to use more visuals and examples, and students are able to remember more data when it is organized and specific.

Some CLIL programs

In Spain, Colombia, Ecuador, and Guatemala, the national curriculum, based on bilingualism (Spanish/English), are having successful implementation. Canada, also, with its official policy being bilingualism (French/English), is involved in the globalization movement in multilingual and teacher improvement.

Teaching English in schools in Mexico is not new. Private schools for two generations have included English in the curricula. In Mexican public schools, twenty-one states have been offering English, some of them for twenty years. The state of Coahuila, for example, began its English program as a project in 550 primary schools, during the 1995-96 school year, with approximately 800 English teachers. Currently, the English program is an official program, not a project. Coahuila has expanded its English program to include pre-school, middle school, and high school levels. As more and more Mexican states have initiated English programs, each state with its own distinct focus, the need for a unified program, at the national level was imperative.

Thus was born the Programa Nacional de Inglés en la Educación Básica (PNIEB), the National English Program for Basic Education. The focus of the PNIEB, since its approval by Congress of Mexico in 2008, is based more on the CEFR standards and on CLIL philosophy than on methods or
philosophies previously emphasized in traditional language studies.

**Conclusion**

Basically, what's being said in bilingual circles, in countries where bilingualism has made a strong, positive image, such as Mexico, Canada, Spain, is this: "If you can't speak the language, you don't know the language." In other words, oral fluency has made a strong impact in these countries, with much less emphasis being given to the traditional grammar-translation method.

PISA is an exam applied in a country's native language, in science, mathematics, and language. Countries enter voluntarily, public and private schools. The exam is based on critical thinking skills, the four higher levels of Bloom's Taxonomy, not memorized responses. South Korea, Denmark, Ireland, Hong Kong, and Germany, are nations placing at the top, joining Finland and Canada, who, consistently, for 15 years, are among the highest scorers. Both countries embrace CLIL, bilingualism, multilingualism, and high level, critical thinking.

Oral fluency classes conducted 100% in the target language, a positive atmosphere, subjects being taught in the L2, use of graphics, and challenging students' thoughts with critical thinking interactions all contribute to the transformation in bilingual education. What needs to be emphasized is that on-going teacher improvement means on-going student transformation.
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Abstract
Based on ITBE’s 2013 Annual Convention Theme, *Looking Back, Thinking Forward*, this paper has three purposes. First, the authors look at the past of bilingual education by delineating its history and highlighting some of the most influential laws and mandates that have changed bilingual and ESL programs, both in a positive and a negative way. Then, they discuss common myths, misconceptions and true facts about Second Language Acquisition. Finally, the authors focus on the future of bilingual education. New demographics, new legislations, and the implementation of new programs are changing the nature of the education of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students. While there are still anti-bilingual attitudes, the number of supporters is significant, which translates into new studies that focus on Heritage Language Education, Bilingualism and Identity, Additive Bilingualism and Multilingualism. The paper focuses on the history of bilingual education in the United States and examines how its past and present are shaping the future of English Language Learner program.
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Introduction

The development of bilingual education in the United States has come a long way throughout the decades, due to the impact of influential court cases and legislative policies. It is evident that new demographics, new legislations, and the implementation of new programs are changing the nature of the education of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students (CLDS). While there are still anti-bilingual attitudes, the number of supporters has risen significantly, which translates into new studies that focus on Heritage Language Education, Bilingualism and Identity, Additive Bilingualism and Multilingualism.

Considering the Illinois Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Language-Bilingual Education’s (ITBE) 2013 Annual Convention Theme, Looking Back, Thinking Forward, this paper focuses on both the past and the future of bilingual education in America. The first part focuses on historic court cases and policies that have shaped bilingual education through the development of foundational laws, funding, special education support and services, equal opportunities, and community activism (Ovando & Combs, 2012). The second part projects what the future of bilingual education will strive for in the United States, and what progression—forward or backward—will likely be seen after reviewing the National Association of Bilingual Educators’ (NABE) current mission, issues posed by Bilingual Advisory Councils, and an analysis of past and current mile markers in bilingual programming.

Background

Dating back to the nineteenth century, the development of bilingual education in schools across the United States has been an on-going roller coaster of ups and downs. This permissive and then restrictive back-and-forth trend in bilingual education in the United States has been predominantly due to conflicting views, and the ever-changing role that politics plays in the field of education. It is important to note that power changes within the political system had, and continues to have, a direct effect on the decisions made in regards to educational policy. For example, the 1800s and early 1900s brought in a variety of different cultures and languages to America. During this time, America seemed to
embrace the implementation of a variety of languages for instruction in the school systems. As supported in Ovando & Combs (2012), “In 1900, for example, records show that at least 600,000 children in the United States were receiving part or all of their school in German in public and parochial schools” (p. 59). The twentieth century brought about shifts in beliefs about bilingual education in America. One example of this shift was the major objective to “Americanize” United States immigrants (Grant & Gomez, 2001). It was not until the 1960s when the idea of English as a Second Language began to unfold and expand with a rebirth of bilingual education followed by a resurgence of English Only movements in the latter part of the century (Crawford, 2005).

**Foundations**

A few major court cases throughout U.S. history have laid the foundation for the evolution of bilingual education in the country. The first foundational court case in the United States was the 1923 case of *Meyer v. Nebraska*. In this court case, a teacher was accused of violating a Nebraska law that outlawed the instruction of foreign languages. The rulings of the Supreme Court determined that this law violated the Fourteenth Amendment, which states that all States will provide equal protection of all citizens within its jurisdiction. The Supreme Court ruled in favor of Meyer allowing for native language instruction to be used. This case is significant because it occurred during a time when there were a number of debates over the use of non-English instruction. Therefore, it was considered to be one of the first cases to have a significant impact on educational policy in America (Nieto, 2009).

In addition to *Meyer v. Nebraska* (1923), the 1974 *Lau v. Nichols* court case has been considered to be the most influential case in United States history. Ovando & Combs (2012) state that the “Lau v. Nichols decision had a direct and immediate impact on the growth of bilingual education programs” (p. 79). In this landmark court case, the Supreme Court ruled in agreement with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that approximately 3,000 students of Chinese descent were not being provided with appropriate educational services in the San Francisco school system. Although the ruling of *Lau v. Nichols* did not give a specific fix for the issue at hand, it is believed to have paved the way for the development of

The prominent case of *Lau v. Nichols* had such a significant impact on educational policy that it also led to the decision of the 1975 Lau Remedies. The Lau Remedies acted as a guideline in identifying language minority students. Additionally, it assisted in the assessment of students' English language proficiency. Unlike the original *Lau v. Nichols* case, the Lau Remedies provided specific expectations for school districts in implementing bilingual education programs in which school districts were now required to provide evidence of effective bilingual programs (Reading Rockets, 2011a). Furthermore, Ovando (2003) supports this by stating, “The Lau Remedies redirected school districts to provide strong versions of bilingual education for language minority students to enable them to become bilingual, biliterate, and bicultural” (p. 10).

The final case that also had a significant impact on creating a foundation for educational policy in the U.S. was the *Castaneda v. Pickard* lawsuit in 1981. This court case was an influential event for education in that it identified specific standards for determining whether programs for English Language Learners (ELLs) were adequate. These standards that were established included a 3-step assessment process which determined that programs be based on thorough educational theory, be implemented effectively by providing resources and the appropriate personnel, and be evaluated to determine the effectiveness (Reading Rockets, 2011b).

**Funding**

The decisions of the United States government can have a significant effect on educational policy. In addition to the important legal cases that have laid a foundation for educational policy in the U.S., some court cases and policies in America’s history have also been pivotal in garnering funding to aid in the growth of bilingual education. One example was the passing of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act in 1964. Title VI is of significance because it specified that funding would be withheld from schools that continued to support segregation. The passing of Title VI occurred 10 years after the famous court case of *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), which banned schools from continuing to segregate schools. Title VI is believed to be “the paramount initiative for
bilingual education in the United States” (Nieto, 2009, p. 63). Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 set the stage for desegregation in schools, and promoting equal educational opportunities for all.

Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has also played an important role in regards to implementing the use of funding to progress bilingual education in America. Title VII of 1968 was the first federal legislation specifically for bilingual education. According to Ovando & Combs (2012), “The new law created a small but significant change in federal policy for linguistic minorities” (p. 64). With this passing, the government provided supplemental funding for schools that implemented programs for English language learners. Title VII also provided funding for schools that were in the process of developing bilingual programs. Overall, the role that funding played from Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, and Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, helped to progress the implementation of bilingual education in the United States.

Special Education

Special education has always been a significant topic in regards to language minority students. For many years, there have been great concerns regarding the disproportionality of language minority students, and special education in the United States. Some key court cases from U.S. history have addressed the issue of over and underrepresentation of language minority students in regards to special education. For example, one of the first cases to bring attention to the overrepresentation of English Language Learners (ELLs) receiving special education services was the case of Diana v. California in 1970. This case brought attention to students who were over-identified as having mental retardation. In this case, students were being placed into classrooms for students who were mentally retarded based on the use of IQ testing administered in their non-native language. The court ultimately ruled that language minority students must be tested in their native languages. Additionally, this court case determined that non-verbal assessments and data be used when completing special education evaluations (Ovando & Combs, 2012).

Similar to Diana v. California, Y.S. v. School District of Philadelphia was another significant lawsuit that dealt with
disproportionate special education placement. In this court case, the claim that the school districts of Philadelphia were violating the Fourteenth Amendment and the rights of almost all Asian American students by providing assessments in the students’ non-native language, thus causing an overrepresentation in language minority students requiring special education services (Lyons, 1988). Diana v. California and Y.S. v. School District of Philadelphia are just a couple of the several court cases in the U.S. that has fought for proper educational services for ELLs.

Over the years, the United States has also implemented new policies in regards to the link between language minority students and special education services. The passing of the Education of the Handicapped Act of 1975—now known as Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)—is one of many important policies that had an effect on bilingual/special education. The Education of the Handicapped Act correlates with the Diana v. California court case in that it mandated assessments administered in a language minority student’s native language to ensure that ELLs are placed into appropriate educational programs.

Equal Opportunities

The fight for equal opportunities for all individuals has been an on-going struggle for decades in the United States. Beginning in the 1960s with the Civil Rights Act, and the famous lawsuit of Brown v. Board of Education, the government began changing their views regarding equality for all. Some court cases that have specifically fought for creating equal opportunities for ELLs include: Rios v. Read (1977) and Cintron v. Brentwood (1978).

The Rios v. Read case of 1977 was influential in creating equality among all individuals in that the court ruling mandated that New York school districts provide quality educational programs for ELLs, after it was determined that language minority students were not receiving proper education in their native Spanish language (Reading Rockets, 2011b). In addition to Rios v. Read, the 1978 Cintron v. Brentwood lawsuit also promoted equality for all individuals, including educators. In this significant case, the court mandated that school districts keep bilingual teachers who were being let go due to low bilingual enrollment numbers. Additionally, it is important to note that this court case
brought on stricter guidelines in regards to the implementation of bilingual education programs (Ovando & Combs, 2012).

Community Activism

Community activism has been another key factor in the bilingual education movement. Several of the court cases previously mentioned involved community efforts to create a higher quality education for minority students. For example, the parents of Asian American students joined as a community to fight for the rights of their children in the famous Lau v. Nichols court case (Arias & Casanova, 1993). In addition, the two cases Rios v. Reed and Cintron v. Brentwood also occurred because of community involvement challenging the inadequate educational programs provided.

Another significant action that involved community activism was the 1982 Plyler v. Doe lawsuit. In this court case, community activists fought on behalf of illegal immigrant children for the right to have equal educational opportunities. The court case involved Texas schools that were denying illegal immigrant students from attending public schools. Overall, the court ruled that students were protected under the Fourteenth Amendment (Walsh, 2009). In addition, the court rulings indicated that schools were prohibited from: denying education to illegal students, from requiring documentation in regards to immigration status, and requesting social security numbers of students (Ovando & Combs, 2012). These court cases, along with many other community activism events, helped to shape bilingual education in America today.

The Future

As the future of bilingual education is pondered in the United States, what progression (forward or backward) will the country take. Documentation such as the National Association of Bilingual Educators’ (NABE) current message to its membership, the Illinois Bilingual Education Advisory Council’s recommendations to the state, and past and current state program data could give insights as to what trends may come. Effective teaching and programming for ELLs can now be based on research that is rooted in a variety of perspectives about desirable and achievable outcomes for second language learners.

Many data sources are available to guide educators as they plan and implement bilingual education. Best practice
implementation is a choice at this point, and many myths about second language learning have been debunked. In effect, the future era of bilingual education is based on a reflection of eras gone by and current initiatives. Noting the historical work of Crawford (2005), will bilingual education step into a permissive era such as that experienced during the inception of the country where German, Dutch, and French dual language schools could be found? Will the nation move toward the restrictive eras found after each world war where fear, economics and politics, called upon schools to Americanize the youth? Will an era of rebirth occur, where parents who want dual language capabilities for their own children win out much like the movement that Dade County, Florida parents enacted beginning in the 1950s? Whether indicators of a coming era similar to the second language theory building times of the 1970s or the late 1980s English-only movements are found, the future is a choice. Bilingual programming with the best chance of offering everyday learning experiences should be chosen, where educational outcomes ensure that children develop into bilingual, bicultural, biliterate and bicognitive individuals.

NABE’s Message

It is important to take the nation’s temperature in regards to where bilingual education stands on the path to excellence. Perhaps the most well-known and influential organization is the National Association of Bilingual Educators (NABE). A review of NABE’s current message reveals a tone of resolute affirmation of all languages and cultures standing together as one voice in many languages. Their current mantra depicts a wide and inclusive path in the face of global change. NABE also seems poised for an expected fight for bilingual education, as they have crafted a mission to:

Stand as one nation of advocates; support all languages; defend many cultures; promote educational policies and programs which give all students the opportunity to become bilingual; defend the rights of language-minority Americans threatened by English-Only extremists as needed; and ensure that the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides for equity and
excellence for language-minority students (NABE 2013).

NABE, as a national organization, firmly calls its membership to: stand, support, promote, defend, and ensure educational excellence for the nation’s second language learners through bilingual education programming as the nation moves forward in this changing world.

In order to live the NABE message, bilingual programs will need to call for the collective engagement of all educators who serve more than 50 million students speaking languages other than English across the nation. A teaching force that is conversant in these languages, cognizant of second language acquisition, and sensitive to the families’ cultural backgrounds is required. This includes practitioners who have the capacity to successfully implement culturally responsive best practices in teaching methodologies, cultivating all students’ critical thinking skills, academic language repertoire, content knowledge and skills using developmentally appropriate strategies and approaches.

Furthermore, as NABE proclaims, the benefits of bilingualism should be afforded to all school age children, bestowing the cognitive and linguistic opportunities for second language learning as part of academic growth. School administrators must understand the research in best practices for program delivery methods. They can implement programs and help their staff develop the knowledge and skills necessary to ensure ELLs have the opportunity for academic, social/emotional, cognitive and linguistic growth.

**Advocacy through Advisory Council Groups**

Strong advocacy messages continue to surface with similar paths, as well as supporting achievement data that calls for inclusivity of bilingual education at different levels. Advisory council groups across the nation are further charged with giving formal guidance and practitioner perspectives on bilingual education initiatives through collaboration with the State and National Boards of Education. Some of the issues that have recently raised by the Illinois Bilingual Education Advisory Council include the following:

1. Whether and how bilingual education programs should be modified to be more flexible, and achieve a higher success rate
among Latino students in the classroom and on State assessments.

2. Whether and how bilingual education programs should be modified to increase parental involvement, including the use of parent academies.

3. Whether and how bilingual education programs should be modified to increase cultural competency through a cultural competency program among bilingual teaching staff.

4. Whether and how the bilingual parent advisory committees within school districts can be supported in order to increase the opportunities for parents to effectively express their views concerning the planning, operation, and evaluation of bilingual education programs.

Parental involvement. Parental involvement in the education of ELLs is mandated, assessed, and will likely be a continuing issue for schools. While schools offer varying opportunities for parents and community members to have an active voice in school improvement activities and learning how American schools work, data is not routinely collected that depict the actual number of parents who participate in these opportunities. Therefore, data depicting the effects of opportunities made available to the parents of ELLs and community may be necessary for a better understanding of how to engage these stakeholders in school improvement activities.

There is a need for guidance as to how schools disseminate and receive information to and from parents of ELLs, as expressed in the following two questions:

1. Whether and how bilingual education programs should be modified to increase parental involvement, including the use of parent academies.

2. Whether and how the bilingual parent advisory committees within school districts can be supported in order to increase the opportunities for parents to effectively express their views concerning the planning,
operation, and evaluation of bilingual education programs.

School districts must offer no fewer than four Bilingual Parent Advisory Committee meetings per academic year. The meetings serve the purpose of disseminating critical information to help parents navigate the American school system, as well as gain their input for planning.

**Teacher competency.** Teaching standards provide a great deal of guidance as to competencies required of all teachers, whether they are in a mainstream classroom or in a bilingual/ESL program. For example, Student Diversity, specifically references ELLs. Since P-12 students are expected to display cultural competencies, all teachers should have coursework to help them gain culturally relevant practices. Highly qualified Bilingual and ESL teachers need to complete coursework devoted to addressing the needs of ELLs. In order for teachers to have the requisite skills needed to teach the diverse student population, all pre-service teachers should take at least one course in cultural studies. However, few university faculty members in colleges of education are well-versed in issues of student diversity, which brings the issue that new faculty with training in cultural diversity should be recruited in order to instruct and supervise pre-service and in-service teachers. As a final note, it is important to highlight that in-service teachers should devote a portion of their professional development hours to developing cultural competencies and understandings of student diversity.

**Mile Markers in Bilingual Education**

With the legislated mandates moving us forward, where is the funding in bilingual education? How many highly qualified educators are there who can implement best practices, given the context of their schools and the children they serve? Does the country have the resources to meet the needs of the growing population of second language learners? Table 1 shows an increase of almost 575,000 ELLs in 9 years of data across the nation.

Table 3

*Number and percentage of public school students participating in programs for English language learners, by state: Selected years, 2002-03 through 2010-11 (NCES, 2012b)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Number of public school students participating in programs for English Language Learners</th>
<th>Percent of students participating in programs for English Language Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>4,118,918</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>4,421,489</td>
<td>9.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>4,229,217</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>4,153,870</td>
<td>8.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>4,439,514</td>
<td>9.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>4,659,349</td>
<td>9.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>4,693,818</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 includes the latest federal FY 2012 Annual Performance Report and FY 2014 Performance Plan put out by the U.S. Department of Education. These data show appropriation budget items designated to ensure and promote effective educational opportunities, and safe and healthy learning environments for all students regardless of race, ethnicity, national origin, age, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability, language, and socioeconomic status. The budget to run educational programs for ELLs has diminished while the number of ELLs in our nation continues to rise. This trend is expected to hold true given that the federal budget designated for English Learner Education took a 2 million dollar cut in 2012. The table shows that the overall budget was cut with only one area of actual growth in funding for Indian Education for specialized programs. Also noted is the one projected growth in funding for the Office of Civil Rights, which has traditionally been in charge of monitoring program activity.
While most states should see dire economic conditions likely to impact the future ability to place highly qualified staff in best practices bilingual programming, trend data show dilemma that Midwest states face as well. Table 3 depicts ELL Midwestern state population growth experienced over a decade. Midwestern states have doubled, and quadrupled the need for educators trained to meet the needs of ELLs. With flat or dwindling resources available for supplemental training and programs, university-level administrators and teacher-training programs will need to ensure that all pre-service and in-service educators are trained to meet the needs of second language learners as foundational cornerstones of professional development goals.
Table 5

*English Language Learners in the Midwest (Source: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition as stated in Tormey, 2010)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of ELLs, ‘07-'08</th>
<th>ELLs as a percentage of total enrollment</th>
<th>Growth in ELLs from ‘97-'98 to ‘07-'08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>175,454</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>46,417</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>409.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>19,736</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>145.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>71,809</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>103.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>47,593</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>136.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>5,318,164</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>53.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In comparing and analyzing these numbers, it can be predicted that bilingual education, and the quest to provide quality education for ELLs should move toward a more inclusive view that enlists all educators who will require professional development.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the progression of bilingual education in America has evolved throughout the decades. Although there is more work to be done and it is far from perfect, the court cases and federal policies have helped to shape the definition of bilingual education today. Schools across America are continuing to work towards further developing educational policy to better meet the needs of all students, including language minority students. These court cases and policies have also encouraged community activism through demonstrating the importance of involving family and community members to fight for what they believe.

Is bilingual education moving backward or forward? The answer appears to be mixed. Bilingual advocacy groups seem to be placing emphasis on clarifying who ELLs are, in an attempt to be more inclusive of all language learners at the national and state levels. Legislative mandates are moving us
forward with explicit reference to the knowledge and performances required for meeting diverse student needs, and greater accountability measures for teacher competencies. Some states in the nation are moving forward with requiring district and school administrators to ensure that the school culture and climate is measured, and taken into account when reviewing school improvement data. With the continued increase of ELLs, most school districts will need to add new hires who have ESL and Bilingual endorsements. Therefore, there is an increased need for university faculty who are well-versed in providing professional development focused on methods and strategies that work with second language learners.

There is a need to look for new and better ways to include more parents of ELLs in the opportunities that schools offer. At the same time, there is need for a more focused approach to ensure that bilingual teachers collaborate with mainstream and special needs teachers to improve student learning of ELLs. Administrators may consider offering the benefits of bilingualism to all schoolchildren where dual language programming is feasible as a measure to improve student learning. However, high schools will need a more rigorous teasing of the facts to understand feasible solutions for increasing student learning of their ELLs.

Ultimately, the question is whether politics and economics be put aside for one era to place the learner at the forefront of the decision-making. This era should be the instructional best practices era as opposed to the accountability era. The dwindling funding needs to be spent on resources that make a difference in the everyday learning of children, such as instructional resources like highly qualified teachers and up-to-date learning materials. After all, a competent learner is equipped with critical thinking, and armed with the knowledge and skills to join in on the new workforce that the nation needs. Thus, the chances that bilingual education can move forward toward educational excellence are inevitable.
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Abstract

This preliminary study brings to light the benefits and challenges of collaboration between teachers in isolated-skill institutional settings, particularly regarding the execution of collaborative cross-modality action research. The study focuses on the acquisition and retention of vocabulary following the commonly held belief in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) that “communication without vocabulary is impossible” (Folse, 2004). Despite this fact, teachers remain faced with the challenging task of choosing the most effective techniques for facilitating acquisition and retention of vocabulary. Widely used techniques include extensive reading and creative language use in communicative oral tasks; lacking in this formula, however, is the skill of writing. While it has largely been viewed as a product of acquisition, new literature is conceptualizing writing as a tool for promoting acquisition (Harklau, 2002; Machón, 2007; Williams, 2008, 2011). Drawing on the Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1995), the Involvement Load Hypothesis (Hulstijn &
Laufer, 2001), and the concept of Writing-to-Learn (Manchón, 2007), this study investigated how extended written production can enhance the retention of vocabulary for upper intermediate-level ESL learners. While the results of this study remain inconclusive, student work and feedback provide insights into the implications of this investigation for vocabulary-teaching methodology and for teacher collaboration across modalities. This paper concludes with a discussion of the issues facing teachers who aspire to conduct action research in their classrooms, and provides suggestions for research structuring.
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**Preface**

“In a true experiment you keep constant every cause you can think of except one, and then see what the effects are of varying that one cause. In the classroom you can never do this.”

Robert M. Pirsig (1974)

*Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*

There exists in the field of Second Language Acquisition (SLA) a longstanding friction between researchers and classroom teachers. This friction pits rigidly controlled laboratory research against the experiences and knowledge gleaned from everyday observation and interaction within the second-language classroom. Such disparity is present in studies published in the field of SLA, particularly in the professionals-driven discussions that follow them, which often ask if and how the research findings in question might be best applied to the classroom. In many ways, this disparity has been at the heart of a movement towards more classroom-based research in which research institute-funded studies are conducted in actual classrooms, and in which the researchers either function as co-teachers or as persons familiar to the participants (the students) by way of classroom visits. While the concept of classroom research is not distinctly a new one, the appearance of teachers as researchers within this context
remains rare. Goswami & Stillman (1987) offer the following explanation for this situation:

> Although classroom research is a natural outgrowth of teaching […] it seldom figures in undergrad or graduate education courses. Thus, those of us who enter into it most often do so with little formal guidance (or, even worse, persuaded that any inquiry must meet exacting empirical standards). In other words, it remains easy to become lost or overwhelmed—to wonder if and how our study has concluded, and what its actual outcomes are. (p. 128)

In other words, while research is inextricably part of teaching—teachers are constantly forming hypotheses and assessing their practices to best investigate their students’ learning—action research in the classroom falls prey to a lack of guidance for teachers in navigating the labyrinth of research processes. In addition, there is the preconception that it is imperative for the study to produce concrete, neatly measurable, and generalizable results.

However, even in laboratory research in the humanities, such neat results are seldom observed and are hardly generalizable considering that they result from highly controlled environments that do not reflect the real-world classroom context. It is for this reason that teachers are in a perfect position to “ask questions about learning, to accumulate data, and to take up teaching directions based on the learning patterns that emerge” (Goswami & Stillman, 1987, p. 20). Teachers are, after all, the ones regularly interacting with students in the classroom, and who are thus the most sensitive to the behavioral and emotional changes that can result from methodological shifts in the classroom.

Inspired by the interest in the process of conducting action research, instructors took on the role of teacher-researchers in order to conduct this collaborative action research study. The following is the culmination of the preliminary efforts in classroom research, the focus of which espouses our interest in the teaching and learning of vocabulary across modalities (speaking, listening, reading, and writing). Reflections on the process are reported in the final section of this paper.
Introduction

It has been hypothesized that for non-native speakers to read effectively in a second language, they need a vocabulary of 15,000 to 20,000 words that form a complex web of word relationships in the mental lexicon—or mental inventory of vocabulary in a given language (Nation, 2001). Given the vast and complex nature of vocabulary knowledge, then, it is easy to give credence to Keith Folse’s assertion that communication without vocabulary is impossible (2004). However, research has yet to determine which types of intervention tasks best facilitate vocabulary acquisition and retention. Widely used techniques are based on Stephen Krashen’s position on the “power of reading” and the belief that vocabulary is best learned through comprehensible input—the language that a second-language (L2) learner understands (Krashen 2009; Nation, 2001; Williams, 2012; Schmitt, 2008). However, others in the field of SLA have claimed that input is not sufficient and that learner output—the language an L2 learner produces—has largely been overlooked in prior searches for types of tasks—activities—to facilitate vocabulary acquisition and retention. Taking Swain’s Output Hypothesis as a framework, recent research has looked at the significance of output-type tasks. According to the Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1985), learner output is essential for the development of learner interlanguage, or the language produced by an L2 learner during the learning process. In consideration of this development in the field of SLA, research and classroom instruction have focused on creative language output—specifically oral output (speaking)—as a means to teaching vocabulary (Folse, 2004). This study sought to investigate how the Output Hypothesis functions differently when the modality of writing is used in addition that of speaking in order to enhance the retention of newly acquired vocabulary items.

Definition of Terms

Bilingual education has terms that may not be common to other educational fields. Thus, this list of definition will be helpful to the non-bilingual educator.

**Comprehensible input:** The language that an L2 learner understands (Gass & Selinker, 2008)
**Generalizable:** Results can be easily and clearly applied to a variety of contexts under the assumption that trends will continue and that the same outcomes would be expected across contexts regardless of where the study was to be replicated.

**Interlanguage:** The language in a given language as produced by a non-native speaker of that language, typically during the language-learning process.

**Mental lexicon:** One’s mental inventory of vocabulary in a given language, here, the second language (L2)

**Off-line:** Planned, not spontaneous. An off-line task is one in which a language learner has the time to process the given language and to think through a problem and calculate a response, as opposed to having to respond in real-time. Writing is characterized as an off-line task that allows for planning, while speaking is characterized as an on-line task, requiring simultaneous comprehension of the input and calculation and communication of the output (response).

**Output:** The language that an L2 learner produces in speech or writing

**Task:** “An activity which requires learners to use language, with emphasis on meaning, to attain an objective” (Bygate, Skehan, & Swain, 2001 in Brown, 2007, p. 50).

**Reliability:** The degree to which a test produces consistent results

**Target language:** The language form that is the focus of a given L2 lesson or exercise

**Validity:** How well a test measures what it claims to measure

**Literature Review**

Merrill Swain’s (1985) Output Hypothesis states that output helps to restructure learners’ interlanguage system because it helps learners to notice the gaps between their production and that of more advanced users as the learners struggle to produce the target language. These gaps may then lead them to work towards filling these holes in their interlanguage to communicate more effectively. However, still missing from this equation is written output (Harklau, 2002). Recent literature has begun to discuss the ways in which written output can be a facilitator of—as opposed to
solely the product of—language acquisition (Manchón, 2011; Williams, 2012, 2008; Harklau, 2002). Manchón (2011) outlines the case for viewing written output in these terms. She argues that writing is largely an off-line task, which provides more time for the processing of language. As such, it involves learners in a deeper level of processing.

This assertion is consistent with the Involvement Load Hypothesis (Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001b), based on the assumption that more attention paid to new information will result in higher levels of retention of that information. More specifically, it claims that higher levels of need, search, and evaluation in vocabulary tasks lead to higher retention of target vocabulary items. Here, need is the learner’s desire to use the word, search is the attempt to find the meaning or concept of an unknown L2 word, and evaluation is the comparison of a word to other words in order to determine whether its use in a particular context is appropriate. In two studies (Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001; Laufer & Hulstijn, 2001), it was found that writing tasks with pushed output—or required use—of vocabulary items facilitated longer-term retention of newly acquired vocabulary items than did either of the more input-driven tasks: (1) reading and (2) reading with in-text vocabulary item gap-fill.

Paralleling these findings, Manchón (2011) argues that writing creates more opportunities for learners to access both implicit and explicit knowledge, allowing them to attend to both form and meaning, which can aid in transforming knowledge from explicit knowledge into implicit knowledge. More specifically, the learner is allotted more time to test out language hypotheses and expand his/her interlanguage. Furthering these assertions, Williams (2012) outlines the argument that writing presents two advantages over speaking: 1) time-on-task and 2) permanence. First, writing is largely an off-line task, which provides more time for the processing. It thus allows learners to attend to form and meaning as well as aiding them in transforming explicit knowledge into implicit knowledge. Second, Williams notes that the permanence of written output is the second key feature of its role in facilitating language acquisition. In comparison to spoken language, the record left by written output allows learners to continue to attend to language forms even after learners’ initial production of them. These advantages are graphically represented in Figure 1. She further states that when learners are engaged in speaking, they are under pressure to produce
spontaneous language, and therefore may only be able to produce what they can access automatically. Therefore, the off-line planning time and individual nature of writing can lower affective factors and help learners focus their available resources on accessing both implicit and explicit knowledge.

Figure 1
*Inherent Features of Written Production and Its Effects (Williams, 2012)*

This study seeks to combine the claims of the Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1995), the Involvement Load Hypothesis (Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001) and the concept of Writing-to-Learn (Manchón, 2011), to investigate to what effect extended written production can serve as a method for enhancing the retention of vocabulary for upper intermediate-level English as a Second Language (ESL) learners.

**Research Question & Hypothesis**

**Research Question:** Does extended written production (in a writing class) enhance the retention of newly acquired vocabulary items (taught in a speaking/listening class)?

**Hypothesis:** Based on observations made in the literature that the task of extended writing in a second language provides a higher involvement load for vocabulary learning and time for off-line processing, allowing for learners’ accessing of explicit and implicit knowledge, the researchers predicted higher rates of retention of newly acquired vocabulary items among
participants in the extended writing treatment group than those in the control group.

**Methodology**

**Participants:** The participants of this study were 12 learners of English as a Second Language (ESL), with a proficiency level in English equating to the upper intermediate level at the host institution. TOEFL® (Test of English as a Foreign Language) scores for these participants had a mean of 482 out of a total score of 677. For university acceptance, a score of 550-600 is needed. The participants at the time of the study were all students enrolled in the same High Intermediate Spoken English class in an Intensive English Program (IEP) at a large urban private university. The control group was comprised of six students who were enrolled in the High Intermediate Spoken English course, but not in the High Intermediate Writing course, while the experimental group was comprised of the other six students who were enrolled in both the High Intermediate Spoken English course and Writing course. Students ranged in age from 18 years old to 35 years old, with a mean age of 21 years old. The native languages represented by this group of students were as follows: Spanish (2), Chinese [Mandarin] (4), Korean (1), Kurdish/Turkish (1), and Arabic (3).

**Educational Context**

This study was conducted in an IEP at a large private urban American university, which focuses on English for Academic Purposes. Structured on the platform of isolated-skill instruction with the following four courses per level of study: writing, reading, grammar, and speaking/listening, this program consists of five levels ranging from ‘Foundations’ to ‘Bridge’ (see figure 2), and allows for split-level students across the different skills. Approximately 250 students of a variety of language and cultural backgrounds are enrolled in the program per term, of which there are four terms per year. Three terms are 10 weeks in duration, and one term (Summer session) is 8 weeks long. This study was conducted in the Fall session (first term). Many of the students work to progress through the program and matriculate into the American university system, a goal that is reflected in the intensive, academic nature of the program.
5 Levels of Proficiency

- Foundation Level—The most beginning level
- Intermediate Level
- High Intermediate Level
- Advanced Level
- University Bridge Level—The most advanced level

*Note: Foundation level (beginning) classes are for students who have studied some English and can use 200-400 words in English.

Materials

Target items list: The vocabulary item lists used in this study were selected from lists presented in the textbook *Q: Skills for Success: Listening & Speaking* 4 (Freire & Jones, 2011), which was the required text for the Spoken English course. The chosen lists were those whose unit themes and vocabulary items were closely related to the themes and vocabulary used in the writing assignments in the High Intermediate Writing course. The intention here was to provide students with conditions for writing that would elicit incorporation of the target items in the students’ writing. Students were encouraged, but not required, to use the target items in their writing. (For the list of target vocabulary items, see Appendix A.)

Pre- and Posttests: Pretests were developed by the Spoken English course teacher-researchers uniquely for the purposes of this study to test students’ knowledge of the target items in terms of receptive knowledge, part of speech knowledge, and sentence-level productive knowledge (Appendix D). Posttest data was drawn from Spoken English course vocabulary quizzes (Appendix E).

Instructional materials: Consistent with Nation’s assertions that successful vocabulary learning in a second language requires multiple forms of “rich instruction” (2001), the techniques used for vocabulary instruction in this study incorporated a variety of skills. Listening exposure consisted of vocabulary used in context from in-unit listening excerpts, as well as related questions and activities. Speaking exposure consisted of the explicit review of stress and syllables for each
of the target vocabulary items, and games and conversational activities in which students were required to negotiate and/or recall the pronunciation, meanings, and uses of target items. Reading exposure consisted of textbook and online exercises in which students completed multiple-choice and matching tasks largely related to target items and their definitions.

Writing treatment materials: Each of the writing assignments administered to the experimental group closely related to the unit themes that these students were taught throughout the previous week(s) in the Spoken English class. A total of three essays (narrative, cause/effect, & comparison) were assigned across the 10-week period of study, each one containing stages of draft writing, revision, and final submission. Incorporation of the target vocabulary items was not a requirement for completion of the assignments but was encouraged. (See Table 1 for essay-vocabulary combinations).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay Type (Title)</th>
<th>Unit Title for Target Vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>Growing Up I (and/or 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A Milestone in My Life)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare/Contrast</td>
<td>From School to Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Comparing an issue in Home Country vs. U.S.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause/Effect</td>
<td>The Science of Food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A Health Issue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure

The study was conducted over the span of a regular 10-week term, and was integrated into the lesson plans and materials for the regularly scheduled units as dictated by the course syllabi and overall curriculum schedule. Researchers were the instructors of the courses in which the study was conducted, two in the Spoken English course and one in the Writing course. This project was initially introduced to the students by the teachers in the Spoken English in the first week of the term, and students were made aware that their performance on the pretests was not graded and would have no impact on their academic standing at the school.
Vocabulary instruction: Prior to the instruction of target vocabulary items, students were administered the pretest for the given unit. Pretests were unannounced, and units were not explored in the order in which they appeared in the book. As a result, students did not have knowledge of which vocabulary words would appear on the pretests prior to taking them. Once the pretests were collected, the researchers in the Spoken English class engaged the students in a series of activities centered on the rich instruction of the target items. (For descriptions of these activities, see Appendix B.)

Experimental phase: Following vocabulary instruction in the speaking class, the six students enrolled in the High Intermediate writing course were asked to integrate into their writing relevant vocabulary words from the correlating unit in the speaking class. For each writing assignment, the type of writing reflected the topic and skills previously explored in the speaking class. For example, for the unit that discussed food additives and health issues, the speaking class looked at causes and effects related to food; the correlating writing assignment in the writing class asked students to write a cause/effect essay. Students were allowed to choose the focus of their essays, but as they were asked to incorporate the target vocabulary, their essays were expected to reflect the topic of discussion in the speaking class. Throughout the term, vocabulary quizzes in the speaking class functioned as sources for posttest data. Prior to these assessments, students participated in communicative oral vocabulary review sessions. Following these assessments, data was extracted and coded for analysis.

Data collection and coding: The pre- and posttests were scored by the two teacher/researchers of the Speaking class who were both native speakers of English and who had experience teaching ESL. Data collection and coding was done manually using a GoogleDrive Excel spreadsheet. The data was individually entered for each student across each list of vocabulary items, and was organized into three categories in accordance with the data collection tool used. Within these categories, the data was divided into subcategories representing the type of knowledge exhibited for each set of data collected (ie. receptive, part-of-speech, and productive knowledge for pre- and posttest data, and use of the vocabulary items in terms of grammatical and semantic correctness for essay writing data). Figure 1 illustrates the
manner in which data was coded and organized within the excel spreadsheet. Data was coded so that, for pre- and posttest data, \( Y \) represented that the student exhibited appropriate knowledge of the target item, \( N \) represented that appropriate knowledge was not exhibited, and \( X \) represented that the data was not available due to discrepancies in the posttest. For student essays, data extraction was conducted using the “word search” function of Microsoft Word 2007. The researcher entered the target item into the search box, for which the program scanned the document and highlighted words in the text that resembled the target item. Careful evaluation of these highlighted items was necessary as the program highlighted any words or parts of words containing the target item, even in instances when this resulted in misleading results. Non-target item highlighted words were discarded, while any instances of target item use (i.e. the past tense form of a present tense target item verb) were counted. Data entry for this process (see Table 2) identified that (1) the target item was used, (2) the number of times it appeared in the student’s text, and (3) in which text it appeared. This third code was added following the conclusion of the study when it was discovered that students were using words from unrelated subsequent vocabulary lists in essays with different target topics and essay types. \( Y \) represented that the target item was used, and \( N \) represented that it was not used.

Table 2

Sample of Coding Data for Pretest, Posttest, and Writing Production Item Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Writing Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. TC</td>
<td>Casefree</td>
<td>Assume</td>
<td>Contribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRETEST</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSTTEST</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP: Used vocab item correctly (grammatically)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP: Used vocab item correctly (contentiously)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Results

Results of this study were inconclusive due to inconsistencies in the pre- and posttest measurements, and due to students’ limited use of target words in the writing assignments. These issues are discussed in the Limitations section of this paper. Regardless of the lack of measurable data, however, the researchers were able to make a number of observations.

The first observable trend to appear in the data illustrated that students tended to use target items with which they were already familiar. This finding is not surprising, especially considering that the integration of target items (particularly newly acquired items) in essays was not required, but instead was optional. In spite of this phenomenon, a second observation was noted. Students who made efforts to use newly acquired items did self-report vocabulary knowledge reinforcement. Two participants, who made notable efforts to incorporate the target items into their writing assignments, commented that they would be unlikely to forget target vocabulary items as the usage of these words in their essays required extensive careful thought and planning. This finding is consistent with the assertions put forth by Hulstijn and Laufer (2001) that a higher load (level) of involvement with vocabulary items leads to longer retention.

The third observation involved target-item movement across essays. Application of unrelated target items to various writing assignments was observed across writers. In other words, while the researchers originally searched the essays for the target vocabulary that had been paired with the given essay topic and structure, they began to notice that students were incorporating items from other lists, including those never mentioned in the writing class but were taught in the speaking class. These items were confirmed to have been used appropriately, in terms of both grammatical correctness and meaning.

Fourth and most striking observation was that dramatic discrepancies existed between students' individual speaking and writing fluencies. The researchers were surprised to find that a drastic lack of spoken English fluency was not paralleled by a lack of written English fluency across participants. In one particularly striking example, a student exhibited a highly limited level of comprehension and
expression in the speaking class, yet demonstrated the highest
level of complexity in writing across students in the writing
class.

**Discussion and Pedagogical Implications**

Despite the limited nature of the reported results in
this study, the observations made here offer evidence that
supports the Output Hypothesis the Involvement Load
Hypothesis, and the concept of Writing-to-Learn. The simple
fact that students are inclined to make use of vocabulary with
which they are familiar, even when they are granted the
planning time to challenge themselves to make use of newly
acquired words, illustrates the necessity for teachers to
facilitate new word usage and therefore to push students to
develop a richer lexicon (Output Hypothesis). Students’ self-
reported awareness of retention arguably speaks strongly in
defense of a vocabulary-teaching methodology that requires
written pushed output for the purpose of retention
(Involvement Load Hypothesis). Additionally, the observation
that students with heightened fluency in writing may not have
parallel abilities in speaking illustrates the potential for
utilizing writing as a means of facilitating language learning,
by helping the student move from the more planned modality
of writing to the more spontaneous modality of speaking
(Writing-to-Learn).

**Limitations of This Study and Areas for Future
Research**

Limitations of this study are largely due to the design
of its materials and procedure. The first set of limitations
involved the pre- and posttests, which contained a number of
shortcomings that interfered with their validity and reliability.
The “part-of-speech” knowledge measure assumed that
students possessed ample knowledge of the part-of-speech
terms to appropriately identify the target items. However, in a
number of cases, students were able to exhibit sentence-level
productive knowledge of a word while they were not able to
label the word correctly with its part-of-speech. Additionally,
the posttests doubled as formal assessments, complete with
vocabulary item reviews in the speaking class prior to the
administering of the assessment. As such, any difference
between writing-treatment and non-treatment groups in terms
of vocabulary retention was negated by the fact that students
studied for the test prior to taking it. In other words, any potential difference in retention by individual students’ ability to study effectively for an exam, were overshadowed. Lastly, as the posttest functioned as a formal assessment, non-problematic target items were excluded from the test in the interest of time and students’ mental resources during the exam. Unfortunately, this resulted in problematic holes in the collected posttest data.

For the purposes of current and future research, the researchers have made changes to the pre- and posttests. Firstly, “part-of-speech” knowledge is now only tested as part of productive knowledge. Secondly, the posttests now function as an element of vocabulary review prior to the formal assessment, meaning that the teacher/researcher administers the posttest unannounced, then encourages students to make note of which words they need to focus on for the formal assessment. This change also eliminates the lack of data supporting extended retention. As the posttest is now unannounced, contains all target items, and mirrors the pretest in its structure, it is more reliable in its measurement of longer-term retention of target items, and is more able to elicit differences in retention between the experimental group and control group.

The second set of limitations involves the precision of the essay prompts used in the study. As previously discussed, students were encouraged, not required, to incorporate target items into their essays. As such, a number of students avoided using the words, which resulted in a lack of data. In addition, students were allowed to choose the topic of their essays, and were not required to write about a given prompt that directly mirrored the topic discussed in the speaking class. To rectify these issues, the teacher-researchers have adapted the current writing prompts to relate more precisely to the topics discussed in the speaking class. The teacher-researchers have also required use of target items.

A third set of limitations involves the number of participants. In sum, a larger sample size would be necessary to gain more accurately generalizable results. While there is no specific minimum number of participants required for the results of a study to be considered generalizable, it is a widely accepted belief that the larger the sample size in a research study, the more reliable—and thus generalizable—the results
of the study. The number of individual variables across participants would have been shown to be insignificant in the face of the trends in the data, thus supporting the argument that the same trends would appear in a replication study regardless of the context, if all other variable were controlled.

**Conclusion to the Study**

This study combines the claims of the Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1995), the Involvement Load Hypothesis (Hulstijn & Laufer, 2001), and the concept of Writing-to-Learn (Manchón, 2011) to investigate to what effect extended written production can serve as a method for enhancing the retention of vocabulary for upper intermediate-level ESL learners. While concrete results were not obtained, certain significant observations were made. First, when prompted to incorporate target items into their essays, most learners chose to use existing vocabulary over newly acquired vocabulary. Second, items that had appeared on previous target-item lists appeared in subsequent essays regardless of the fact that they were not targeted for those particular assignments. Third, while extended retention could not be determined empirically, learners who made conscious efforts to incorporate newly acquired items in their essays reported feelings of heightened retention of these items.

These observations appear to support the Output Hypothesis, Involvement Load Hypothesis, and Writing-to-Learn approach in that a student who uses a new word, specifically in writing, is open to more opportunities for feedback on usage, and instances of exposure (often linked to higher loads of involvement as dictated by need, search, and evaluation), which can lead to higher rates of retention in the long-term. Additionally, these observations hold clear implications for the teaching of vocabulary. Without being pushed to produce newly acquired words, learners are more likely either to replace the target item with a more familiar item, or to avoid the target item concept entirely. Therefore, it can be concluded that the incorporation of “pushed-output” activities in the teaching of vocabulary is necessary, and integrating writing into these activities can prove advantageous for learners’ retention of targeted words.
Insights for Teacher-Researchers

The experience with this study stands as an example of the cyclical nature of classroom research. In this study, the objectives did not become entirely clear until the research was underway, and it evolved as a product of ongoing research into existing literature and of conversations with colleagues about the study. Under conventional research models, researchers cannot modify research questions, hypotheses, or research methodology in response to information “emerging” from the data. However, in action research, it is not uncommon for holes in a study to become apparent as the study is conducted. It is therefore imperative that teacher-researchers keep a detailed record of the research process so that such holes can be eliminated before the next iteration of the study can be conducted. After all, the point of classroom research is not simply the gathering and coding of data, but rather “continual redefinition and renewal” (Odell in Goswami & Stillman, 1987, p. 128) of both the study and of classroom practices.

A few suggestions for teacher-researchers are as follows. First, when reviewing existing literature on a topic, the teacher-researcher should take the time to record significant information, such as other relevant references in the literature, links to related theories, and information about how similar studies are structured. Even simply scratching the surface of existing research can be daunting, and gathering relevant theoretical information for a project can quickly become overwhelming in the face of routine course planning and teaching. Organized records of relevant information can be referred to for ideas about how to structure the study, as well as how to record, code, and analyze data, and can provide insights mid-study that may have been overlooked at the beginning of the process. In other words, keeping notes of relevant research and similar studies can help streamline the research process.

Second, teacher-researchers should write reflective research notes on their observations and “emergent” findings throughout their studies. Reflective research notes allow teacher-researchers to work though their findings and the evidence they have to support them. The review of research notes may lead to “new” and different lines of inquiry.

Third, teacher-researchers should keep a record of all materials used in the study. For example, even if the focus of the research is based on final writing samples, the teacher-
researchers should copy all work leading up to the final writing sample. Examining these copies will make the progression of teaching and learning more visible. Lastly, classroom-based research is typically time consuming, and it requires substantial flexibility in research design and approach. Many teachers shy away from classroom research because of its time demands and required flexibility. However, the potential benefits of classroom research offset the demands and challenges of this approach. In this study, the benefits of classroom-based research included:

1. A deeper understanding of vocabulary learning and use;
2. The integration of ESL theory with “actual” classroom-based teaching;
3. An increased capacity to deal with ambiguous or “mixed” research results; and
4. Enhancement of our research design skills

Each of these benefits has strengthened the skills of the authors as teacher-researchers, which has prompted a personal passion for incorporating classroom research into course planning. This has, in turn, given rise to a department-wide support at the host institution of teacher-led field research as a faction of professional development and continuing teacher education. By scientifically investigating the effects of varying teaching approaches, methods, and materials in the classroom, teacher-researchers can continue not only to improve the educational experiences of their own students, but also to contribute knowledge to the field that can positively affect the experiences of the students of others.
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Appendix A

Target vocabulary item lists retrieved from *Q: Skills for Success: Listening & Speaking 4* (Freire & Jones, 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growing up I: Generation Next</th>
<th>Growing up II: Growing up quickly</th>
<th>The Science of Food: Food additives linked to hyperactivity in kids</th>
<th>From School to Work: Life experience before college</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assume</td>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>Controversy</td>
<td>Concept (To) Dare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carefree</td>
<td>Burden</td>
<td>Artificial</td>
<td>Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradiction</td>
<td>In charge of Reverse</td>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>Figure (smth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributor</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>Adverse</td>
<td>(smth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitled</td>
<td>Capable</td>
<td>Identical</td>
<td>Particular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>Isolation</td>
<td>Consume</td>
<td>Rigorous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker</td>
<td>Confusion</td>
<td>Superfluous</td>
<td>Commute (To) Log</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone</td>
<td>Resent</td>
<td>Substantial</td>
<td>(To) Face (smth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morally</td>
<td>Barrier</td>
<td>Consist of</td>
<td>Serve well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinpoint</td>
<td>Frustration</td>
<td>Optimal</td>
<td>Stand out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B

Examples of Vocabulary Instruction and Activities

- The instructor read the words aloud and the students drew the syllables and stress for each word in their books. Students were assigned a word in pairs to come to the board and draw the syllables and stress for their word. Students then conferred with their partners before coming to the board. Answers were checked as a class.
• The instructor drew columns on the board with empty syllable/stress patterns. Students were asked to (in pairs) match the target words with the appropriate syllable/stress patterns. Pairs were assigned a particular column to fill on the board. Answers were checked as a class.

• Identifying /ə/ in target vocabulary words and drawing an X through the vowel in the word that sounds like /ə/. This exercise was followed by a combination of listen-and-repeat drills and communicative practice in which students used these target words in question-facilitated conversation.
  
  o Ex. First, mark the syllables and find the stressed syllable. Next, put an X through the unstressed syllable(s). Third, draw /ə/ above the unstressed syllable that becomes a /ə/.
  
  1. Stumble upon
  2. Guidance
  3. Isolation

  …

  Finally, read these questions for your partner to answer. Then add your experiences. Be sure to ask follow-up questions!
  
  1. What is a restaurant or store that you recently stumbled upon?
  2. Who usually gives you guidance in your family?
  3. When was a time that you felt isolation?
  
  …

• Listening for vocabulary in context. One student read a series of sentences each containing a target word (in bold) and context clues to his/her partner. The partner had a separate paper containing the target word and definitions to be matched to the appropriate target word. Together, without looking at each other’s papers, the partners worked together to determine the best definition to match the target word based on the context clues.
Appendix C

Vocabulary Exercises Excerpted from *Q: Skills for Success: Listening & Speaking 4* (Freire & Jones, 2011)

### Appendix D

Complete Versions of Pre-Tests

**VOCABULARY PRETEST #1: GENERATION NEXT**

Circle the best answer. Then circle the correct part of speech. Then, if you can, write a new sentence using the underlined word.

1. If you are **carefree**, you _______.
   a. Worry a lot b. do things carefully c. are a relaxed person d. protect your friends and family

This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb

Can you write a sentence with **carefree**? Your sentence must show your
understanding of the word.

2. A good synonym for assume is _________.
   a. guess        b. investigate   c. prove        d. reject

This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb

Can you write a sentence with assume? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

3. The man contributed ________ to the organization.
   a. a request for help  b. problems  c. money  d. freedom

This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb

Can you write a sentence with contribute? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

4. Which of these is a typical milestone of adulthood?
   a. getting married    b. getting arrested by the police    c. getting divorced    d. learning a new language

This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb

Can you write a sentence with milestone? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

5. A student left his iPad in the cafeteria at lunchtime. In which situation did the security guard behave morally?
   a. The guard took the iPad and sold it to his friend.
   b. The guard took the iPad to the lost and found.
   c. The guard threw the iPad in the garbage can.
   d. The guard gave the iPad to another student.

This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb

Can you write a sentence with morally? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

6. Which of these describes a pinpointed location?
   a. the U.S.    b. Chicago    c. North America    d. 25 E. Jackson

This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb
Can you write a sentence with **pinpoint**? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

---

7. Which is NOT as synonym for **run**?
   a. manage       b. discover   c. control    d. direct
   
   This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb
   
   Can you write a sentence with **run**? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

---

8-10. Match the word in the box with its definition below. You will not use one definition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>milestone</th>
<th>marker</th>
<th>transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a change in state or condition. (ex. The change from summer to fall)</td>
<td>a sign that shows the position of something (ex. A piece of paper that you put in your book to remind you of the last page you read)</td>
<td>an important stage or event in development (ex. Getting married)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
<td>____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a very long distance (ex. 20 kilometers)</td>
<td><strong>Milestone</strong> is a (circle one) noun verb adjective adverb</td>
<td><strong>Marker</strong> is a (circle one) noun verb adjective adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition</strong> is a (circle one) noun verb adjective adverb</td>
<td><strong>Transition</strong> is a (circle one) noun verb adjective adverb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can you write a sentence with each of these words? Show your understanding of the word.

---

**VOCABULARY PRETEST #2: GROWING UP QUICKLY**

Circle the best answer. Then circle the correct part of speech. Then, if you can, write a new sentence using the underlined word.

1. What is something you CAN be **in charge of**?
   a. your decisions       b. your age       c. your supervisor    d. the weather
This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective idiom
Can you write a sentence with in charge of? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

2. If you receive guidance from your parents, you receive ________.
   a. clothes  b. advice  c. money  d. freedom
This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective idiom
Can you write a sentence with guidance? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

3. If you resent someone or something, you feel ________.
   a. regretful  b. angry  c. calm  d. confused
This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective idiom
Can you write a sentence with resent? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

4. If you are capable of something, you ________.
   a. are successful when you do it  b. can’t do it successfully
   c. need more experience in order to do it  d. forget to do it
This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective idiom
Can you write a sentence with capable? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

5. Which of these is a good synonym for the word burden?
   a. discovery  b. understanding  c. difficulty  d. attempt
This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective idiom
Can you write a sentence with capable? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

6. What does a barrier do?
   a. buries someone  b. gives an explanation for someone
   c. marks an entrance for someone  d. stops someone from doing something
This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective idiom

Can you write a sentence with barrier? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

7. The teacher threw up her hands in complete frustration. She was clearly ________.
   a. excited   b. annoyed   c. angry   d. trying to get her students’ attention

This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective idiom

Can you write a sentence with frustration? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

8. Which is your sibling?
   a. your cousin   b. your sister   c. your doctor   d. your supervisor

This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective idiom

Can you write a sentence with sibling? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

9. What is a synonym for confusion?
   a. doubt   b. anger   c. certainty   d. disgust

This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective idiom

Can you write a sentence with confusion? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

10. If you reverse your opinion, what do you do?
    a. argue about it   b. support it   c. change it   d. forget it

This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective idiom

Can you write a sentence with reverse? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

11. A person can feel satisfaction when he or she ________.
    a. is hated   b. loses a friendship   c. has an accident   d. is successful

This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective idiom

Can you write a sentence with satisfaction? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.
12. If you feel isolation, you feel ___________.
   a. loved  b. lonely  c. cold  d. free
   This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective idiom
   Can you write a sentence with isolation? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

---

VOCABULARY PRETEST #3: LIFE EXPERIENCE BEFORE COLLEGE

Circle the best answer. Then circle the correct part of speech. Then, if you can, write a new sentence using the underlined word.

1. Which word is a synonym for concept?
   a. discussion  b. idea  c. feeling  desire
   This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective idiom
   Can you write a sentence with concept? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

2. Which of these would be your peer?
   a. your mother  b. your youngest niece  c. the student sitting next to you  d. your country’s leader
   This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective idiom
   Can you write a sentence with peer? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

3. If you dare to do something, you must be a __________ person.
   a. forgetful  b. friendly  c. fearless  d. boring
   This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective idiom
   Can you write a sentence with dare? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

4. Which is a possible synonym for figure?
   a. guess  b. use  c. break  d. describe
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Word Type</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Which is a possible synonym for point?</td>
<td>a. discovery b. purpose c. choice d. clue</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Which word could replace the word particular in a sentence?</td>
<td>a. difficulty b. common c. large d. specific</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If you take a rigorous class, how will you feel at the end of each class?</td>
<td>a. strict b. bored c. physically tired d. sleepy</td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Write a sentence to answer this question: How did you commute to school this morning?</td>
<td></td>
<td>verb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Where is the best place to log something?</td>
<td>a. on your face b. in a chair c. inside your stomach d. on a piece of paper</td>
<td>noun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Which situation would you describe as something you had to face?

a. The person you love asks you to marry him or her. You accept the proposal.
b. The doctor tells you that you have a serious medical problem and need painful surgery.
c. Your parents tell you that they love you and want to buy you a new car for your birthday.
d. Your hair is too long. You need to go to the salon for a haircut.

This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective idiom
Can you write a sentence with face? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

VOCABULARY PRETEST #4: FOOD ADDITIVES LINKED TO HYPERACTIVITY IN KIDS

Circle the best answer. Then circle the correct part of speech. Then, if you can, write a new sentence using the underlined word.

1. If the president’s actions abroad created much controversy his actions caused…
   a. disagreement           b. support           c. confusion         d. understanding
This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb
Can you write a sentence with controversy? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

2. Something that is artificial is NOT …
   a. made by chemicals        b. made by man          c. made by machines
d. made by nature
This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb
Can you write a sentence with artificial? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

3. If an event is significant, it is…
   a. dangerous            b. meaningful          c. casual
d. calm
This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb
Can you write a sentence with significant? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.
4. If the information was superfluous, that means it was…
a. difficult    b. missing    c. extra    d. simple
This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb
Can you write a sentence with superfluous? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

5. The adverse situation made our trip more…
a. fun    b. peaceful    c. difficult    d. boring
This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb
Can you write a sentence with adverse? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

6. If two people are identical, they…
a. take the same classes    b. know the same friends
c. have the same features    d. like the same things
This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb
Can you write a sentence with identical? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

7. When you consume something, you…
a. smell it    b. touch it    c. eat it    d. throw it away
This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb
Can you write a sentence with consume? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

8. If you have a substantial amount of something, you…
a. need a little bit of it    b. have a lot of it    c. are missing some of it
d. have too much of it
This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb
Can you write a sentence with substantial? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.
9. His final grade consisted of the scores from all his tests in the class. In other words, his grade…
a. included only his test scores b. remained the same as his test scores
c. was different from his test scores d. did not include his test scores
This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb
Can you write a sentence with consist of? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

10. Optimal grades are grades that are…
a. poor b. average c. excellent d. missing
This word is a (circle one): noun verb adjective adverb
Can you write a sentence with optimal? Your sentence must show your understanding of the word.

---

Appendix E
Complete Versions of Post-Tests (Quizzes)

VOCABULARY QUIZ 1

PART I: PHRASAL COLLOCATIONS

Write the missing preposition you learned to complete each phrasal verb.
(Write the preposition that shows the meaning.)

Stumble ________ Stand ________ Turn ________ Point____
(meet by accident) (be noticeable) (become something at the end) (make clear)

PART II: USING VOCABULARY CORRECTLY

Select the expression from the box below that best completes the ________.

Change words for tense and number as necessary, but do NOT change part of speech!

Carefree inflexible milestone contradiction dare
Initiation transition chaos face stifle
Run bias frustration entitled pinpoint

1. Susan never worries about anything. She has a very ______ attitude about life.
2. The invention of the automobile was an important ______ in human history in many ways. It completely changed the way people moved and lived.

3. The man caused ________ when he yelled “fire” during the movie. Everyone tried to escape from the dark theater at once.

4. That teacher’s homework policy is very _________. He will never accept late homework, even when a student has an excellent excuse.

5. Once he passed his driving test, Jake was ____________ to drive the family car. He really enjoyed having the ability to drive himself to school instead of getting a ride from his mom.

6. That student needed to sneeze in class. However her fellow classmate was giving a presentation, so she needed to be quiet. Therefore, she ____________ her sneeze as well as she could.

7. In many clubs and groups, there is a(n) ___________ ceremony. During this official ceremony, participants become member of the club or group.

8. Something in Robert’s refrigerator smells very bad, but he just can’t ______________ the source of the bad smell. He will have to empty his refrigerator to locate the food that smells so bad.

9. Randy Hardwick ____________ the ELA; he is the Director and manages students, teachers, and classes.

10. The appearance of my office is in ____________ to the appearance of my apartment. My apartment is very neat while my office is very messy.

11. In Chicago, you have to take a physical test if you want to be a firefighter. Females who have taken the test have complained that the test has a(n) ___________ against women. Only 1% of women pass the test.

12. My sister wouldn’t ____________ to come to the U.S. to study English because she is very shy. However, I am brave and friendly, so I came here easily.

PART III: SYLLABLES AND STRESS

For each word below, clearly mark the stress and syllables.

particular stifle stimulating contributor

rigorous morally procedure embrace

VOCABULARY QUIZ #2

PART I: USING EXPRESSIONS CORRECTLY

Write the missing preposition on each ________.

Identify ________ consist ________ take note ________ state-____ -the-art

PART II: USING VOCABULARY CORRECTLY

Select the expression from above and below that best completes the _______. Change words for tense and number as necessary, but do NOT change part of speech!
1. I would like to take a(n) _____________ vacation and visit an expensive spa, but I don’t have enough money to treat myself to a very comfortable and high-priced experience.

2. Do you like my new painting? It is a(n) _____________ of a very famous painting called “Mona Lisa.” The original is inside a museum in Europe, but I put my copy right in my bedroom.

3. A group of religious men called “Vincentians” _____________ DePaul University in 1898 because they wanted to provide a place for students to get a good college education. Can you believe that this university is 103 years old?

4. The new iPad has _____________ technology. This technology is the newest and most advanced in the whole world.

5-8. The diet of most Americans _____________ meat and potatoes, so a(n) _____________ American meal is a hamburger and French fires. On the other hand, many people in India are vegetarians and prefer grain or bread to potatoes. Therefore, Indians _____________ mainly bean dishes with bread or rice. A(n) _____________ Indian meal includes dal (a spicy bean curry) and rice. If you visit an India family, they will probably serve you this dish.

9. If you want to exercise, you can sue the Ray Meyer Fitness Center. It is an exercise _____________ for DePaul students and staff.

10. Although the government and private groups have many anti-smoking initiatives, a _____________ percentage of the population—30% of all adults—continues to smoke.

11. Mary Kate and Ashley Olsen are _____________ twins. They look exactly alike.

12. There is a big _____________ over healthcare in the U.S. Some believe it should be public, or funded by the government, while other want it to remain private.

13. Many people like _____________ sweeteners because they have fewer calories than natural sugar.

14. President Obama won a lot of votes in urban areas like New York and Chicago during the last election, but Mitt Romney was more popular with _____________ voters like farmers and people who live in small communities.

15. Please _____________ your final exam schedule. If you don’t read it carefully, you will come to school at the wrong time and miss the exam.

16. Margo got a new job, and he had to work at night. Because his wife worked during the day, they almost never saw each other, and their relationship ___________. They used to have a strong marriage, but now they act like stranger with each other.

17. Scientists are now able to _____________ animals, so if your favorite pet dies, scientists can use its DNA to create an exact copy of that pet.
PART III: SYLLABLES AND STRESS

For each word below, clearly mark the stress and syllables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deteriorate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overseas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superfluous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amateur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-Boring Grammar and Visual Images in Oral Output Tasks

Robin Gay Wakeland
Glendale Community College

Abstract

English as a second language (ESL) students at a metropolitan community college in United States of America (USA) were tasked to use visual images from a web search for an oral presentation. Requirements included using future tense, describing how to travel to a country outside USA, and producing two internet based visuals. Instructor input included a slide show and textbook lesson. A retrospective evaluation of this oral output task gauged the effect of input, student visuals, and instructor’s prompting on the lesson's goals. Arising in the 1980s, task evaluations sought to provide teachers with a framework, toolbox, parameters, outlines and procedures to design their own output tasks adapted to their class. Criteria for oral performance tests were also sought among oral output task studies. Within these guidelines, the instructor/researcher's observations plus academic grades on the assignment provided data. In-class prompting by the instructor produced a 100% success rate on the speaking assignment. While problematic for the academic bell curve, this result indicated potential for structured, task based instructor-student interaction. Oral output tasks with expanded instructor prompting, incorporating visuals, and fostering student engagement were foreseen as useful future applications.

Key Words: Oral output task, visual images, task evaluations, internet visuals
Introduction

Situated along the continuum of reality contextual tasks, this study grabbed technology and visuals to launch future tense into non-boring cyberspace. To emphasize and enhance the textbook lesson and course competencies, students were assigned internet research and oral class presentations utilizing streaming images. Retrospectively, the researcher inquired into the effect of the component elements on the lesson's goal and resulting student achievement. The method was encouraged by laments about the "paucity of research in the area of oral language use as opposed to the written mode" (Izumi & Izumi, 2004, p. 591). Likewise, computers and 2D input were preceded by tasks centered on mobile phones, audio players, mobile web search devices, and screen images of frogs and dogs; plus print media of advertising brochures, a bus breakdown, and yellow highlighting. Pragmatics involving employee-employer relationships and garbage disposal provided impetus for the instructor's pre-task slide show. Future global trekking was narrated with images invoking travel angst accompanying a passport application and the tarmac at the Madrid, Spain airport. The task evaluation methodology follows in the literature review below.

Literature Review

With the proliferation of output tasks and their widespread acceptance (Ellis, 2003a), a need to measure their effectiveness, separate from whether they fulfilled learning objectives, emerged. Educators embraced the classroom task, and the multiple-task syllabus even arose as a classroom outline (Ellis, 2003b). Researchers sought to provide tools for teachers to compose classroom tasks. Indeed, design was relevant as most tasks focused on a formal language structure (grammar). The “design of tasks is crucial in 'proactive focus on form,' in which teachers plan in advance the target of instruction” (Song & Suh, 2008, p. 299).

A literature review of these efforts from 1980 to 2001 was compiled as a literature review for an oral output task study. This legacy served as the springboard for a vanguard attempt to define task characteristics for measuring oral output. In search of a framework, they boldly delved into "the relationship between task (e.g., type, format, performance..."
conditions) and response characteristics (e.g., accuracy, fluency, complexity)" (Iwashita, McNamara and Elder, 2001, p. 403). Evaluation of task effects, they concluded, was accomplished through recording, compiling, coding and analyzing discourse produced during the task itself, as well as the resulting scores achieved on the tasks (Iwashita et al., 2001, p. 402-404).

These three responses which researchers sought to measure became standards for both written and oral output tasks: accuracy, fluency, complexity (Michel, Kuiken, & Veder, 2007, p. 245; Taguchi, 2007, p. 117; Yuan & Ellis, 2003, p. 7,8; Iwashita et al., 2001, p. 413,17-18). Another compilation advised continuation of these three components as task measurements. Outlines and procedures on how to accomplish such evaluations were also crafted (Vasiljevic, 2011).

Accompanying these standards, a task definition emerged through consensus. A task consisted of "(1) language input, (2) goals (a clearly specified outcome) ... and (3) activities" (Vasiljevic, 2011, p. 4). Or, a task is "a goal-oriented activity involving a meaningful, real-world process of language use" (Taguchi, 2007, p. 114). Throughout these tasks, instructors provided input. Input was verbal (written/oral), or non-verbal (including visuals). While spontaneous teacher talking throughout the task comprised a natural learning method, within-task teacher talking also facilitated learning objectives. Guided by learning objectives, teachers should "decide what kind of input, advice or feedback may enhance learners' task performance and at what point in the lesson that information should be provided" (Vasiljevic, 2011, p. 4-6).

Thus, task evaluation became germane to contemporary ESL teaching and studies arose to fulfill this niche and need. One study resulted in collateral conclusions about instructor oral input, interaction and correction (feedback) during a task. A written task reconstruction (dictogloss) was evaluated via analysis of paired oral discussions. It was concluded that lack of teacher input and feedback during the reconstruction dialog negatively affected production of the final text (Nabei, 1996, p. 71).

The dynamic of visual images in oral output tasks focusing on grammar also evolved. Twenty-four adult students
participated in a study of oral output tasks' effect on learning relative clauses. Learning outcomes were compared between two treatment groups in a picture description task: one assigned an oral output task, and one assigned a task requiring input comprehension only. For the oral-output tasks, visuals were shown on a computer screen, accompanied by relevant aural input. Students then orally described the picture. An example was: "The frog which the boy and the dog look at is in a jar" (Izumi & Izumi, 2004, p. 594).

Rather than recorded, coded, and analyzed oral output, pre- and post-tests measured students' knowledge of the target grammar form. The output group made progress in production but not in interpretation. In contrast, the non-output group increased knowledge in both. As this contrasted with researcher expectations, the discrepancy was attributed to lack of student engagement. A task, it was concluded, "must be evaluated in terms of whether relevant psycholinguistic processes are really engaged in the learners" (Izumi and Izumi, 2004, p. 606).

Student engagement was impliedly more emphatic in an oral output task in which students chose their own input: topic, target grammar form, and media sources (including internet). Although a college presentation course was the setting for freshman English as second or multiple language assignments, the instructor or professor inserted exercises focusing students on the non-count garbage. A class of seventeen was divided into groups of two or three students. Three oral presentations, ten, twenty, and thirty minutes, were researched and presented throughout the nine-month college calendar. These presentations, plus one rehearsal, were recorded (Mennim, 2007).

Only two students' data were analyzed. They chose garbage disposal as their subject. The non-count "garbage" became the focal language structure. Audio recordings, together with post-presentation questionnaires, abbreviated transcripts, and new vocabulary lists, comprised the data collection. An increase in accuracy of garbage use was found to have occurred throughout the school year, although there were instances of inaccuracies even at the last presentation (Mennim, 2007).

An earlier study within the same college course applied "reactive focus on form" treatment, based on
transcripts of the presentation rehearsal (Mennim, 2003, p. 132). The context was, like the 2007 class, a presentation in which students chose their own topics. Thus the task's target grammar form(s) derived from whatever usage and grammar students found in their input, and chose for their presentation (Mennim, 2003).

The 20-minute rehearsal before the final presentation was recorded, and students themselves transcribed five minutes of it. They, then the instructor, corrected it for grammar errors. Equivalent sections of the final presentation recordings were then transcribed and compared for changes in grammar accuracy. The research question was whether students could benefit from the rehearsal "in order to make improvements in their spoken output" (Mennim, 2003, p. 133). Thus conclusions were: (1) the transcription exercise drew students' attention to the targeted grammar; and (2) the entire task resulted that the final presentation produced more accurate oral output (Mennim, 2003, p. 136-37).

Also focusing on pragmatics and real-world subjects, Taguchi (2007) studied role playing and social relationships. Fifty-nine English learners at a Japanese university responded in pairs to role-playing prompts, such as "Ask your teacher to reschedule the exam" (Taguchi 2007, p. 119-20). He concluded that "the social factors involved in a task, namely power, distance, and the degree of imposition, seemed to make certain situation types more demanding to perform than others" (Taguchi 2007, p. 127). For future research, he suggested continuing evaluation using "a variety of task conditions from pragmatic and sociocultural categories" (Taguchi, 2007, p. 132).

Using a single task, Niu (2009) compared oral to written output tasks' efficacy in focusing attention on past tense. In a dictogloss task, paired students discussed, debated, argued about, or put past tense to use. This oral dialog, not the resulting output tasks, provided evaluation data (Niu, 2009, p. 386). During the oral dialog, visual enhancements via text highlighting and cued words in students' first language (Chinese) aided students (Niu, 2009, p. 388). This task drew students' attention to correct grammar in an engaging way. Thus, it contrasted with boring grammar lessons' "explicit explanations of language items followed by exercises to practice the language items" (Niu, 2009, p. 385). Coding and
analysis of the recorded dialog resulted that discussions preparing for the written output task produced more focus on past tense, compared to those preparing for the oral output task (Niu, 2009, p. 397).

Monolog output tasks as well joined in the evaluation pool. These also implemented visuals as a task component. Yuan and Ellis (2003) looked at the factor of planning time in monolog oral output tasks narrating a story. Forty-two students learning English as a foreign language participated in a laboratory setting. They were given pictures showing six boys scrambling on two busses, one of which breaks down before the destination. They were tasked to narrate the story in English, with instructions given in students’ first language (Chinese). No planning, pre-task planning, and open-ended time frame for completing the task (online time), comprised the three conditions (Yuan & Ellis, 2003).

Researchers concluded the "PLP [pre-task planning] group produced language that was more lexically varied but tended to be less grammatically accurate than the OLP [online planning] group, whereas the OLP group produced language that tended to be more grammatically accurate but less lexically rich" (Yuan & Ellis, 2003, p. 23). As a practical application, the researchers advised teachers: "manipulating opportunities for both pre-task and online planning may be needed" (Yuan & Ellis, 2003, p. 24).

Oral monolog versus oral dialog output tasks were compared in Michel, Kuiken and Veder’s (2007) study. Complexity of the task (number of elements) and task condition (dialog or monolog), served as factors. Forty-four adult participants were at B1/B2 intermediate level of Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) for Dutch as a second language. See Cambridge University (2001) and Participants and Settings section for definitions of these levels.

Twenty-two participants in each group were given electronic devices (phones, MP3 players, etc.) with accompanying descriptive color brochures. Complexity elements were number of devices: two for simple, and six for the complex. Each device differed in seven characteristics, such as color, price, functions, and RAM. The monolog speakers were tasked to leave a message on an answering machine responding to a friend who called for advice on
which to buy. The dialog pairs talked on the phone about which device to buy (Michel et al., 2007).

Oral responses coded for accuracy, linguistic complexity and fluency showed fluency was higher with simple tasks among both monolog and dialog participants. Dialog speech was more fluent than monolog. In general, complex tasks resulted in higher accuracy rate. Lexical complexity was higher, but structural complexity decreased, in dialogs. Overall, "task complexity did yield significant effects for accuracy and fluency" (Michel et al., 2007, p. 253). Task condition (dialog or monolog) caused significant effects in all performance measures. In summary, results both confirmed and challenged prior conclusions. Suggestions for future research included more detailed studies on combined effects of these factors (Michel et al., 2007, pp. 253-57).

The effect of visuals was the inquiry in another monolog oral output task evaluation. A series of oral output tasks tested the effect of picture stimulus on accuracy, fluency, and complexity. Researchers measured speaking proficiency to determine if pictures had any effect on task difficulty. A collateral goal sought to develop an assessment for oral performance. (Iwashita et al., 2001).

A total of 193 adults, mostly ESL students, participated. Students were asked to tell a story via eight, 3-minute tasks, both with and without the pictures. The pictures were considered visual support for this narrative story, and were hypothesized to decrease task difficulty. Other factors were number of pictures supplied (6 or 4), and planning time (3.5 or 5 minutes). Thirty-six were selected for discourse analysis due to the time involved in transcribing responses. Responses were coded within the three established categories: fluency, accuracy, and complexity (Iwashita et al., 2001). This data resulted that overall both "task versions were making similar demands on candidates' ability" (Iwashita et al., 2001, p. 423).

Responses of the entire 193 participants were quantitatively scored by trained raters using rubric-style scales developed especially for the study. This analysis resulted that in the except for the dimension of "Immediacy", "ratings were significantly higher (i.e., the task was easier) when candidates told the story without the pictures in front of them [emphasis by Iwashita et al.]" (Iwashita et al., 2001, p. 424).
One shortcoming, or drawback in the pictures used was they did not elicit complex sentence structure. (Iwashita et al., 2001). Suggestions for future research were to replicate the study using different, varied, and more complex visuals such as maps. (Iwashita et al., 2001, p. 431).

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework derives from a retrospective task evaluation procedure, following those in the literature. The research question sought to discover the effect of visuals and instructor’s input before and during the task. The instructor designed and provided the language input and task focusing on future tense. The preceding class textbook lesson, the slide show with instructor’s oral presentation modeling future tense, the grading rubric and country assignment sheet handed out to the students reiterated, repeated, and explained future tense. Students’ visual images cued them during their tasks. The instructor also interacted with students during the task. This follows recommendations for continued measuring of students’ performances during output tasks (Vasiljevic, 2011), as well as compiling and analyzing oral output task discourse and scores (Iwashita et al., 2001). Focus on grammar forms in oral output tasks has been exemplified and recommended, as well (Nabei, 1996; Yuan & Ellis, 2003; Taguchi, 2007; Niu, 2009; Izumi & Izumi, 2004).

Use of visual components in further study was recommended by Vasiljevic, (2011) (non-verbal input); Michel et al., (2007) (color brochures); and Iwashita et al., (2001) (complex visuals such as maps). Visuals were integral components of the tasks being evaluated in other studies as well (Yuan & Ellis, 2003; Niu, 2009; Iwashita et al., 2001; Izumi & Izumi, 2004). The web-based media and repeated use of the visual images in this study fulfill this need for more complex input visuals in oral output tasks.

This study also continues the thread of student engagement in task design. Like the college students in Mennim's (2003, 2007) studies, students here picked their own topics, partial input, and used the internet as research sources. As in Izumi and Izumi’s (2004) study, computer visuals were used as instructor-selected input. Of course, students in this study also chose their own internet visual to display on the computer screen during their presentation.
Instructor input, via correction, talking to, and oral interaction with students during the task likewise set this study’s context. Instructor interaction was considered integral to output tasks (Vasiljevic, 2011). Opportunities for instructor input and correction during oral output tasks were recognized, retrospectively (Nabei, 1996). Although not specifying instructor input and interaction with students, researchers recommended a supporting infrastructure. They suggested teachers expand task time to allow for online planning time, (Iwashita et al., 2001). This time could accommodate oral instructor correction, input, and feedback such as occurred online in this study.

Method

Students completed an assignment to give an oral presentation to the class, using future tense, complete and correct sentences, and showing at least two images from the internet about traveling to a country outside of the United States (class location). These requirements were included in the one-page grading rubric. Additionally, students were told orally in class that two complete sentences using future tense were required. These were the goals and activities of the oral output task. This task fulfilled course competencies of accessing and using media resources, oral presenting, expressing future intentions, and explaining a step-by-step procedure.

Language input was multifaceted. The textbook lesson on the two future grammar forms, is going to and will, was presented in the preceding class (Stempleski, Morgan, & Douglas, 2011). It was required reading, and the instructor explained it via lecture, using the white board to write examples. Students practiced repeating and creating examples of the verb tense use. Students and instructor exchanged questions and answers.

After the textbook lesson, the instructor demonstrated the use of these tenses with a slide show (Appendices A-G), accompanied by her spoken narrative modeling these future tenses. The context was an upcoming trip to Valencia, Spain. The how-to aspect and future, sequential actions encompassed getting a passport (Appendices C, D), flying to Madrid (Appendix E), the geographical relationships between Madrid and Valencia, via a map (Appendix A), taking the train to Valencia (Appendices F, G), and arriving at the destination.
Two internet searches were activated during the presentation. First, a USA government website URL lead to information on obtaining a passport. Modern angst of obtaining a passport arose, searching for forms, and other bureaucratic quagmires (Appendix C). Likewise, buying tickets, and making high-speed train connections were demonstrated with a URL to the European train network (Appendix F).

Students were randomly assigned a country, using the printed form handout, in the following class. Given about fifteen minutes class time to do their web search, they were allowed to use their notes during this research time, but not during their speaking presentation. They had notice from the preceding class of the task subject, allowing for pre-task planning time to practice internet searching, vocabulary, and future tense. This in-class assignment of country obviated fraud from students getting help from others to prepare their presentation.

The instructor completed the grading rubric forms in class, as each student spoke. This allowed the instructor to notice when students lacked any requirements. Instructor interaction, correction and further input, was offered when any requisites were lacking.

Two students showed video streaming image series, common on the internet. Although this video stream comprised more than two images, it did not allow the student to focus attention or description. In order to replicate the two-image input, the instructor asked these students to select two images within the stream, to complete their presentation. Both students efficiently accomplished this stop-action and proceeded to discuss their chosen images.

One student showed only one image. When asked if he had another image to show, the student said no. When then asked if he could find another one on the web, he was unable to do so. All other students supplied the requisite two images.

Three students failed to speak the requisite two sentences utilizing the target future tense (either form) as of the time they ended their presentation. There was no time limit or minimum time requirement to their presentation. Having calculated lack future tense sentences, the instructor prompted
the student. These prompts did not suggest nouns, content related to travelling, verbs, or other vocabulary. Prompts were open ended, such as, “Can you tell us about Brazil using future tense?” Or, “Can you use future tense in another complete sentence?” These sentences, after the prompts, were accepted as fulfilling the assignment rubric.

Participants and Setting

Twenty-one adult students, 12 female and 9 male, were enrolled in a speaking and listening English as a second language (ESL) course at a community college. One student was unable to log in to the computer, and so was excluded from the study. Admittedly small, the twenty student sample size was an acceptable quantity. Ten students for each dimension area (group) was common in oral output tasks (Iwashita et al., 2001, p. 418). Nabei’s (1996) study utilized a total of 8 students. The total class enrollment for Mennim’s (2007) study was 17. In Niu’s (2009) dictogloss study in which students discussed how to complete the task, 16 students were divided into two groups. This study comprised a single condition, or group. This course was the fourth semester in a series of four sequential 3-credit hour courses at a community college. Students had the option of repeating any ESL course once, and they had the option of standard letter grade or credit/no credit. Credit/no credit required a minimum 70% to pass. Five students chose letter grade status.

Prerequisites were a minimum score of 51 on the Combined English Language Skills Assessment (CELSA) test or completion of one prior level ESL course in either reading, writing, grammar, or speaking and listening. The CELSA test is an holistic 45 minute test of English grammar and reading, without any speaking component (Association of Classroom Teacher Testers, 2013). However, this screening was ineffective to standardize student English proficiency levels or qualify students for the level of the textbook. Students’ English speaking and listening proficiency levels varied.

Informal assessment by the instructor indicated three levels of English proficiency according to the common European framework of reference (CEFR). The A2 (three students) level indicated basic expression of routine and present needs and information, such as giving geographic locations and personal name, and shopping. The B1 level (fourteen students) indicated limited but effective
communication about opinions and familiar situations. Competencies included work, traveling in English-speaking countries, and school scenarios. Level B2 (three students) indicated reading and writing complex text about a range of topics, including topical events. Speaking and listening competencies at B2 involve giving opinions and easily communicating with native speakers, (Cambridge U., 2001, pp. 23-24).

**Data Collection and Data Analysis**

The instructor assessed each student’s presentation according to the rubric, in her role as instructor. The final score numeric score constituted the student’s grade. Primarily, this involved two complete, correct sentences using the future tense, on topic of traveling to the country shown in the visuals. Two visuals, produced via a web search, up and running with the presentation, were also required.

Because students’ presentations were not recorded, the instructor did not score or record fluency. Also, fluency was not on the rubric. Additionally, the instructor altered the rubric during the task by prompting the students, as described in the results and discussion sections. However, this prompting was consistent with her role as instructor and task designer, providing language input and feedback during the task (Vasiljevic, 2001, Nabei, 1996; Mennim 2003, 2007 (written feedback)). As in Niu’s (2009), Nabei’s (1996), and Mennim’s (2003, 2007) studies, the researcher and scorer/coder were the same.

In the literature review, analysis of task effectiveness was conducted via multiple groups, each with a different variable task component, or condition. Multiple groups allowed for comparisons and conclusions about task components. (Yuan & Ellis, 2003; Michel et al., 2007; Iwashita, 2001; Izumi & Izumi, 2004). As a retrospective evaluation of a class assignment, no such separate groups were involved in the community college study.

However, other studies contained only one group. The Nabei (1996) and Mennim (2003, 2007) studies recorded and analyzed students oral output without opposing or variable condition groups. Results from both qualitative coding and quantitative compilations were used to determine effectiveness of the tasks and task components.

The instructor also made written notes, separate from scoring. Prompting itself became a task component, which
was recorded by the instructor. Likewise, the instructor recorded details such as students’ informal assessments, their efforts working with the computer, and their visual images. Students’ names and ID numbers were removed, and random numbers were assigned to data.

Results

Three measurements are relevant to task evaluation: students’ accuracy and fluency, plus task complexity (difficulty). Towards this end, students’ performance, including discourse throughout the task, as well as their scores on the task, was analyzed. As this was a retrospective study of a classroom assignment, it lacks measurements of fluency, as the rubric did not include it.

The classroom assignment resulted that, with prompting, all students completed it and received one point (100%) for oral presentation. For those prompted, speaking was original, not imitating the instructor. Students were not assisted by written notes, on screen or on paper. Their images were web-based, not composed by students, and shown on the screen. As future tense in two correct sentences was required, the scores indicate such grammar proficiency. For visuals, 19 students received 1 point for two visuals (100%). One student, who found only one image, received a 50% score.

Computer use and student-selected visuals were two relevant, interrelated performance indicia. Students didn’t require any help with the technology, other than a few questions about login. The visuals were searched, and retrieved during the presentation, not printed out. Two students (10%) surpassed the two web images requirement with a series of images in streaming video. The students who retrieved streaming video did not require prompting on future tense, did not give expanded descriptions, and were both B1 level students (defined above) (Cambridge U., 2001).

Amount and degree of prompting also gauged performance. Seventeen students (85%) produced at least the two required future tense sentences without any prompting. Three (15%) ended their presentation (stopped talking or concluded) without having spoken the two required future tense sentences. However, these 15% completed the task with prompting.
Two students (10%) spoke elaborately, continuing to use future tense (beyond assignment requirements). They portrayed the country to be visited as a dream vacation, cultural experience, or future reward. They also utilized other tenses. Both these students were at B2 level. They were not among the students who needed prompting.

These performance observations compiled various results. Seventy-five percent spoke adequately. Fifteen percent needed prompting, and 10% spoke beyond the task requirements. Eighty-five percent used the computer hardware and software adequately; 10% beyond requirements. The fifteen minutes in-class search time was adequate for the task.

**Discussion**

From the rubric were derived numeric scores which allowed quantitative analysis. The rate was 85% for adequate focal language structure use (future tense), according to the rubric. However, with prompting, considering the oral task alone, all scores were 100%. Considering both the visual and speaking halves, the scores were all 100% except for one 75%. This high success rate resulted from instructor prompting. Being in an academic class, these scores were problematic, as they were incongruous with an academic curve. However, students’ scores in performing the task were integral and indispensable to task evaluation and couldn’t be disregarded because of this incongruity (Vasiljevic 2011, p. 4-6).

Likewise the manner in which the scores were obtained was also a component of, and evaluated with, the task. Through classroom dynamics, the rubric morphed to pass-fail by way of the prompting. Eschewing the numeric academic curve, the instructor delved into feedback. Having laboriously constructed the task, and with the student’s own images online, she was loath to discard the opportunity to elicit future tense speaking. The resulting scores fell within acceptable academic pass-fail parameters and showed the possibilities of using prompting within academic coursework.

This prompting comprised, as well, a well-defined correction and feedback aspect of an oral output task (Vasiljevic, 2011; Nabei, 1996; Mennim, 2003, 2007 (written)). Equivalent to analyzing the task’s discourse (Iwashita et al., 2001), the prompting measured differences in speaking, and ease of completing the task. Had the instructor
not engaged in prompting, she never would have known the 15% could have completed the task so easily. Their speaking would have been graded as 75% or 50% (1 or 2 sentences lacking). Instead, their performance was established as not as proficient as those who didn’t need prompting. It showed they had learned future tense, but were unable to produce it without reminders or suggestions. The prompting established a more precise and dynamic scale of speaking assessment not possible with the graded, numeric rubric. This process gave more individualized and personal insight into each student’s proficiency level.

Students’ visual images obtained through computer searches factored into this prompting. As they selected their own images, they contributed to task input and thus created the scenario conducive to eliciting further oral output. Participant familiarity with the task topic was enhanced, from the outset. Obviously, some written text was involved in both the search process as well as the result (written explanations accompanying the images, etc.), adding this modality to the task. Prompting was launched from the springboard of student self-entrenchment in the images. Thus it showed a successful method of arriving at relevant content so germane, even requisite, to task based learning.

Further significance of the technology and visual images derived from the fact that students in various English competency levels were equally successful at finding vivid and descriptive images of their assigned country. They all completed the task within the 15 minutes allowed. The two who went beyond visual image requirements were B1 level (not the highest) (defined above). Also, the two elaborate oral descriptions were produced by B2 level students (defined above) (Cambridge U., 2001). Thus applicability for student engagement for multiple level classrooms via computer searches and images was indicated.

**Conclusions, Applications and Future Research**

The study was too small to make any conclusions about the effect of one, two, or more than two visuals on completing oral output tasks, speaking, and grammar. However, the ease at which students embraced the computer technology, together with their success researching the visuals, indicated a positive effect of technology and visuals on task goals. This was consistent with output tasks evaluations
concluding that while output tasks lacked empirical proof, they probably had some effect on production and acquisition (Ellis, 2003a; Izumi, 2002). Additionally, the task implemented the paradigm of relevant topics and student engagement, as students chose their own input through internet searches and visuals (Izumi and Izumi, 2004; Mennim, 2003, 2007).

Two prior models fuse with this study to suggest adaptation of this task with expanded feedback and instructor-student interaction via prompting. Online (within-task) planning time (Yuan & Ellis, 2003), and teacher input and correction (Nabei, 1996 (oral); Mennim, 2003, 2007 (written)) pedagogies accommodate this dynamic. When students finish their oral presentation, teachers could follow with further input, correction, and open-ended dialog, moving beyond correction/feedback. It would utilize the structured task, centered around a grammar form and with student-created visuals, to create an extemporaneous, real-time learning environment for each student (Lantolf, 2009). The dialog and oral output would continue, and the student’s proficiency level could be more accurately determined. Such pass-fail assignment tasks could be instrumental in an academic environment. The method could also bring language competency and proficiency measurement to the non-graded classroom.

Future studies should add tools and structures missing from this study: recorded oral output and multiple groups. This would facilitate measuring on all three aspects: accuracy, fluency, and complexity. This would allow for multiple evaluators, and comparisons of various components and conditions. Various types of visuals, such as a series of streaming images, video images, still visuals, computer visuals, and print media are possibilities for comparison.

Grammar teaching sometimes is perceived at odds, or even conflicting, with relevant context curricula. Grammar imposes drastic and unyielding structures of the culture sought to be learned. Thus grammar is antithetical to relevant context. Through this evaluation it is hoped internet searches and prompting methods have provided tools for teaching relevant, non-boring grammar.
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Appendix B

Appendix C

LINK TO THE USA STATE DEPARTMENT TO GET YOUR PASSPORT
YOU CAN ALSO CLICK ON LINKS WITHIN IT TO GET THE APPLICATION FORMS

http://travel.state.gov/passport/passport_1738.html
Appendix D

First Time Adult Applicant
(Age 16 and Older)
Minor Applicant (Under Age 16)
Where to Apply in the U.S.
Renew By Mail

Renew a Passport
Have a Passport Book?
Apply for a Passport Card by Mail
Lost or Stolen U.S. Passport

Report and/or Replace a Passport Lost or Stolen in the U.S.
NOTE: For overseas help with a lost or stolen passport, contact the nearest U.S. Embassy or Consulate.
Correct or Change U.S. Passport Information

Change Your Name
Correct an Error or Typo
Add Visa Pages
Replace Your Limited Passport (see restrictions)

Global Entry is a U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) program that allows expedited clearance for pre-approved, low-risk travelers upon arrival in the United States. Though intended for frequent international travelers, there is no minimum number of trips necessary to qualify for the program. Participants may enter the United States by using automated kiosks located at select airports. More

Information & Assistance
National Passport Information Center
1-877-487-2778
1-888-874-7793 (TDD/TTY)
Send an E-mail
Appendix E
Appendix F

LINK TO EUROPEAN TRAIN TRAVEL
YOU CAN ALSO SCHEDULE YOUR
TRAVEL AND BUY TRAIN TICKETS ON
THIS WEBSITE

http://www.eurostar.com/dynamic/SyBoExpress&ookingTerm?_TM=1345936318683&_DIG=SyBoEx
pressBookingTerm&_LANG=UK&_AGENCY=ESTAR&c
ountry=UK&lange=UK&VT=EB&cid=ppc-UK
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