

# A Decade of Foreign Language Standards: Influence, Impact, and Future Directions

## *Survey Results*

APRIL 2011



*A Decade of Foreign Language Standards: Influence, Impact, and Future Directions.*  
U.S. Department of Education. Title VI: International Research and Studies Program.

Copyright info to come.

# Impact of Foreign Language Standards: Influence, Impact, and Future Directions

## TITLE VI INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH AND STUDIES PROGRAM GRANT

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON THE TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

### Project Co-Directors:

Martha G. Abbott, ACTFL

June K. Phillips, Weber State University (Emeritus)

---

#### Task Force: Survey of Literature on Standards

Chair: Sally S. Magnan,  
University of Wisconsin

Members: Katherine Arens,  
University of Texas-Austin

Frank (Pete) Brooks,  
Indiana University of  
Pennsylvania

Robert L. Davis,  
University of Oregon

Virginia Scott,  
Vanderbilt University

#### Task Force: Institutional Impact

Chair: Deborah W. Robinson,  
Ohio Department of  
Education

Members: Michael Everson,  
University of Iowa

David Jahner,  
Gwinnett County, Georgia

Ursula Lentz,  
University of Minnesota,  
CARLA

Aleidine Moeller,  
University of Nebraska

#### Task Force: Professional Development

Chair: Eileen W. Glisan,  
Indiana University of  
Pennsylvania

Members: Elizabeth Bernhardt,  
Stanford University

Nathan Bond,  
Texas State University

Iman Hashem,  
California State University-  
Long Beach

Grisel López-Díaz,  
New Jersey City University

#### Project Assistants

Jacques Arceneaux  
University of Wisconsin-  
Madison

Barbara Bird  
University of Wisconsin-  
Madison

# Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROJECT .....	1
DEMOGRAPHICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS AND STANDARDS, CURRICULUM, AND INSTRUCTION .....	2
DATA FROM SURVEYS TO ASSESS INSTITUTIONAL IMPACT	
State Supervisors .....	5
District Supervisors .....	9
Language Specific Professional Associations .....	15
National Language Resource Centers .....	16
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	
Language Teachers/Faculty .....	21
Methods Course Instructors .....	32
LITERATURE SURVEY .....	41
CONCLUDING REMARKS AND NEXT STEPS .....	51

# Introduction to the Project

*A Decade of Foreign Language Standards: Influence, Impact, and Future Directions* is a project designed to assess the effect of the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century* (i.e., National Standards), first published in 1996, on language teaching and learning. The goals of the project are to:

- 1) create a bibliography of Standards as they appear in the professional literature; categorize topics addressed and annotate major works;
- 2) assess how Standards have been institutionalized in educational programs and identify the degree to which Standards have forged connections between K–12 and higher education;
- 3) identify areas in which research and professional development could more effectively promote teaching toward Standards.

The project is funded for a three-year period with tasks outlined as:

**Year 1:** Survey members and organizations in the profession and conduct a literature search to answer the question: Where are we with the Standards?

**Year 2:** Analyze results of the survey and the literature search to answer the question: What do the data mean?

**Year 3:** Draw implications from the data and literature search to answer the question: Where do we go from here?

This report contains much of the data from the surveys and analyses made by the Task Forces during Year 2. The Task Forces are using this information as part of the input toward summarizing the impact and influence of Standards prior to drafting recommendations to take to the profession during the final year of the project. The information in this report can also serve researchers and program designers as they consider the role of Standards in their specialty areas.

# Standards Grant Project

## DEMOGRAPHICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS AND RESULTS FOR STANDARDS, CURRICULUM, AND INSTRUCTION

Compiled by: June K. Phillips

The Task Forces designed a survey to assess the impact of the National Standards on state and local curriculum, on classroom instruction, on methods courses, and on professional development. The survey was electronically delivered and consisted of forced-choice and open items. It had a branching system so that after a common series of items inquiring about familiarity with the National Standards and perceived impact on student learning, respondents were prompted to answer as language teachers, methods instructors, district supervisors/program chairs, or state supervisors. Survey findings for each group are reported; it must also be kept in mind that the respondents represented educators made aware of the survey through professional associations and collaborations.

### DEMOGRAPHICS

The following demographic information covers all 2,134 respondents to the survey. Discrepancies with total numbers on individual items occurred for several reasons. On many of the questions (e.g., languages taught) respondents could answer with more than one choice. On some questions, respondents could choose not to answer.

Gender of Respondents		
Male	588	28%
Female	1,546	72%

Years of Experience Teaching		
1–3 years	200	10%
4–10 years	447	23%
11 or more years	1,307	67%

Language/s Taught		
Spanish	1,350	69%
French	418	21%
German	167	8%
ESL	149	8%
Latin	88	8%
Chinese	79	8%
Italian	74	4%
Russian	55	3%
Arabic	42	2%

Teaching Assignments/Positions					
Elementary	278	14%	Lecturer/Instructor	171	9%
Middle/Junior High School	537	27%	Part-Time Adjunct	162	8%
High School	1,220	62%	Tenured/Tenure Track	196	10%
Postsecondary/Undergraduate	397	20%	Graduate Student	135	7%
Post Undergraduate	67	3%	Other	71	4%

*Other included: administration/director, adult education, advanced placement, assistant professor, associate professor, business/corporate schools, curriculum specialist, daycare teacher, district coordinator, dual credit-community college, extra-curricular, intermediate, interpreter, kindergarten/preschool, master's student teacher supervisor, methods/teacher educator, missionaries, private school/adults/tutor, professional development in state, program retired, retirement community, special need, state department of education, supervisor, trainer/consultant, tutor, visiting professor, volunteer.*

**Analysis:** Respondents did want to be very precise in designating their position whereas our question had looked only at school assignment and employment status. The “Other” category allowed for this preciseness and it reveals the extent of teaching/administrative experiences in our profession. For example, individuals are teaching from daycare to retirement communities, from schools of many configurations to adult businesses and from classes to tutoring. Respondents also represent experienced teachers with 67% having over 11 years in the field, and only 10%, three years or fewer.

## GENERAL KNOWLEDGE OF STANDARDS

Familiarity with National Standards for Foreign Language Learning		
Yes	1,801	89%
No	218	11%

This item served to separate those who continued with the survey. Those answering “No” to the familiarity item were thanked and exited the program. Those who answered “Yes” continued and were tracked into three areas:

Curriculum and Instruction					
Report that state Standards/framework are based upon National Standards			Report that local or departmental curriculum/program of study is based upon National Standards and/or state Standards		
Yes	1,203	78%	Yes	1,258	80%
No	105	7%	No	228	14%
Do not know	244	16%	Do not know	90	6%

**Analysis:** Among respondents with knowledge of the connections between national and state documents, there is a high degree of alignment. That perception is reinforced by responses from state supervisors. At the same time, the number of respondents with no knowledge of that relationship is higher than one would anticipate. The “Do not know” category is less when asked about local or departmental programs where both the percentages based upon National Standards are higher.

## Impact of Standards-Based Language Programs

The following statements were rated on a Likert Scale from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5).

Question: There Has Been a Concerted Effort in Our Department to Implement a Standards-Based Language Program					
Response	1	2	3	4	5
Number of Respondents	135	123	293	415	577
Percentage of Total	9%	8%	19%	27%	37%

Question: My Knowledge of the National Standards Has Influenced the Way I Plan My Lessons					
Response	1	2	3	4	5
Number of Respondents	89	87	259	518	587
Percentage of Total	6%	6%	17%	34%	38%

Question: My Knowledge of the National Standards Has Influenced the Way I Create World Language-Based Extracurricular Activities					
Response	1	2	3	4	5
Number of Respondents	130	132	350	443	468
Percentage of Total	9%	9%	23%	29%	31%

Question: My Knowledge of the National Standards Has Influenced the Way I Integrate Community Resources into My Planning					
Response	1	2	3	4	5
Number of Respondents	134	182	387	421	404
Percentage of Total	9%	12%	25%	28%	26%

Question: I Read Research/Articles about the Standards					
Response	1	2	3	4	5
Number of Respondents	170	197	334	413	430
Percentage of Total	11%	13%	22%	27%	28%

Question: I Am Able to Compare What It Is like to Teach in a Standards-Based and a Non Standards-Based Program		
Response	Yes	No
Number of Respondents	1,074	547
Percentage of Total	66%	34%

# DATA FROM SURVEYS TO ASSESS INSTITUTIONAL IMPACT: STATE SUPERVISORS, DISTRICT SUPERVISORS, LANGUAGE ASSOCIATIONS, AND RESOURCE CENTERS

Compiled by: Michael Everson, David Jahner, Ursula Lentz, and Deborah W. Robinson

To gauge institutional impact, the Task Force gathered information through the electronic survey, targeted surveys to organizations, and website searches.

## DEMOGRAPHICS FROM THE ELECTRONIC SURVEY

Twenty respondents identified themselves as state supervisors. On the question as to whether National Standards had influenced policy in their state, results were:

Yes	16	80%
No	4	20%

**Analysis:** Response was not as strong as anticipated. The National Council of State Supervisors for Languages (NCSSFL) membership would indicate an expectation of 34 respondents. A number of states do not currently have a foreign/world languages supervisor and some who do may not have a supervisor from the discipline. Follow-up work is being done to increase the amount of knowledge in this area.

## FRAMEWORKS AND STANDARDS

Revision Cycles		
Every 5 years	9	45%
Every 7 years	3	15%
Every 10 years	2	10%

*Other: Every 6 years, in process, no set timeline, when DOE has funding, not scheduled*

Basis of Revision		
Incorporating 21st Century Skills	11	58%
Orienting more strongly to Performance-Based Assessment	11	58%
International benchmarking (frameworks from other countries)	9	47%
Benchmarking with other states	7	37%
Looking at career and college readiness descriptors	7	37%
Crediting proficiency demonstration	4	21%

*Other: State ED HUB alignment, adopt National Standards to save money developing own, essential skills framework.*

Tools and Products Developed by the State Related to the National Standards		
Yes	14	74%
No	4	37%

For those answering yes, tools and products include:

- Model units and lessons
- Classroom applications, documents, exemplar curricular unit for Novice-High, Standards in Action documents targeted to proficiency levels
- Curriculum Framework
- Pocket PASS (Priority Academic Student Skills) and Parent PASS

## KEY FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FROM OTHER PARTS OF THE SURVEY FOR THE STATES

The following information set is based upon responses from state supervisors.

### National Standards, Five Cs Impact in the States

- Standards do provide focus for curriculum development and planning as well as assessment.
- Among the goal areas, Communication receives the most attention in terms of teaching emphasis and professional development, followed by Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities being less prominent.
- Communities goal area is viewed as most difficult to teach, followed by Connections, Cultures, and Comparisons.
- Standards have not been extended and made transparent to students at the classroom level.

**Analysis:** There is a tendency to embrace Communication and Culture Standards and take these on as a primary mission. That overlooks the purpose of the Standards' five-goal-area design, intended to promote greater interdisciplinary work (Connections), more integrated cultural content and the vision of language as having a real world communicative use (Communities). Evidence of Standards assessment tends to be in terms of Communication only.

### Professional Development Issues in the States

- Professional development (PD) has raised awareness of what Standards-based programs might be, but it remains a vision for the future.
- The Standards have given educators a common language for talk within the field.
- Overall, implementing Standards into the classroom is difficult. The need for time or a perceived lack of time to do so is critical.
- Only 28% read about research related to Standards, raising the question of how to reach teachers who do not read or attend conferences?

- The majority of teachers receive PD at the district level in “one-shot” PD with no choice of topics; these are increasingly being determined by the school or district.
- Lack of follow-up and lack of connection with higher ups is problematic.

### Teacher Education

- Teachers are too often prepared by part-time faculty or general methods professors which contributes to a minimal understanding of Standards.
- Supervisors report that 56% of new teacher education graduates are “well versed in Standards.” However, their judgment of university mentors is that:

37% Are “completely well versed”  
 58% Are “minimally well versed”  
 5% Are “not at all versed”

### National Standards and the Five Cs

- Modes of Communication are often viewed through a teacher lens rather than a student lens so a deep understanding of the characteristics of each modality and the appropriate teaching approach is not always evident.
- Assessing and teaching to the interpretive modality: Open-ended responses indicated that a surprising number of teachers did not seem to understand the characteristics and processes of this communicative mode. The interpretive process in the minds of learners is not so readily visible and that may account for a low number of those measuring it.
- Too many Standards issue: Some states have moved to one or two “goal areas” of the Standards, e.g., (Communication and Cultures). As states are revising Standards, they are being reduced. There is also confusion over having five goal areas, and 11 Standards. Regardless, the trend is toward reducing the number of Standards in state frameworks.
- Foreign language teachers are not using the Connections Standards to talk or work with colleagues in other disciplines. Teachers could place foreign languages more strongly in the total school curriculum by linking communication with content in a synergistic manner.
- The Cultural Framework with the 3 Ps (products, practices, perspectives) is neither taught nor assessed by a sizeable number of teachers. Yet this framework could provide a very powerful notion of how to work with culture in ways that students and teachers would find accessible. Where could culture be taught to increase teacher comfort with it? It is important to look for good models of how people through PD are learning about 3 Ps.
- Assessment and Standards. The conversion of goal areas to Standards diminishes development of new assessments. The goal areas are intentionally broad, and it is the Standards areas that should be measured. Many feel there are too many Standards to be realistic in terms of assessment. Are there data that show that Communication is the goal area and the one most assessed? *LinguaFolio* has “can-do” statements as focus of their assessment. Integrated Performance Assessments (IPAs) also focus on communication, but there are strong linkages in that model to cultural and/or interdisciplinary content (Connections). Good IPAs do have items that measure the understanding and reaction to content.

- What instructional strategies engender better Standards-based alignment/outcomes?
- Why are current secondary textbooks seen as limiting Standards-based implementation? Again, on paper they may talk a good Standards game, but are they reaching the other Cs? Are they moving away from discrete grammar? Don't they need to discuss the achievement focus of lower levels where can-dos are pretty consistent across programs moving to more of a proficiency orientation as one becomes more proficient?

### Supervisory Roles

- There is a need to collect classroom observation forms to see how observers track Standards implementation (if done at all).
- To what extent are Standards only on paper (e.g., in lesson plans, curriculum guides) and not actually being followed? In other words, the evidence question needs to be pursued further on district supervisors' forms.
- Need to discover if only older, veteran teachers are reluctant to implement Standards-based programs. Do younger teachers “talk the talk” but not “walk the walk”? Do veterans actually teach Standards but simply not talk the talk?
- Given one-shot or several-shots nature of PD, what other models might be more job-embedded or sustainable? [See section of this report on informal PD for models, page 22.]

# ACTFL STANDARDS PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SURVEY RESULTS: DISTRICT SUPERVISORS

Compiled by: Grisel López-Díaz

## DEMOGRAPHICS

**Respondents:** Sixty-four individuals responded to questions directed to self-identified supervisors, or department chairpersons.

District Size	
1,000 or less	5%
1,000-5,000	22%
5,000-10,000	16%
10,000-20,000	17%
20,000-50,000	17%
50,000-100,000	16%
100,000+	8%

Foreign Language Enrollment (Differences in District Size and Scope of the Program Also Made for Enrollment Variability)	
500 or less	12%
500-1,000	20%
1,000-5,000	39%
5,000-10,000	18%
more than 10,000	10%

### Instructional Levels in District

Fifty percent of respondents have elementary programs. Eighty-four percent have middle school programs and 98% have high school programs.

Given that many districts have dropped elementary programs because of the 2010 budget crises in many states, it will be interesting to see if this number changes. Also, the numbers may be larger because those supervisors who have fought to implement and maintain these programs are probably the same ones who would take an interest in responding to this survey.

### Foreign Language Requirement Prior to High School

Middle school level instruction was reported at 84%, yet 63% responded that there was no foreign language requirement prior to high school.

Does this mean that it is not offered to all students, but only to a select few? Most likely, language is not a requirement at the middle school level, but rather offered as an elective.

## Number of Foreign Language Teachers at Various Levels

- Low numbers at the elementary level: 73% indicated having 0–10 elementary foreign language (FL) teachers. This may indicate that these teachers see a large number of students infrequently.
- Number is higher at the middle school level: 49% reported having 11–50 FL teachers.
- As expected, the number of high school teachers is higher than at other levels: 53% reported having 11–50 teachers, 11% have 51–100 teachers, and 15% have 101–200.

Languages Offered			
Spanish	98%	Japanese	37%
French	95%	Italian	27%
German	73%	Russian	16%
Latin	63%	Arabic	14%
ESL	57%	Other: American Sign Language (ASL), Hindi, Modern Greek, Hebrew, Spanish for Heritage Speakers, Turkish, Hebrew, Swahili	30%
Chinese	52%		

(N.B.: Percentages reflect offerings not enrollment figures.)

## KEY FINDINGS FROM THE SURVEY DATA

The data show that the supervisors who responded reported that the Standards have had impact on:

- Professional development
- Curriculum development
- Assessment

The supervisors reported that their district’s professional development was based on the National Standards and their state standards. Seventy-two percent reported using copies of both of these in professional development. Additionally 52% report that the district supports attendance in Standards-based workshops offered outside the district.

Sixty-one percent of district supervisors report that their district curriculum is “most definitely” aligned with the Standards, 26% say their curriculum is in process of being realigned, and only 2% have no plans for alignment.

Development of performance assessment appears to lag well behind curriculum development. No one reported assessment programs as completed but rather described them as beginning or in progress. A closer look at each of these topics follows.

## PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

### Professional Development for the Supervisors Themselves

Supervisors report that their own professional development was facilitated by:	
Reading professional literature	79%
Attendance at state conferences	77%
Professional dialogue with colleagues	74%
Attendance at national conferences	67%
Professional meetings of supervisors	67%
Attendance at regional conferences	61%

Less widespread activities but still of note include visiting other districts (41%) and connecting with postsecondary institutions (31%). The efforts made by supervisors to gain knowledge of Standards and current practice are reflected in their taking professional development to their teachers and in their curriculum and assessment activities.

### Number of Professional Development Workshops Offered by District Per Year

Although 42% reported the district offered full-day workshops, an even higher percent (50%) was reported under the category “Other Answers.” These respondents reported offering from 2 to 6 full days per year.

*Note: This was a poorly written survey question since it asked for the number of workshops offered but did not give numbers in the choices, but rather format (full-day, half-day, 1–2 hours). Those who indicated “other answers” in reality answered the question of “how many” workshops are offered annually. Based on these responses, the average would be approximately three full-day workshops per year.*

### Freedom in Planning Workshops

The majority reported having “complete” (33%) or “some” (63%) freedom in terms of topic selection and budgetary allocations.

### Factors Considered When Planning Professional Development

National Standards: 95% when combining responses “some” and “all the time.”

State Standards: 95% with the same combined responses. Further information on states is provided by state supervisors.

State-Mandated Programs: 82% responded “some” and “all the time.”

District Curriculum Priorities: 95% responded “some” and “all the time.”

Department Priorities: 97% responded “some” and “all the time.”

District’s Professional Development Plan: tends to be a year-long annual one in 63% of cases, with only 42% indicating multi-year planning.

Language-Specific Professional Development: offered by 70% of programs.

## Components of the Plan

Plans consist mostly of individual workshops (92%). It is difficult to know if these are linked to one theme, thus providing ongoing professional development; most likely, they consist of a series of disconnected topics. Thirty-nine percent report offering summer institutes, and 23% provided “other answers,” mostly citing in-service programs.

## Greatest Limitations on Planning Standards-Based Professional Development

Time (68%) and budget (67%) are the greatest constraints. Other responses are more spread out and probably more local in nature: Addressing many priorities (43%), resources (32%), finding effective facilitators (30%), lack of support from administration (21%). The other responses coalesce around the issue of change; of the nine open responses, seven make statements about teacher behaviors. Citations:

- Lack of interest on the part of teachers who do not want to change
- Lack of interest on the part of tenured teachers who should have retired when Susan B. Anthony passed away
- Lack of interest on the part of teachers who do not want to change
- Reluctance from older teachers who have taught in a specific manner for many years
- Seasoned teachers comfortable with grammar based approaches and fear of change
- Teachers who think they have nothing left to learn
- The professional development is primarily optional, so not all teachers choose to take advantage of the opportunities

## CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

### Alignment with Standards

In terms of alignment of the district curriculum to Standards, 61% responded “most definitely” and 19% indicated this was true for “some grades and courses.” Twenty-six percent reported being in the process of realignment, and only 2% indicated there were no plans to align with Standards.

In response to evidence supervisors have on implementation of Standards, classroom observations (84%) and discussions with teachers (83%) were highest; one might assume that the close tie here comes from a combination of observation followed by discussion. Professional development activities (75%) and lesson plans (73%) were also a major source of evidence. It was surprising to see that assessment practices (78%) constituted evidence beyond lesson plans even though another question indicated that district assessments aligned with Standards occurred in just 43% of schools. Further only 62% used student performance as evidence leaving a gap between how the students did on the assessments and the design of the assessments by teachers.

## ASSESSMENT

### Alignment with Standards

Only 43% of respondents indicated complete alignment of assessment to Standards, 38% reported some alignment, and 19% indicated no alignment. As with data from states and other institutions and programs, the lag between instruction and assessment is not an unusual nor unexpected one.

### INSIGHTS GAINED FROM OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

Supervisors provided open-ended responses on two topics: (1) Greatest successes in implementing Standards-based professional development and (2) greatest challenges. Patterns drawn from this information follow:

#### Greatest Successes

- **Curriculum writing** that involves teachers actively, takes place over a number of years, facilitates collegial dialogue, creates experimental plans, and enables teachers to take ownership of curriculum, assists in articulation
- **Support for professional development** for teaching strategies through outside consultants, workshops, resources (e.g., new textbooks, technology) and involvement of teachers across levels
- **Assessment projects** to connect teaching and testing through resources and training in district or national plans (e.g., AFLAP, LinguaFolio, proficiency testing)

#### Greatest Challenges

- **Administrative support** in terms of budget, time, stable leadership, teacher turnover, PD specific to foreign languages, and staff
- **Teacher reluctance to change** with concerns of those who are unwilling to abandon a primarily grammatical syllabus, focus on textbook coverage, consider Standards a waste of time, want classroom autonomy not collaboration, rely on discrete-point/pencil-paper tests, and see language as the outcome not communication
- **Status of foreign languages** as not being a core subject with resulting lack of funding and exclusion from district priorities

### SURVEY RESULTS AND CURRENT RESEARCH AND POLICY ISSUES

- Impact of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) has been felt in terms of professional development and curriculum priorities. Other “core areas” seem to be given preference over languages. Limitations listed by district supervisors include allocation of time (68%), budget (67%), and other priorities (43%). This is evident in budgetary allocation, time of instruction, themes selected for professional development, and especially assessment. One open-ended comment: “[We lack]

opportunities to bring teachers together. The district reorganized this year and allocated no PD days for content areas outside of Language Arts, Math, Social Studies, and Science.”

- The quality of teacher preparation and induction programs vary. For student teachers and new teachers, 73% of the districts address Standards through mentoring programs, 63% through workshops, 53% through written guidelines, and 52% through peer observation. As to whether recent graduates of teacher education programs are familiar with the Standards, 56% responded yes and 44% no. This percentage falls in response to the degree to which university mentors for student teachers are oriented toward the Standards: 37% completely, 58% minimally, and 5% not at all. The gap between the degree of familiarization of recent graduates and their university mentors may be a result of the student teaching experience itself in a district that had a standards-based curriculum.
- Survey results on the impact of Standards in methods courses are reported in this report beginning on page 32.

The following questions need to be explored. How long have teachers who are resistant to change been teaching? What is the impact of the ACTFL/NCATE Standards on teacher preparation programs? From the supervisory perspective, are the local colleges and universities preparing their candidates effectively?

## LANGUAGE-SPECIFIC PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

A survey was sent to language-specific organizations, both those who have developed Standards included in the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (2006) publication and those representing languages for which Standards are not yet published. A summary of results for those who responded by November 2010 is below.

Professional Association	Standards: D = Developed, P = Published I = In Process NR = Interested but Not Ready, X = No interest	Standards-Related Products	Future Association Plans Regarding Standards	Advice for Profession
<b>AATG</b>	D, P	Print: middle school units, <i>Die Umwelt und Ich, Deutsch-Amerikaner</i> PD workshops with middle school units, PD consultants who focus on standards	<i>Toleranz</i> (in process), continue with publications and workshops	Awareness seems good at K–12 level and growing awareness and use in higher education
<b>AATSP</b>	D, P	Print publications PD workshops, seminars, sessions @ national conferences		Re: Culture (Note A)
<b>ACTR</b> (American Council of Teachers of Russian)	D, P	Professional development institutes, sessions at national conferences, framework for prototype AP course and exam	Continue professional development institutes, sessions at conferences	Awareness continues to develop at all levels. Awareness continues to be stronger at K-12 level and is developing at postsecondary levels. Textbooks and related materials show developing awareness
<b>ASLTA</b> (American Sign Language Teachers Association)	I (target 2010)	Plans to disseminate in print, on website once developed	More scenarios, plans for teachers	

### Notes from Open-Ended Comments

- Standard 2: Culture:** “It would be good if the standard itself (or the description/definition of the standard) could address the issue of over-generalizations and stereotyping. It needs to be made clear that practices, products, and perspectives do not apply to all speakers of the language all of the time. We want to avoid stereotyping on the part of teachers and students so that when discussing practices and products they don’t state things like, ‘All Latinos eat tacos, the French drink a lot of wine, Brazilians like soccer.’ Which Latinos eat tacos and when do they eat them; which French-speakers drink a lot of wine—on what occasions? So perhaps the Culture standard needs a 3rd sub-standard that addresses to whom (or which sub-group) does the practice, product or perspective pertain and on what occasions is it true?”

# NATIONAL LANGUAGE RESOURCE CENTERS

Compiled by: Ursula Lentz

A survey was sent to the directors of the Language Resource Centers (LRCs) to assess influence, impact, and activity undertaken by these institutions in terms of Standards. Eleven of the National Language Resource Centers provided responses to the survey and provided additional information in open-ended items.

## STANDARDS-BASED PROGRAMS ARE FUNDED THROUGH THE NFLRC

All responding centers have funded Standards-based programs through their NFLRC. They did so under a number of specific categories.

- **Research studies:** Three centers have funded research studies. Studies include South Asian language and technology and surveys of Bengali teaching materials. No other examples were provided.
- **Teaching and learning materials:** Responses from 10 of the 11 responding LRCs indicate that they have funded teaching and learning materials.

Among materials produced are textbooks and multimedia for critical languages: Language survival kits for Pashto and Dari; proficiency guidelines for Hindi; interactive readers and grammar for Tamil; and a variety of online learning materials for Punjabi, Bangla, Nepali, and other South Asian languages. Given that most of these language groups have not developed language-specific Standards aligned with the National Standards (only Hindi has done so), it is not clear whether the materials developed are based on the National Standards as well as the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. (Centers not reporting also feature links to or information about teaching and learning materials developed at the center.)

Materials for commonly taught languages include online learning modules for technology, assessment, etc.—some of which focus on the National Standards while others focus more on the Proficiency Guidelines. Materials include Standards-based lessons and units and teacher training on implementation of the materials. Content-based materials produced by LRCs are also Standards-based and target a variety of languages and proficiency levels.

Many materials developed for teacher professional development also focus on or incorporate National Standards.

- **Assessment initiatives:** Six of the 11 responding LRCs have undertaken proficiency assessment initiatives. Initiatives targeted assessment of critical and less commonly taught languages. Other initiatives targeted higher levels of commonly taught languages as well as the Novice and Intermediate proficiency levels. Assessment initiatives for elementary students and students in immersion programs were also undertaken.

Assessment-related professional development focused on Proficiency Guidelines and the National Standards.

Initiatives for developing classroom assessments and teacher training for formative assessment focused on the National Standards.

Proficiency Guidelines for critical languages were also developed. LRCs also developed searchable databases for assessments.

- **Professional development for teachers/instructors:** All 11 of the centers responding to the survey provide professional development for teachers/instructors via workshops and summer institutes, many of which focused on National Standards, incorporating technology for access and use of authentic materials, access to native speakers and proficiency-oriented instruction and assessment. Centers focused on the National Standards as the basis of the workshops they offered. Also, centers acknowledged that Standards are the basis of their work, even when not mentioned explicitly. (Centers not responding also provide professional development for teachers/instructors.)
- **Less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) initiatives:** Nine of the 11 responding LRCs have LCTL initiatives. Initiatives at LRCs dedicated to specific LCTLs include development of guidelines and materials (e.g., lessons, readers), assessments, and professional development. Centers provide and maintain searchable databases of where LCTLs are taught and organizations for continuing study. LCTL resources include lessons and materials to support lessons. Lessons are proficiency-based and some are overtly Standards based.
- **Outreach and dissemination:** Eight of the 11 responding LRCs reported outreach and dissemination activities in the form of newsletters, workshops, materials available on their websites, summer institutes, collaboration on larger initiatives (e.g., Language Teacher Education Conference, Immersion Conference). The definition of dissemination may have been interpreted differently as all centers post material and information about programs and resources and provide some professional development.
- **Professional learning communities:** Four of the 11 responding centers have worked to fund projects or support members to participate in professional learning communities, including listservs. Activities within the learning communities show a range from four-skills approaches to on-line courses focusing on teaching with the National Standards. Train-the-Trainer programs were another form of professional community developed for the expansion of professional development opportunities.
- **Social/professional networking:** Six of the 11 responding centers have developed social/professional networking opportunities for discussion of questions and to disseminate information regarding workshops, etc.
- **Other:** All CLIP (less commonly taught critical languages) teachers go to California Foreign Language Project training (SAILN) where they learn how to make Standards-based lessons. Standards-based activities are being added to the Digital Media Archive, with SAILN's participation. (LARC)

It is difficult to quantify exactly which products and services incorporate the Standards, because everything in the centers is based on best practices in FL teaching; therefore the Standards underlie all output, even if not explicitly. Several workshops back in the early days explicitly addressed the Standards, but later and current workshops rarely explicitly bring up the Standards even though the foundation is there. (CLEAR)

A workshop in 2010 addressed the Cultures goal area, called “The Second “C”: Culture Teaching in the Language Classroom”: <http://clear.msu.edu/clear/professionaldev/summerworkshops.php>.

## RESEARCH AND DATA ON THE IMPACT OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ON PARTICIPANTS' PROGRAMS/TEACHING

Yes	10
No	1

**Yes:** Ten reported having data, including one center with a study underway. Of the data, eight reported having quantitative data and 10 reported qualitative data.

Qualitative data (e.g., open-ended questions, observation notes, case studies)

Quantitative data (e.g., evaluations, surveys, assessment results)

Textbook evaluation comments; Seminar evaluation comments; PTP assessment results

- **Comments:** SALRC does collect post-workshop surveys. In the majority of these surveys, participants indicate they intend to use what they have learned in their classrooms. SALRC maintains paper copies of these surveys that can be digitized and provided on request. SALRC has developed a comprehensive evaluation plan to evaluate the impact of the Center's programs over the next four years. The Center has enlisted the services of the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) for the development and implementation of the evaluation plan.

An outside evaluator (Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement [CAREI]) is currently gathering data regarding the impact of CARLA's professional development programs on what participants do in their own programs/teaching.

- **Dissemination of Research Findings to the Foreign Language Community**

**Yes:** Six of the centers have made their research findings available to the larger foreign language community.

*<http://calper.la.psu.edu/cmci/index.php>*

*<http://international.ucla.edu/languages/nhlrc/surveyreport/>*

CERCLL website: *[cercll.arizona.edu](http://cercll.arizona.edu)*

LARC (anecdotal at this point)

**No:** Five of the responding 11 centers have not made any research findings available to the larger foreign language community.

One response of "not yet."

One comment: In annual evaluation reports.

- **Unpublished Impact Research Findings Availability**

**Yes:** Four centers responded and provided contact information:

*[dbaer@indiana.edu](mailto:dbaer@indiana.edu)*

*[etarone@umn.edu](mailto:etarone@umn.edu)*

*[salrc@uchicago.edu](mailto:salrc@uchicago.edu)*

*[cercll@email.arizona.edu](mailto:cercll@email.arizona.edu)*

**No:** One reply with the following comment:

- Participants were not asked for permission to use responses for research purposes
- No unpublished impact research findings

## PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AROUND STANDARDS

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Participants in our professional development programs/experiences commit to incorporating standards-based goals/objectives/outcomes into their programs/courses.	6	1	4*		
Participants in our professional development programs/experiences incorporate standards-based instructional strategies into their teaching.	3	6	2		
Participants in our professional development programs/experiences incorporate standards-based assessments into their programs/courses.	2	5	4		
Participants in our professional development programs/experiences develop products/materials based on the standards (e.g., lesson plans, thematic units, classroom activities, assessments).	6	2	2	1	

**Comments:** Centers offered additional information in the following survey comments.

**CLEAR:** Marking all of these “neutral” because though the Standards form a foundation for professional development, participants do not make a formal “commitment” to using or incorporating them. Follow-up research has not been done to determine use of Standards in classrooms after participation. This is a known shortcoming of the professional development program and plan to work on that in the upcoming funding cycle.

**LARC:** All of the curricula and textbooks now produced are Standards-based. Where Standards are needed to be made more explicit, that is being done. This survey has had some wash back effect as a reminder that even though materials are standards based, it is not enough that teachers have been thoroughly trained in the standards for these principles to appear. It must be overt to teachers and to their students as to why certain activities are being undertaken!

The value of standards at all levels of instruction is acknowledged as way to go for university level. Even literature teachers (perhaps, especially literature teachers) can and should use the National Standards effectively as organizing principles for their classrooms.

**CALPER:** Produced a Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC) Library, a database of teaching/learning activities that are aligned with the Standards. Online at <http://calper.la.psu.edu/cmcl/index.php>. A CALPER project director (Professor Susan Strauss, Penn State) who is a member of the American Association of Teachers of Korean (AATK) Task Force to develop Standards for Korean <http://www.aatk.org-cf>. Newsletter June 2009, p. 7–9 (PDF).

Hold in-service professional development sessions for language instructors at our campus.

**CARLA:** Has some evidence through teacher self-reporting that they use what they learn about the standards in their instruction. The Center also has materials that teachers have developed, such as lesson plans and units, which are housed on the CARLA website. However, one can only speculate on the extent to which they regularly incorporate the standards into their instruction without a way to conduct ongoing, in-depth research of this nature.

**NFLRC-K-12:** The first of nine “Standards-based thematic units” was published in 1998. They are all now available in downloadable format: <http://nflrc.iastate.edu/pubs/homepage.html>

A guide, developed and published in 1997, *Bringing the Standards in to the Classroom: A Teacher’s Guide* is also downloadable: <http://nflrc.iastate.edu/pubs/homepage.html>

**Other considerations regarding the responses:**

- Several of the centers were started prior to the publication of the National Standards. Some of the materials they developed are based on the Proficiency Guidelines rather than the Standards.
- Websites of centers feature activities and examples that can be considered Standards-based but are referred to in language used to describe the four skills (e.g., speaking activities that are unrehearsed but labeled speaking, rather than interpersonal).

**Summary of findings:** Language Resource Centers have funded Standards-based programs in several areas: teaching and learning materials, assessments, professional development, standard writing and content-based materials and research studies. Among less commonly taught languages, especially critical languages, centers developed Proficiency Guidelines and teaching and learning materials and resources as well as Standards. Standards are integrated into materials, professional development, assessments and resources are developed and provided by the centers, with some also providing training on the use and meaning of the Standards either in person or online.

Communication and Culture were the goal areas most frequently addressed. The increasing focus on content-based classes and language across the curriculum as well as use of technology, provides LRCs an important opportunity to increase the focus on the other 3 Cs, particularly, Connections and Communities.

# DATA FROM THE SURVEY: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Compiled by: Nathan Bond and Eileen W. Glisan

As the branching system of the survey took effect, respondents were asked to identify their primary role among language teacher, methods course instructor, and state or district supervisor. Respondents who self-identified as language teachers numbered 1,299 or 89% of the total. Subsequent questions focused on professional development (PD) experiences and implementation of Standards in their classrooms.

## KEY FINDINGS FROM THE DATA ON PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

### PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ON STANDARDS: FORMAL AND INFORMAL

Respondents reporting formal PD on the Standards	668	51%
Respondents reporting no formal PD on the Standards	636	49%

Respondents also reporting informal PD on the Standards	491	45%
Respondents also reporting no informal PD on the Standards	600	55%

Respondents reporting informal PD only	353	57%
Respondents reporting no PD, formal or informal	269	43%

**Analysis:** Given that survey respondents to this question have already attested to familiarity with the Standards, only slightly over half have received formal PD and less than half have received informal PD. Thirteen years after publication of the Standards, this number is disappointing. Teachers who received notification of the survey and responded would be expected to be among the most professionally aware. (The branching system in the survey asked about informal PD of those responding to formal and informal, giving two pieces of data. The percentages for informal PD are slightly below 50% for those who received formal PD and slightly above for those for whom that was the only condition.)

### Context of Formal Professional Development

Setting/Sponsorship for PD					
School district	278	44%	National conference	182	29%
College/university	257	41%	State DOE	96	15%
State conference	251	40%	National FLRC	54	9%
Regional conference	219	35%	Other	52	8%

*In the "Other" category, respondents listed workshops sponsored by professional groups (e.g., AATG, ACTFL OPI, AP/College Board, Goethe-Institut, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards), specific district or state-sponsored workshops, online courses, and one person named it (Standards or PD?) as a dissertation topic.*

**Analysis:** As indicated in the chart, the location of PD is closest to the teaching location (school or district) and as distance is greater, the likelihood is less (national conferences). Empowering district / state personnel to provide PD is critical.

Format of PD					
Workshop	495	79%	Summer institute	151	24%
Session/seminar/lecture	353	56%	Series of workshops	78	12%
Course	176	28%	Other	28	4%

*“Other” formats included during development of state frameworks, district curriculum, accreditation, model lesson writing, course revision, departmental meetings, and grant programs such as FLAP.*

**Analysis:** The most popular format of formal PD was the workshop or session/seminar/lecture. Only 12% of respondents reported having participated in a series of workshops offered as a package. In sum, the “one-shot” workshop, although identified in the research as the least effective means of PD, still appears to be the preferred format, while ongoing PD (i.e., a series of workshops) appears to be selected least often. It is also interesting to see that the “other” responses show the indirect effect of PD when done as part of a teacher participation project in district, state, or departmental work.

Time in PD on Standards: Length and Recentness					
0–10	168	27%	PD within last 6 mos.	192	31%
11–25 hours	212	34%	PD within last year	152	24%
26–50 hours	118	19%	Within last 5 yrs.	219	35%
50 or more hours	123	20%	More than 5 yrs. ago	62	10%

**Analysis:** The time spread here was fairly even, but the dominant pattern was 25 hours or fewer (61%). By combining this data set with the set from format of PD, this could mean a single-day workshop or a short series. It does appear that the majority of respondents participated in PD within the last year (combined 55%) and that the overall range of within the last five years (90%) suggests that it took some time for PD on Standards to reach teachers. Standards were first published in 1996 but most PD is occurring as of 2004, even in the demographics of the survey that indicated that 67% of respondents have taught 11 years or more.

Types of Activities					
Talking with colleagues	389	76%	Study group	114	22%
Reading professional literature	305	59%	Online discussions	79	15%
Peer coaching/mentoring	236	46%	Conducting action research	50	10%
Independent study	176	34%	Other	35	7%

*Other included: District and state meetings to develop frameworks/curriculum guides; textbook development.*

## Support for Professional Development on Standards

Type of Follow-Up Support					
None	546	60%	Resources	186	21%
Collegial & administrative support	220	24%	Time	138	15%

Follow-Up by School/Department Chair		
No	472	50%
Yes	183	19%
N/A	298	31%

Quality of Professional Development on Standards					
Excellent	168	27%	Average	111	18%
Good	317	52%	Poor	16	3%

**Analysis:** These responses describe a high degree of quality of PD yet almost half show no follow-up institutional support (60%) and more alarming (50%) not even from the immediate supervisor who should be closer to the FL discipline. This indicates that teachers are on their own and would benefit from professional support offered by a larger community such as a professional organization.

## CONTENT OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN TERMS OF STANDARDS

*(N.B.: More than one answer allowed; branching system resulted in number variances.)*

Combined Numbers for Formal and Informal PD					
Communication	666	90%	Comparisons	235	32%
Cultures	413	56%	Communities	188	25%
Connections	277	37%			

Informal PD (Alone or in Addition to Formal)					
Communication	694	94%	Comparisons	383	52%
Cultures	545	73%	Communities	295	40%
Connections	385	52%			

**Analysis:** Informal PD seems to have included more evenly all the goal areas (5Cs) with four of the five over 50%, whereas formal PD seems concentrated on Communication and Culture, areas more traditionally associated with language instruction. This suggests that on their own teachers sought information on the full spectrum of goal areas and advanced their knowledge independently of formal offerings. It is possible that the formal offerings are restricted to the traditional expertise of language departments in schools and universities which represents the most common contexts for formal PD.

## OVERALL IMPACT OF PD ON INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES

The majority of respondents (74%) reported that PD on Standards prompted them to implement new ideas and/or change their instructional practices.

Ways of Dealing Overall with Results of PD with Standards		
Connecting current activities with Standards	277	38%
Implementing Standards-based approach by planning for achievement of Standards rather than textbook content	251	34%
Connecting textbook/curriculum to Standards	152	21%
Making few or no changes	53	7%

Specific General Activities Resulting From PD with Standards (Above 50%)		
Created classroom activities related to Standards	620	85%
Created new lesson/unit plans with Standards focus	507	70%
Taught Standards-based lessons	433	60%
Designed Standards-based assessments	417	57%
Developed curricula/syllabi around Standards	381	52%

**Analysis:** Much of the implementation is focused on incorporating Standards into classroom activities from a daily to a curricular focus. Areas where little activity is reported include those of reflection in follow-up to teaching (e.g., journals, [11%]; videotapes of one's teaching [11%], and classroom research; [13%]).

Many of items that follow used a Likert scale to assess instructional activities and change. Items had a range of 1 (negative) to 5 (positive). Results are reported by combining ratings 4+5 and 1+2. Descriptors used are given with items.

Areas of Reexamination: 5 = Extensive, 1 = Minimal
Philosophy of teaching languages (Cat. 4+5: 61%)
Instructional practices (Cat. 4+5: 76%)
Assessment practices (Cat. 4+5: 76%)
Increase one's own oral proficiency (Cat. 4 +5: 49% Cat. 1+2: 26%)
Increase one's own knowledge of cultures (Cat. 4+5: 56% Cat. 1+2: 19%)

**Analysis:** Positive impact in terms of reexamining practices with few negatives. The lower percentages in oral proficiency may be due to the numbers of native speakers or Advanced/Superior speakers of the language and some of the same may play out regarding cultures.

## Specific Instructional Activities

Extent to which the respondent is doing the following as a result of PD with Standards: Highest impact based upon 5 = Always, 1 = Never. Results presented below represent percentage of responses that indicated 4 and 5.

Develop students' interpretive reading strategies	77%
Develop students' interpretive viewing strategies	77%
Adapt textbook activities to make them more interpersonal	75%
Provide my students with the tools to engage in lifelong learning of the foreign language	75%
Develop students' interpretive listening strategies	74%
Pair students to exchange information in real conversation	73%
Provide opportunities for students to negotiate meaning with the teacher	71%
Provide opportunities for students to negotiate meaning with classmates	71%
Provide opportunities for students to engage in oral presentational communication designed for specific audiences	71%
Provide opportunities for students to engage in interpersonal speaking that is neither scripted nor memorized	70%
Help students to develop insights about their native cultures through study of the target language culture	70%
Provide opportunities for students to engage in written presentational communication designed for specific audiences	69%
Use authentic printed texts to develop interpretive skills	68%
Assess students' ability in interpersonal communication	67%
Develop students' interpretive viewing strategies	66%
Integrate in lessons cultural products, practice, perspectives	65%
Help students to develop insights about L1 through study of L2	65%
Assess students' ability to interpret authentic texts	63%
Use knowledge of Standards to develop language learning activities	63%
Develop language learning activities based upon Standards	63%
Assess my students' ability to make cultural comparisons of C1 and C2	62%
Assess my students' ability to make linguistic comparisons of L1 and L2	62%
Design lessons that integrate content from other disciplines	60%
Assess differently due to knowledge of Standards	60%
Guide lesson plan design using Standards	59%
Use the TL 90% of the time or more in most of their classes	57%
Use one mode of communication as basis for work with others	56%
Use authentic materials/texts as the basis for exploration of the 3Ps	56%
Use authentic video texts to develop interpretive skills	55%
Provide students with opportunities to create multimedia projects	55%
Engage students in being investigators of culture— i.e., research and discovery of cultural products, practices, perspectives	55%
Use authentic oral texts to develop interpretive skills	54%
Use English for discussion in L2 cultural perspectives	52%
Engage students in investigations of target language communities by accessing internet sites	52%
Provide feedback to students and interact with them about their progress differently because of Standards	52%

L1=first language; L2=second language; C1=first culture; C2=second culture; TL=target language

Lowest impact based upon 5 = Always, 1 = Never

Assess students' ability to interact with TL communities (Cat. 4+5 27%/Cat. 1+2 48%)
Make students aware of the Standards in the classroom (Cat. 4+ 5 28%/Cat. 1+2 44%)
Provide opportunities for students to communicate with others via technology (Cat. 4+5 29%/Cat. 1+2 48%)
Teach students the terms products, practices, perspectives (3 Ps) (Cat. 4+5 30%/ Cat. 1+2 46%)
Collaborate with other colleagues to reinforce content (Cat. 4+5 33%/ Cat. 1+2 41%)
Assess students' understanding of 3 Ps (Cat. 4+5 38%/ Cat. 1+2 31%)

**Analysis:** A high number of the activities presented for reaction received positive responses indicating that many Standards-based activities are being implemented by these teachers. Among those not substantially implemented include issues of assessment, communities, and bringing students into the discussion of Standards. There were some conflicting responses such as low numbers assessing the 3 Ps, yet high numbers assessing cultural comparisons. This may indicate that cultural comparisons are being made without using the 3Ps framework.

## FIVE CS

### Rank Order of the Five Goal Areas in Terms of Emphasis on Planning and Learning Experiences (5 = Most Emphasis)

- #1: Communication (5: 79%)
- #2: Cultures (5: 22%)
- #3: Comparisons (5: 12%)
- #4: Connections (5: 11%)
- #5: Communities (5: 8%)

### Rank Order of Three Modes of Communication in Terms of Emphasis on Planning and Learning Experiences (5 = Most Emphasis)

- #1: Interpersonal (5: 63%)
- #2: Interpretive (5: 31%)
- #3: Presentational (5: 24%)

### Easiest to Teach/Most Difficult to Teach

Easiest: Communication and Cultures  
 Most difficult: Communities and Connections

The above were open-ended items and over 800 responses were offered. The following presents some patterns of responses and comments that provide interesting insights. Statements in a numbered list are ordered with the most frequent response listed first.

## Reasons That Communication is the Easiest Goal Area

1. "It's at the heart of the standards/it's the most 'natural' part of language learning."
2. "Students want to communicate."
3. "I know how to teach it/I've had the most training in Communication."
4. "Textbooks address this goal area."

### "Interesting" responses in this section:

- "Communication is the easiest to teach because it is the easiest to assess and requires the least effort."
- "It is fairly simple to come up with activities and assessments in this domain."
- "I have developed a fairly extensive verb conjugation methodology."
- "Communication: You need to know enough words before you can truly appreciate the culture."
- "Communication: Not sure what is meant by 'goal area'. I do not find any of the 5 C's hard though."
- "Standard 1.1 This is the most concrete of all the Standards. It is more objective and less subjective."
- "Personal communication. It deals with vocabulary and grammar."

**Analysis:** Among reasons for finding it easiest are those that acknowledge student interest, teacher instructional confidence, effect of materials and training, and focal content of the discipline. Some comments however illustrate that even though deemed "easiest" there remains dissonance over the construct of Communication in a Standards environment. There was overall a consistent reference to the "four skills" instead of to the "three modes of communication." Communication was frequently defined as language forms (e.g., vocabulary, grammar). Also, respondents often referred to interpretive communication as "interpretative" communication.

## Reasons That Cultures is the Easiest Goal Area

1. "I am well traveled/fascinated with cultures myself/have lived abroad/am a native speaker."
2. "It's embedded in everything/easy to embed with communication/language instruction."
3. "Students are interested in cultures."

### "Interesting" responses in this section:

- Three respondents indicated that teaching Cultures is easy because it can be done in English.
- "Culture. Just explain it."

**Analysis:** Culture is seen as easy when teachers themselves have experiences in the culture. Student interest in culture as part of language study is acknowledged. However numerous responses indicate that it is done in English. There was minimal mention of the 3 Ps or of any organizing framework for teaching culture; examples imply that cultural topics are random and a result of teacher familiarity rather than thematic linkages. Out of 170 open-ended responses, only two mentioned the use of the Internet/technology to teach cultures and only two mentioned the use of authentic resources.

### Reasons That Connections is the Easiest Goal Area

1. "It's easy to connect to other subject areas."
2. "It's more interesting to me/to students."

### Reasons That Comparisons is the Easiest Goal Area

1. "It's easy to make comparisons between 2 languages and cultures."
2. "I can draw on students' prior knowledge."

### Reasons That Communities is the Easiest Goal Area

There were only 12 open-ended responses given, and all of these responses mentioned Communities along with one or more of the other goal areas, with only very vague comments.

### Miscellaneous Responses to the Question of Which Goal Area is Easiest to Teach

Grammar (11 responses)  
Vocabulary (8 responses)  
The 6th C-Consciousness

#### "Interesting" responses in this section:

- "None. I hate the Standards."
- "This is not something that applies to me—I teach upper level and graduate level courses on literature and culture."
- "Grammar, the textbooks is [sic] a good outline for this."
- "ACTFL Standards are too restrictive and financially ruin departments."

### Reasons That Communities is the Most Difficult Goal Area

1. "There are no/limited resources in the local community/community is not diverse."
2. "There is not enough time/students do not have enough time."
3. "Issues of feasibility: too difficult to take students out of school; safety concerns, administrative policies too restrictive."
4. "It's difficult to build relationships with people outside of school and find opportunities."
5. "I don't know how to plan for this goal area."
6. "This goal area is not measureable/how do I assess Communities?"

**Analysis:** The overwhelming majority of respondents interpret the Communities goal area as one that requires teachers to take students into the local community or abroad.

The majority finds this goal area to be nebulous, out of their control, and not assessable, particularly Standard 5.2. Only two respondents mentioned using the Internet to connect to TL communities. Several Latin teachers who responded indicated that this Standard has no relevance to them since "there are not a lot of ancient Romans left."

### Reasons That Connections is the Most Difficult Goal Area

1. "Not enough time"
2. "It's difficult to connect to other disciplines/other departments"
3. "Lack of resources"
4. "Lack of knowledge of how to address this goal area"

#### "Interesting" responses in this section:

"Connections—I have to create and translate nearly everything I do, which is 'sooo' time-consuming."

**Analysis:** There seemed to be some confusion between Connections and Communities and Connections and Cultures in the comments.

### Reasons That Comparisons is the Most Difficult Goal Area

1. "Students are not familiar with their own native language."
2. "Difficult to teach in the TL/difficult to plan this."
3. "This goal area is not clear/should change it."

### Reasons That Communications is the Most Difficult Goal Area

1. "Time"
2. "Class size"
3. "Students are reluctant/afraid to speak"
4. "How to assess large numbers of students"

#### "Interesting" responses in this section:

"Speaking, because it is very easy to speak wrong and be understood. And spoken mistakes are very hard to correct."

"It can also be difficult to make sure that ALL students chorally repeat."

"Proficiency in grammar, especially verbs."

Grammar (15 responses)

### Reasons That Cultures is the Most Difficult Goal Area

1. "I lack knowledge of cultures/have not been abroad."
2. "Lack of resources"

### Miscellaneous Responses to the Question of Which Goal Area is Most Difficult to Teach

"Goal 29: I do not have the resources to fully realize this goal area. It is also often not covered well in the curriculum (I have to base my curricula on the books), as we want students to be able to communicate first and so we focus heavily on vocabulary and grammar."

"I can never truly gauge standard seven."

"They are pie in the sky and do not relate to what we really do in the classroom."

## **INSIGHTS GAINED FROM RESPONSES**

### **Research and the Survey Results**

Some of the results can be supported by research and others seem to be in conflict with current research.

- The fact that teachers have responded to the Standards by mainly matching their textbook and classroom activities to them has appeared in many articles that present “strategies” for integrating the Standards. This result seems to be supported by research.
- The lack of support and follow-up by administrators to implement the Standards contradicts what we know about good professional development and about helping teachers to improve their practice. The research shows that professional development needs to be ongoing, teacher-centered, and job-embedded. The research is critical of one-shot workshops where teachers “sit, knit, and get.”

### **Information That Was Surprising or Unexpected**

- Almost half (49%) have not received any formal training on the Standards. It would be interesting to know why.
- Over half of respondents reported that they always or almost always use the TL 90% of the time or more in most of their classes.
- On the one hand, respondents reported providing students with the tools to engage in lifelong learning of the FL (75% always or almost always), while Communities was reported as the goal area least often addressed by them. The survey shows that 41% of the respondents are receiving information about the Standards from colleges and universities; however, the district supervisors report that university mentors don’t know much about the Standards (58%).
- Students are not aware of the Standards despite all of the work that is reportedly done on them in the classroom.
- In this age of technology, teachers are not providing opportunities for students to communicate with others in the TL via technology (only 29% reported doing so).

### **Results That Seem Supported by Anecdotal Observations in the Absence of Research**

- The district supervisors report that university mentors do not know much about the Standards (58%). Anecdotal evidence indicates that many university mentors do not have a background in FL pedagogy and therefore do not know about the Standards. We are not aware of actual research findings to verify this claim.
- The fact that Communities seems to be the least understood and least integrated into the classroom would seem to be supported by what is observed anecdotally.

### **Greatest Impact of Professional Development on the Standards**

- It has clearly prompted instructors to implement new ideas and/or examine their practices, particularly regarding their instructional and assessment practices.
- It has led to instructors' matching or connecting their current classroom activities to the Standards, and to developing lesson/unit plans that address the Standards.
- It has prompted instructors to focus more on developing oral interpersonal communication, be it adapting textbook activities to make them more interpersonal or providing their students with opportunities to negotiate meaning with the teacher and classmates.
- It has also been a catalyst in teachers paying more attention to developing the interpretive mode of communication.

### **Impact Less than Expected**

- PD has had some effect on the teachers' integration of the Communication goal area, but it has had much less of an impact on the other four goal areas.
- More training is needed for university student teaching mentors.
- Teachers have not educated their students on the Standards and how they are incorporated into their learning experiences (only 28% said that they did educate their students on the Standards). Accordingly, they did not teach students the terms "cultural products, practices, perspectives."
- Instructors are not incorporating the Communities goal area to a large degree, despite the fact that some consider it to be the most valuable and visionary of the five goal areas. Nor are they assessing their students' abilities to use the TL in communities.
- Teachers are not capitalizing on the use of technology to enable their students to communicate with others in the TL.
- Teachers are not spending as much time making connections to other disciplines in the TL.

# DATA FROM THE SURVEY: METHODS COURSE INSTRUCTORS

Compiled by: Nathan Bond, Eileen W. Glisan, and Iman Hashem

## DEMOGRAPHICS

Seventy-two respondents indicated that they taught methods courses and answered the relevant survey section. Twenty-seven states were represented. Raw numbers are presented in the demographic information as not all questions were answered by all respondents, and more than one answer could be given for certain questions.

Languages Taught by Those Also Teaching Methods	
Spanish	42
French	17
ESL	12
German	9
Arabic	5
Japanese	3
Chinese, Italian, Russian	2
Hebrew, Ilocno, Korean, Quecha, Tagalog, Thai	1

Gender	
Female	44
Male	26

Position within the Institution	
Tenured/tenure track	29
Lecturer/Instructor	15
Part-time/Adjunct	8

Number of Years Teaching	
11 + years	61
4–10 years	6

Description of Student Status	
Postsecondary/undergraduate	44
Post undergraduate	18
Graduate students	25

## CONFIGURATION OF METHODS COURSES

Number of Methods Courses	
One	21%
Two	38%
Three	17%
Four	26%

Length of the Course	
Quarter	10%
Semester	86%
Other: (i.e., trimester, 48 contact hours in 5-week span)	6%

Student Body (More Than One Answer Could Be Checked)	
Preservice K–12 teachers	65%
In-service K–12 teachers	51%
Postsecondary teaching assistants/lecturers	49%
Alternative licensure candidates	33%

Number of Hours Spent in the Course Presenting and Expanding on the Standards	
0–10 hours	29%
10–20 hours	35%
20–40 hours	22%
40–60 hours	5%
More than 60 hours	5%

## KEY FINDINGS FROM THE SURVEY DATA

Resources Used in Addressing Standards in the Methods Course	
<i>Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century</i> (book)	76%
Professional literature	72%
Textbook	68%
Websites and online material	66%
State Standards and framework for foreign languages	61%
Video clips of Standards-based classroom lessons	49%
Sample Standards-based thematic units and lesson plans	48%
Other answers (e.g., authentic literature, films; authentic materials, FLTeach, Integrated Performance Assessment, self-designed materials from language classes, real-time classroom observations)	10%

Topics Covered in Methods Course	
Communicative language teaching	94%
Importance of using the target language	93%
Integration of technology	93%
Cultural practices, products, and perspectives	91%
Making input comprehensible	90%
Making content meaningful	90%
Teaching grammar in context	90%
Teaching learning strategies	87%
Interpretive tasks	84%
Interpersonal tasks	84%
Comparing language and cultures	83%
Oral Proficiency Interview and proficiency assessments	83%
Making connections to other subjects	79%
Negotiation of meaning	77%
Using the target language beyond the classroom	69%
Standards-based assessment such as IPA	63%
Preparing learners for lifelong learning	60%

Types of Assignments That Reflect the Methods Course Objectives Related to the Standards	
Observations of language classes	84%
Reflections/reflective papers about observed and/or taught lessons	82%
Design and implementation of Standards-based lessons	79%
Teaching of Standards-based lessons	79%
Observations of lessons by mentor teacher and/or colleague/classmate	76%
Design of thematic unit plans that address Standards	74%
Design of Standards-based assessments	69%
Evaluations of textbooks re: support for Standards-based instruction	62%
Group presentations of activities related to Standards	57%
Evaluations of sample Standards-based instructional units, lessons	54%
Development of Standards-based curricula/course syllabi	43%
Other: technology such as developing websites, customized learner-centered lessons, Standards-based web-quests, inquiry projects, action research	12%

Tasks Methods Students Do That Relate to the Standards	
Design oral, written, and/or multimedia presentational tasks	88%
Select an authentic oral, written, and/or visual text as the basis for a lesson and/or thematic unit	84%
Design lessons that integrate the three modes of communication	84%
Design interpretive listening, reading, and/or viewing activities that develop interpretive strategies	82%
Develop a thematic unit and/or teacher work sample	79%
Design interpersonal activities for learners to engage in speaking that is neither scripted nor memorized	78%
Design lessons that integrate cultural products, practices, perspectives	76%
Design interpersonal activities that feature an information gap	74%
Design an activity that engages learners in investigations of target language communities by accessing Internet sites	71%
Design a task to assess learners' ability to make cultural comparisons of the native and target cultures	66%
Design lessons/activities that engage learners in discussion of L2 cultural perspectives in the target language	62%
Adapt textbook activities to make them more interpersonal and/or communicative	62%
Design lessons that integrate content from other disciplines	60%
Design a task to assess learners' ability to make linguistic comparisons of L1 and L2	57%
Design lessons/activities that engage learners in discussion of second language cultural perspectives in English	51%
Design lessons/activities to help learners develop insights about their native cultures	51%
Design an activity that provides opportunities for learners to communicate with others via technology— i.e., key pals, blogs	51%
Design an assessment tool to assess learners' ability to understand content from other disciplines using L2	50%
Design an activity that provides opportunities for learners to interact with target language communities—i.e., guest speakers, field trips	50%
Design lessons/activities that help learners develop insights about first language (L1) through study of L2	49%
Design an assessment to measure students' understanding of the 3 Ps	41%
Design a task to assess learners' ability to interact with target language communities	34%
Other: All lessons are learner centered and not based on Standards; Student projects in the community; Develop instruction that demonstrates and hopefully develop attitudes of joy and appreciation for language use and communication with others.	4%

## ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

### INFORMATION ABOUT METHODS COURSE

- A large percentage of respondents spend two or more than two semesters preparing their teacher candidates; 38% reported offering two methods courses while 26% reported having four methods courses. This is surprising and a major expansion from a long tradition of a single course. Researchers in the profession may want to conduct a study of the teacher candidates who received multiple methods classes. Are these teacher candidates more effective? What conditions exist at their institutions that allow three and four methods courses to be offered? What was the impetus to expand (e.g., K–12 certification in languages?) How do the teachers with multiple methods courses compare to those who take only one methods course? Is there a noticeable difference in their teaching? Do these teachers remain in the profession longer?
- Most respondents (44%) agreed/strongly agreed that they have enough time to address content in each methods course thoroughly, while 36% were neutral in their opinion. The data may be misleading. A further disaggregation of the data is needed. How do methods professors who teach

only one methods course respond? How do those who teach two, three and four methods courses respond? For professors who have only one semester to teach methods, do they feel as if they have enough time?

- The majority of respondents (86%) indicated that their methods courses are offered for a semester (as opposed to quarter); this may be due to the national trend in the 1990s toward semester calendars in many states for public institutions.
- The largest audience for the methods course is pre-service K–12 teacher candidates (65%), while in-service K–12 teachers were cited as the next largest group (51%), and 49% reported post-secondary teaching assistants/lecturers as their primary audience. Thirty-three percent reported alternative licensure candidates as the audience.

## THE METHODS COURSE AND STANDARDS

### Time Spent Presenting and Expanding on Standards

Approximately one-third of respondents (29%) reported spending 0–10 hours; another one-third (35%) reported spending 10–20 hours; and another one-third reported spending more than 20 hours (22%: 20–40 hours, 14%: more than 40 hours). These numbers indicate that there is a considerable spread in the amount of attention given to Standards as an anchor in the methods course.

### Listing of Three Primary Course Objectives That Relate to the Standards

An analysis of the open-ended responses suggests that methods instructors are focusing on three primary course objectives. Teacher candidates will: (a) design and implement Standards-based, student-centered instruction at the activity, lesson, and unit levels, (b) design and implement Standards-based performance assessments, and (c) differentiate the instruction and assessments according to their students' language proficiency (Novice, Intermediate, Advanced) and grade level (Pre-K to 20). A fourth objective would be that teacher candidates will design tasks and activities that integrate the three modes of communication.

- Only 54 out of 72 (75%) provided a response to the question; however, there are only 52 answers. Interestingly, one left it without any answer and six out of 54 (13%) listed general one-word objectives that may or may not be connected to the Standards. Such respondents listed student assessment, activities, curriculum, and so on. or referred to listening, speaking, and reading as separate skills.
- Although the rest of the respondents listed objectives in relation to the Standards, these objectives varied in their depth and breadth. Only eight respondents (15%) focused on all the Standards, clearly described how the Standards are connected to one another, and connected Standards to assessment. Only 15 respondents (28%) tied assessment to instruction.
- The rest of the programs (57%) listed mainly the Communication Standards. Only five listed the Cultures Standards and five listed content as another Standard. The rest were not specific, and included responses such as “identify the five Cs, familiarity with the state Standards,” etc.

- Only six respondents showed a deep understanding of the connectedness of the Standards versus focusing on one isolated goal area, such as the three modes of Communication, focusing on Culture, or connecting languages with other disciplines.
- Fourteen respondents (25%) listed Standards-based assessments as one of their primary objectives and three (0.5%) mentioned assessment.
- Thirteen respondents identified the Standards as one of the primary course objectives. However, the objective listed is not specific, which makes it hard to evaluate the depth of the objective and how it was measured.

### Resources Used to Address Standards

The majority of respondents (76%) cited the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* as the resource used. This was followed by the professional literature (72%) and then by a textbook (68%) and by websites and online materials (66%). Open-ended responses indicate that the most widely used methods text is *Teacher’s Handbook: Contextualized Language Instruction* by Shrum & Glisan (26 out of 45 responses); eight respondents identified *Teaching Language in Context* by Omaggio-Hadley and five identified *Languages and Children—Making the Match* by Curtain & Dahlberg.

Only 48% of respondents reported using sample Standards-based thematic units and lesson plans. Cited in “other answers” were authentic materials, FLTeach, and the Integrated Performance Assessment.

### Most Frequently Cited Topics Covered in the Methods Course

Communicative language teaching	94%
The importance of using the target language	93%
Integration of technology	93%
Cultural practices, products, and perspectives	91%
Making input comprehensible	90%
Making content meaningful	90%
Teaching grammar in context	90%

#### The least cited topics were:

Preparing learners for lifelong learning	60%
Standards-based assessment such as Integrated Performance Assessments	63%
Using the target language beyond the classroom	69%

This aligns in many ways with the responses from teachers themselves, in that Communication and Culture are considered to be “easiest to teach” and receive the most emphasis and Communities is the goal area that is “hardest to teach” and receives least emphasis. It also confirms data from state supervisors regarding assessment not being developed as extensively as frameworks or other curricular efforts.

## Types of Assignments Required in the Methods Course That Relate to Standards

Observations of language classes (84%) and reflections/reflective papers about observed and/or taught lessons (82%) received the most responses followed by design and implementation of Standards-based lesson plans (79%), teaching of Standards-based lessons (79%), and observations of lesson by mentor teacher and/or a classmate/colleague (76%).

Evaluations of textbooks to assess how they support Standards-based instruction were assigned by 62% of respondents. Fifty-seven percent of respondents assigned group presentations of activities related to Standards. Videotaping of a lesson taught was assigned by 53% of respondents, and development of Standards-based curricula/course syllabi was assigned by 43% of respondents.

## Tasks in Methods Course Related to Standards

The most frequent responses were:	
Design oral, written, and/or multimedia presentational communication tasks	88%
Select an authentic oral, written, and/or visual text as the basis for a lesson and/or thematic unit	84%
Design lessons that integrate the three modes of communication interpretive strategies	84%
Design interpretive listening, reading, and/or viewing activities that develop interpretive strategies	82%
Develop a thematic unit and/or teacher work sample	79%
Design interpersonal activities for learners to engage in interpersonal speaking that is neither scripted nor memorized	78%

The least cited responses were:	
Design a task to assess learners' ability to interact with target language communities	34%
Design an assessment to measure students' understanding of the 3 Ps	41%

Approximately half of respondents reported giving methods students tasks that deal with the Comparisons, Connections, and Communities Standards:	
Design lessons/activities that help learners develop insights about L1 through study of L2	49%
Design an activity that provides opportunities for learners to interact with TL communities	50%
Design an assessment tool to assess learners' ability to understand content from other disciplines using L2	50%
Design an activity that provides opportunities for learners to communicate with others via technology	51%
Design lessons/activities to help learners develop insights about their native cultures	51%

## IMPLICATIONS FROM AN ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

- The length of the methods course may not allow the instructor to focus on the Standards given the many other issues to be addressed in the course.
- The number of hours spent in addressing the Standards seems to be limited in comparison to reading the related literature.
- Surprisingly, the number of respondents who listed that their course objectives relate appropriately to the Standards was low. A large number did not respond at all, and a few referred back to focusing on the skill areas. This might lead us to believe that either the instructors did not know what to write about or they do not know how to address the Standard.

- It is interesting to note that more than half of the instructors did not use samples of the Standards-based thematic units and lessons as one of their resources.
- Dealing with the Standards as isolated areas, methods instructors may feel a need to teach about the Standards versus showing how the 5 Cs were integrated. It is impossible to interpret, interact, and present to the target audiences without proper understanding of the cultural practices, products, and perspectives.
- In examining the topics studied, communicative language teaching, making input comprehensible, making content meaningful, and cultural practices, products, and perspectives, were found to have received higher percentages than addressing interpretive tasks, interpersonal tasks, making content meaningful, comparing language and cultures, and teaching grammar in context. This discrepancy shows us that some instructors do not see how these concepts directly relate to the Standards.
- The use of technology is high, whereas the focus on the Communities goal area is low. It seems that technology was used to locate authentic materials and to deliver presentations. Technology seems to play a lesser role in serving as a means to address the Communities Standard.
- It is clear that teachers depend on reading and becoming familiar with the available body of literature and textbooks rather than examining, analyzing, and showing example of real application of the Standards.
- Some assignments that reflect identified objectives related to the Standards focus on observing language classrooms. It is not clear how the teachers in these classrooms or the mentor teachers are able to be good models for these teachers in addressing the Standards in their teaching.
- The required tasks range from creating full Standards-based thematic units to discrete activities that address one of the Standards.
- When the objectives of the methods instructors, the assignments, and tasks were analyzed, assessment did not appear to be addressed extensively. It seems that assessments have been addressed in isolation, not directly connected to the Standards. There seems to be very little focus on assessing students' abilities to use the language in real-world interaction.

## **RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR DATA AND IMPLICATIONS AND CONFLICTING RESEARCH FINDINGS**

- Current research claims that teachers are moving toward more communicative practices and indeed the topic most identified by methods instructors in their courses is communicative language teaching.
- It has been fairly well-documented that teachers know how to plan and teach activities and assessments involving presentational communication, which was identified most often as a task used by methods instructors.
- It has also been documented that teachers often struggle with assessment and that assessment practices have not caught up with instructional practices. This seems to be confirmed by the fact that the two lowest responses in the task category both deal with assessment design.

## **Surprising Information**

- The vast majority of programs offer between two and four methods courses.
- Assessment seems to be low in priority in methods course.
- It is surprising that designing interpersonal activities was cited as one of the top tasks in the methods course, yet we see an absence of interpersonal communication in foreign language classrooms.

## **Research That Seem Supported by Anecdotal Observations in the Absence of Research**

Lack of treatment of the Communities and Connections goal areas.

## **Greatest Impact of Standards**

- Using the three modes of communication and making communication meaningful
- Shifting from learning about the language into focusing on communicative teaching
- Using the target language as the means of instruction and making it comprehensible
- Teaching grammar in context instead of teaching it in isolation
- Using authentic materials
- Seeing the importance of the products, practices, perspectives of the Cultures Standards
- Creating activities that address the communicative Standards
- Seeing most methods courses use textbook materials that support the Standards

## **Less Impact Than Expected**

- The impact seems to be marginal in the Cultures goal area and minimal in Connections, Comparisons, with the least impact in Communities.
- There does not appear to be a major impact in the area of preparing students to use the language for real-world purposes beyond the classroom and increasing students' interest in continuing their learning beyond the courses they take.
- Regarding the integration of the Standards, it seems as if they are taught to be addressed as separate entities instead of instructors showing how they are interrelated with one another.
- The survey shows that understanding how to align Standards instruction with assessment is still lacking. Some teachers still value measuring what the students learned, rather than measuring what students can do with the language.

# LITERATURE SURVEY

Compiled by: Sally S. Magnan

The work of the Literature Survey Task Force was not part of the electronic survey. However, this Task Force did collect data as part of its development of a searchable bibliography focused on standards. This part of the report will present the findings of the literature search.

## PARAMETERS FOR THE ONLINE DATABASE SEARCH

The Task Force set the dates of inclusion for the database as 1996, when the National Standards were published, through 2009, allowing work to be completed during 2010 with the expectation of identifying all published material through a fixed year (2009).

The first step for finding scholarly works treating the National Standards was identifying a list of potential electronic article and dissertation databases to search.

**The databases used were those in the following list (in alphabetical order). The databases marked (\*) seemed most promising to the Task Force members, so they were searched first, and also searched again for updates in early 2011, just before submission of the compiled database to ACTFL.**

ABSEES (American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies) (EBSCO)  
Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (ABELL)  
Catalog of U.S. Government Publications  
Central and Eastern European Online Library (CEEOL)  
Communication & Mass Media Complete (CMMC)\*  
Communication Abstracts  
Dissertations & Theses @ CIC Institutions (formerly Current Research @CIC Institutions)\*  
Dissertations & Theses (formerly ProQuest Digital Dissertations)\*  
Education Full Text\*  
Educational Administration Abstracts\*  
ERIC - Educational Resources Information Center\*  
H-Net Reviews in the Humanities and Social Sciences  
Humanities Full Text  
Humanities International Index  
InterDok Directory of Published Proceedings\*  
International Bibliography of the Social Sciences  
JSTOR: The Scholarly Journal Archive\*  
LexisNexis Academic\*  
LLBA (Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts)\*  
MLA Directory of Periodicals\*  
MLA International Bibliography (Literature)\*  
Social Science Research Network (SSRN)  
Testing and Education Reference Center

## Search Terms Used

Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century  
Standards Foreign Language Learning  
Foreign Language Standards  
"National Standards" (as an exact term; requires limiting to language, lit, and linguistics)  
National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project  
Standards Foreign Language Education  
"Standards Project" (exact term, limit to 1994–1997)  
"Standards Task Force" (exact term, limit to 1994–1997)  
ACTFL Standards (Standards sometimes are called this)  
"Five C's"  
"Five Cs"  
"Five-C's"  
"Five-Cs"  
"Five-C" (last three are adjectives)  
Perspectives  
Practices  
Products (search these as AND terms, all three)  
Interpersonal Mode  
Interpretive Mode  
Presentational Mode (search these as AND terms, all three; and the last one separately)  
"world language" standards

The second step was to look by hand through volumes with potential for relevant references but that did not appear consistently in the database search.

## Series Reviewed

AAUSC (American Association of University Supervisors, Coordinators and Directors of Foreign Language Programs)  
ACTFL Annual Volumes  
Central States Reports  
Northeast Conference Reports/NECFLT Reviews  
SCOLT Dimensions

Because the search turned up a wide variety of materials beyond those to be included in the ACTFL database (e.g., government documents, newspaper articles), the third step was to reduce the list to include only references from refereed journals, books including those in the targeted series above, and doctoral dissertations.

## SELECTION OF REFERENCES FOR INCLUSION IN SEARCHABLE BIBLIOGRAPHY

Each reference was put into a working database. Each reference was reviewed by a member of the Task Force so that each could be classified in terms of the amount of focus given to the Standards. There were three categories: principal focus, substantial mention, and passing mention.

- **Principal focus:** the whole reference is about the Standards, and this fact is usually noted in the title and/or abstract
- **Substantial mention:** the reference has a section of at least two or three well-developed paragraphs related to the Standards
- **Passing mention:** there is only a note or a one-liner pro forma related to the Standards

References in each of the first two categories (principal focus, substantial mention) were then annotated and keywords were assigned to them for the search engine of the database.

### Categories and Keywords

Degree of Focus	Level
Principal focus	All levels
Substantial mention	Postsecondary
Passing mention	FLES/FLEX
	Elementary
	Middle/Junior high
	High school
	Community/Junior college
	Undergraduate
	Adult education
	Distance education
	Study abroad
	Graduate
	Business
	Special purposes
	Heritage learners
	Native speakers

  

Standards for Foreign Language Learning (5 Cs)
Communication
Cultures
Connections
Comparisons
Communities
All 5 Cs
Standards development projects

## Categories and Keywords (Continued)

Language			
CTL	Estonian	Kumanian	Spanish
LCTL	Ethiopic	Latin	Sumerian
Any/multiple	Finnish	Lingala	Swahili
Afrikaans	French	Lithuanian	Swedish
Akkadian	Georgian	Malayalan	Syriac
Albanian	German	Marathi	Tagalog
Ambaric	Greek, Classical or Modern	Mongolian	Tamazight
Arabic	Haitian Creole	Napali	Tamil
Aramaic	Hausa	Norwegian	Telegu
Armenian	Hawaiian	Old Church Slavonic	Thai
American Sign Language	Hebrew, Biblical or Modern	Persian	Tibetan
Assyrian	Hindi	Polish	Tocharian
Bantu	Hittite	Portuguese	Tswana
Bengali	Hmong	Prakrit	Turkic
Bulgarian	Hungarian	Quechua	Turkish
Cambodian	Icelandic	Russian	Twi
Catalan	Indic	Sanskrit	Ugaritic
Celtic	Indonesian	Scandinavian	Ukrainian
Chinese	Irish	Scottish Gaelic	Uralic
Coptic	Italian	Semitic	Urdu
Czech	Japanese	Serbo Croatian	Vietnamese
Danish	Javanese	Sinhalese	Wels
Dutch	Kabyle	Slavic	Xhosa
Egyptian	Kannada	Slovak	Yiddish
English/ESOL	Khmer	Somali	Yoruba
Esperanto	Korean	Sotho	

Topic Frameworks	Topic Areas
Policy/administrative	Accreditation
Curriculum and program development	Assessment
Theories and methods	Classroom examples
Teachers and teaching	Outcomes
Learners and learning	Proficiency
Research	Research
	Standards
	Technology
	Teacher training

## Source Type

- Book
- Book chapter
- Journal article
- Newspaper article
- Government/policy document
- Other report
- Website

The annotations were up to 75 words in length, written toward the following specification: “The annotation should tell who would benefit from reading the article, which Standard(s) the article addresses, and a summary of the contents of the article. APA style.”

Articles in the third group (passing mention) were included in the database but were not annotated or assigned keywords.

## FINDINGS FROM THE LITERATURE REVIEW

A summary of the database contents constitutes the findings of the Literature Review.

**Impact of the Standards.** With 591 references in the scholarly literature (167 principal focus, 143 substantial mention, 281 passing mention), it is considered that the National Standards have had a major impact on the profession. Of the 310 references classified as principal focus or substantial mention, 173 are in journals, 90 are book chapters, 16 are books, and 40 are dissertations. This distribution would be considered typical of academic dissemination, again suggesting a positive scholarly response to the Standards. The number of publications in different journals suggests how that dissemination is reaching teachers and scholars.

Top Seven Journals by Number of References	
<i>Modern Language Journal</i>	60
<i>Hispania</i>	58
<i>Foreign Language Annals</i>	37
<i>Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German</i>	31
<i>NECTFL Review</i>	27
<i>ADFL Bulletin</i>	27
<i>French Review</i>	15

All three of the commonly taught languages (CTLs) are represented through their journals; in contrast, there is no journal dedicated to a less commonly taught language (LCTL) in this group of top seven journals. *Italica* has six references; *Slavic and East European Journal* has five. Others, including *TESOL Quarterly*, have one. The language distribution is similar, with the top languages found in the Standards literature as follows:

Top Languages Found in the Standards Literature	
Spanish	55
French	40
German	12
Japanese	10
Russian	6
LCTLs without a specific language named	3

These distributions confirm the greater impact of the Standards on commonly taught languages than on less commonly taught languages.

It is often believed that the Standards have had a greater impact on the K–12 level than on the postsecondary level. The 27 references found in the *ADFL Bulletin*, which is devoted nearly exclusively to postsecondary instruction, and also the 60 references in the top-ranking *Modern Language Journal*, whose readership is primarily postsecondary researchers or secondary supervisors would suggest considerable impact, or at least interest in the Standards, from postsecondary colleagues. Looking at the category “level of instruction” directly, we find again, that although K–12 references exceed postsecondary references, there is a substantial number of references relating to the postsecondary level as well.

References to Standards by Level of Instruction	
K–12	121
FLES/FLEX	2
Elementary	31
Middle/Junior High	28
High school	60
Postsecondary	96
All levels	117

This finding is encouraging for the impact of the Standards across instructional levels and promising toward their use in building an articulated program of instruction, K–16, as they profess to do.

It is further noted that in the category “Topic Frameworks,” the largest group by far is “Curriculum and Program Development,” with 212 references, followed by “Teachers and Teaching,” with 148 references, suggesting the classroom impact of the Standards over either a “Policy/Administrative” impact (81 references) or especially over a research impact (cf. “Theories and Methods,” 68; “Learners and Learning,” 60; “Research,” 48). This finding is reinforced by the second largest category in topic area “Classroom Examples,” with 115 references (the first is “Standards,” with 136 examples, a vague label that is hard to interpret in terms of this report). It can be concluded therefore that the major impact of the Standards has been on classroom practice.

## Impact of Each of the 5 Cs

References to Each of the 5 Cs	
All 5 Cs together	184
Cultures	58
Communication	37
Connections	27
Comparisons	18
Communities	18

The large number of references treating all 5 Cs together demonstrates that the profession accepts the integrated nature of the 5 Cs, expressed in the National Standards logo and put forth in the text of the National Standards document. Given the findings of the surveys of the profession from the other Task Forces with this project, it is not surprising that Cultures and Communities are most represented, although we might have anticipated Communication to have more mentions than Cultures. It is intriguing that Connections follows, with notably more frequent mentions than Comparisons and Communities. This result might be related to articles that look to using languages in other disciplines, although references suggesting these uses are not numerous: heritage learners of Spanish (five references) or for special purposes (two references). Communities has often been termed the “Lost C,” with the literature expressing the difficulty in teaching toward Communities and its consideration as an application task after the basic language is learned, a sentiment also found by other Task Forces in this project. These results support notions of Communities, but also of Comparisons, as having a lesser impact on the profession than the other three areas.

If states are looking to develop “power standards,” this literature review would support the selection of Cultures and Communities for that role. It should be noted, however, that all the literature in this survey cites thoughts and work of teachers, administrators, and scholars. There are no references that relate a student perspective. (Note that a recent study funded by the Department of Education done at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, in conjunction with ACTFL, revealed the priority students give to the Communities standards, and also the Communication standards, for aligning with their personal goals for language learning.)

## Review of Conference Sessions

The three conference schedules reviewed, as available electronically, from 1997–2009 (ACTFL, NECTFL, SCOLT) showed presentations in each year.

ACTFL Report, 1998–2008					
<i>Search terms: standard, five, 5c, c's, mode, presentational, interpretive, interpersonal, product, practice, perspective</i>					
Year	CTL (Commonly Taught Language)	LCTL (Less Commonly Taught Language)	General or Both (CTL + LCTL)	Total (Mention of standards)	Total Presentations (Including workshops)
1998	19	9	12	40	450
1999	21	6	12	39	486
2000	--	--	--	--	--
2001	14	5	9	28	514
2002	16	7	9	32	467
2003	13	7	11	35	512
2004	5	6	12	23	622
2005	7	6	10	23	759
2006	2	5	11	18	653
2007	7	6	12	25	682
2008	5	7	11	23	598

### Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (NECTFL) Report

*Search terms: standard, five, 5 c, c's, mode, presentational, interpretive, interpersonal, product, practice, perspective*

Year	Presentations	Exhibitor Sessions	Total	Questionable (Included in previous totals)	French, German, Spanish	Other Languages	General or Both
1998	9	2	11	0	8+1=9	0	1+1=2
1999	19	2	21	0	10	2	7+2=9
2000	15	3	18	0	8+2=10	1	6+1=7
2001	19	2	21	0	7+2=9	1	10+*ESL=11
2002	13	2	15	0	6+1=7	3	4+1=5
2003	12	5	17	0	5+1=6	2+1=3	5+3=8
2004	11	4	15	2	4+2=6	1	6+2=8
2005	13	4	17	2	7+3=10	3	3+1=4
2006	26	3	29	2	16+2=18	7	3+1=4
2007	15	1	16	1	8+1=9	2	5
2008	16	5	21	0	12+2=14	1+2=3	3+1=4
2009	13	5	18	1	5+3=8	2	6+2=8

*Searched the following conference schedules for each year: 1998–2009*

<http://www.dickinson.edu/progr/nectfl/confarchived.html>

### Simplified

Year	Total Presentations	French, German, Spanish	Other Languages	General or Both
1998	11	9	0	2
1999	21	10	2	9
2000	18	10	1	7
2001	21	9	1	11
2002	15	7	3	5
2003	17	6	3	8
2004	15	6	1	8
2005	17	10	3	4
2006	29	18	7	4
2007	16	9	2	5
2008	21	14	3	4
2009	18	8	2	8

### Southern Conference on Language Teaching (SCOLT) Report, 1997–2009

*Manual search terms: standard, five, 5c, c's, mode, presentational, interpretive, interpersonal, product, practice, perspective*

Year	Presentations	Exhibitor Sessions	Total	French, German, Spanish	General or Both	LCTL
1997	16	0	16	4	11	1
1998	17	1	18	9	8	1
1999	12	0	12	6	6	0
2000	8	1	9	3	5	1
2001	10	0	10	4	6	0
2002	5	0	5	3	1	1
2003	5	0	5	3	2	0
2004	6	2	8	3	5	0
2005	7	0	7	5	2	0
2006	5	0	5	3	2	0
2007	9	0	9	5	3	1
2008	8	0	8	3	5	0
2009	12	0	12	7	5	0

### Simplified

Year	CTL	LCTL	General or Both (CTL + LCTL)	Total
1997	4	1	11	16
1998	9	1	8	18
1999	6	0	6	12
2000	3	1	5	9
2001	4	0	6	10
2002	3	1	1	5
2003	3	0	2	5
2004	3	0	5	8
2005	5	0	2	7
2006	3	0	2	5
2007	5	1	3	9
2008	3	0	5	8
2009	7	0	5	12

Considering all three conferences together, the numbers are fairly consistent across years, with the average being 62.3 presentations related to the Standards a year. It is interesting that LCTLs are represented as well as CTLs, especially at ACTFL. Sessions about CTLs are much more numerous at all three conferences in nearly all years, however, with ACTFL 2006 and 2008 being the exception. This sampling of conference presentations attests to continued professional engagement with the Standards among teachers of both CTLs and LCTLs.

# Concluding Remarks and Next Steps

The Task Forces have studied the data from the survey instrument and their analysis is presented in this report. They also identified a number of issues that could be further pursued. These follow-up tasks include gathering additional evidence from state department of education websites and from National Language Resource Centers about Standards-related projects. Additional questions were sent to district supervisors for information about Standards and curriculum and professional development in their schools. Methods instructors submitted syllabi that were scanned to look for commonalities and innovative ways Standards were addressed in these courses. Information gathered from the follow-up activities will be presented in a future publication describing the impact and influence of the Standards.

*Submitted by: June K. Phillips, Project Co-Director*



**ACTFL**  
AMERICAN COUNCIL ON THE  
TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

1001 N. FAIRFAX ST., SUITE 200  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314  
TEL: (703) 894-2900 | [WWW.ACTFL.ORG](http://WWW.ACTFL.ORG)