How Foreign Language Teachers Get Taught: Methods of Teaching the Methods Course

Marcia L. Wilbur
The College Board

Abstract: *This study examined the methodological training of preservice secondary foreign language teachers through the lens of the college methodology course syllabus from 32 participating postsecondary institutions, survey data from the related methods instructors, and questionnaires from 10 of the instructors. The findings indicate that preservice foreign language methodological training, while based on common beliefs that theory informs practice and that the* Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century *(National Standards, 1999) should frame instruction and assessment, is accomplished in a great variety of ways. Most significantly, because there are few courses that address meeting the needs of diverse learners, preservice teachers may not be connecting an eclectic blend of instructional practices to learner needs. There is also evidence that while the* Standards *are recognized in theory as important to instruction, they are not being fully integrated into teaching practices.*

Key words: *best practices, methodology, preservice teachers, teacher training, teaching methods*

Language: *Relevant to all languages*

Introduction

Critics believe that teacher education has "failed to keep pace with the profound sociopolitical changes in society and contributed little to the current efforts to dramatically restructure and reform American K–12 schools" (Imig & Switzer, 1996, p. 213). The challenge is compounded by a lack of connection between the diversity of priorities found in the country's school reform movements and efforts to include preservice teacher education in those movements (Hower, 1996).

The matter is further complicated in the area of foreign language education. Second language (L2) pedagogy has undergone numerous recreations over the past 50 years, largely in response to social forces and to a growing body of knowledge about second language acquisition (SLA) (Schulz, 2000). Current classroom teachers may have learned via the audiolingual or grammar-translation method, experienced the natural approach, seen the birth of the four-skills paradigm, and entered into newer communicative approaches in the late 20th century (Omaggio Hadley, 2001). According to Vélez-Rendón (2002):

Marcia L. Wilbur (PhD, University of Georgia) is the Director of Curriculum and Content Development in the Advanced Placement Program of the College Board, New York City.

The body of knowledge and skills that a second language teacher needed two decades ago is no longer sufficient in today's global and rapidly changing world. While knowledge of subject matter—viewed as grammar and pedagogy—sufficed 20 years ago, today's second language teacher faces challenges that require a wider array of competencies. (p. 461)

And in spite of efforts to renew teaching practices through teacher education, "there is evidence in the general teacher education literature that teacher education programs have little bearing on what preservice teachers do in their classrooms" (Veléz-Rendón, 2002, p. 460). Numerous studies have documented new teachers' and student teachers' complaints that teacher education programs did little to prepare them for "real world" experiences, effective classroom management, and teaching in multicultural settings. Once in the classroom, preservice teachers rely more on their apprenticeship of observation and beliefs than on new theoretical approaches presented in formative courses (Britzman, 1991; Cooper, 2004; Goodlad, 1990; Grossman, 1990; Shulman, 1990; Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998).

Therefore, multiple influences have affected the current state of foreign language preservice teacher training for secondary teachers: new SLA research, school reform, preexisting beliefs, and a slowly changing teacher workforce. Yet another compounding factor is that college-level L2 instructors have reacted more slowly than their secondary counterparts to the adoption of the National Standards as the accepted means of content delivery (Guntermann, 2000). Vélez-Rendón (2002) states, "While it is true that many second language teacher educators are seasoned and reflective thinkers, it is also true that many need to rethink their roles and renew their practices" (p. 464).

The Study Questions

For these reasons, I set out to establish a baseline of data regarding the current state of foreign language preservice methods education, with the following questions in mind:

1. What is the current content of postsecondary foreign language methods courses that prepare future secondary teachers, as reflected in the course syllabi?
2. How do postsecondary foreign language methods instructors address the development of pedagogical content knowledge in preservice secondary teachers?
3. How do postsecondary foreign language methodology instructors guide future secondary teachers to make connections between theory and practice?

Data Gathering Methods

The goal for participation was determined to be a minimum of 30 postsecondary preservice methods instructors (i.e., university instructors of future secondary foreign language teachers) across the United States to ensure a sufficient quantity of data for a baseline study. Invitations to participate in the study were sent electronically to 54 instructors identified by Internet searches as individuals who were responsible for delivering preservice foreign language methodology training to future secondary teachers. Instructors who were identified as providing methodology training to graduate teaching assistants for college-level instruction were excluded from this study. Data were received from 32 participants, although one instructor provided questionnaire responses only. The size, location, and type of institution were not limited. The data were solicited in the form of a survey (see Appendix A) accompanied by a letter of request that asked for a copy of the methods instructors' course syllabus. The purpose of the survey was to gain a sense of the postsecondary methods instructors' backgrounds and experiences. Ten randomly selected participants completed a questionnaire designed to elicit additional data

about the metl
(see Appendix
one-third of t
sufficient cross
provide reliabi
tionnaire instr
by three other
2003, which re
prior to use in

Data Analy

The instructo
ed quantitativ
instructor qu
lyzed from an
perspective us
Huberman, 1
data analysis c
data sorting ca
published lite
and preservic
& Hubermar
2000). I creat
combination c
and of data
remaining da
to patterns c
LeCompte (2
tified by a let
etc.) and ente
origin of the
to signify whe
dent in a spe
process also
the manual c
identified rep
from the sylla
of Microsoft
data had bee
categorized.
and categoriz
ent syllabi ir
mity of the p
Appendix C
enumeration

As an
because the
the Preparati
(2002) repre
sional bench

about the methodology instructors' beliefs (see Appendix B). Questionnaire data from one-third of the participants provided a sufficient cross-section of the sampling to provide reliability. The survey and questionnaire instruments were peer-reviewed by three other researchers and piloted in 2003, which resulted in minor adjustments prior to use in the current study.

Data Analysis Methods

The instructor survey data were tabulated quantitatively (see Appendix A). The instructor questionnaire data were analyzed from an inductive analysis research perspective using open coding (Miles & Huberman, 1994). I engaged in archival data analysis on the syllabi, using thematic data sorting categories as established by the published literature on SLA, methodology, and preservice teacher preparation (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Ryan & Bernard, 2000). I created tables of data based on a combination of the aforementioned themes, and of data groupings created with any remaining data, clustering them according to patterns of similarity as described by LeCompte (2000). Each syllabus was identified by a letter or number (A, B, C, 1, 2, etc.) and entered in tables to represent the origin of the data. By using the letter codes to signify when the course content was evident in a specific syllabus, an enumerative process also was established. In addition to the manual clustering of the syllabi data, I identified representative key words derived from the syllabi and used the search feature of Microsoft Word to further ensure that all data had been captured and appropriately categorized. Two peer reviewers each coded and categorized the contents of two different syllabi in an effort to establish uniformity of the process and the categories. See Appendix C for a sample data sorting table, enumerations, and an example key word.

As an additional consideration, because the *ACTFL Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers* (2002) represent the most proximal professional benchmark to the point in time of the delivery of the methods course within preservice programs, the findings also were examined through that lens. These standards comprise two components, Program Standards and Content and Supporting Standards. The Program Standards outline the recommended components of successful preservice teacher programs, and the Content and Supporting Standards outline the evidence that preservice teachers should demonstrate as proof of attained competencies.

To maximize validity, I used a combination of data triangulation and methodological triangulation as defined by Denzin (as cited in Mathison, 1988, p. 14). Open coding, thematic analysis, and quantitative methods generated the final data. The questionnaire and syllabi data corroborate each other on several points.

Study Limitations

Readers are reminded that this study represents but a sample of preservice methodology training across the United States. Because the study included primarily an archival analysis of the course syllabi, it cannot completely account for the all of the classroom interactions during methodological training, nor can it assume the experiences within each teacher-preparation program designed to complement or to enhance the methods course. The study assumes that the preservice methods instructors' syllabi are a close reflection of the course content, and that the topics, texts, projects, and assessments combined within, taken in light of the survey and questionnaire data, serve to establish a suggested baseline of the current state of preservice foreign language methodology course content.

The Participants, Their Experiences, and Their Programs

Of the 32 participating postsecondary instructors, 29 were from public institutions and 3 were from private institutions; the instructors came from 16 different states. Based on the participating instruc-

tors' names, 22 were female and 10 were male. The sizes of their institutions were evenly distributed and varied from small (1,000 to 9,000 undergraduates) to very large (30,000 to 39,000 undergraduates). Program sizes ranged from 2 to 25 students, with 12 programs serving 5 or fewer students. Most programs fell into a middle range, with numbers of enrolled preservice teachers in the teens.

Twenty-one of the methods instructors were full-time postsecondary personnel, tenure-track faculty at the assistant, associate, or full professor level. The remaining instructors were either graduate teaching assistants or adjunct faculty. More than two-thirds of the instructors wanted to teach the course, adding comments that they enjoyed this work. In the words of one instructor, "It is my chosen and prepared professional field." The remaining instructors were either assigned to teach the methods course or taught it for reasons not listed in this survey. Twenty-one instructors worked within the institution's foreign language department, 9 were members of the School of Education or related department, and 2 instructors were members of both foreign language and education departments.

The instructors' language backgrounds included the European languages traditionally represented in U.S. schools: Spanish, French, and German. One polyglot claimed fluency in five languages including Italian and Portuguese. A total of 11 instructors noted fluency in two or more foreign languages.

Table 1 provides the range of the instructors' secondary experience combined with the time lapse in years since those experiences occurred.

The 10 instructor questionnaire respondents underscored the connection between secondary classroom experience and successful methods instruction with statements like, "I feel the time I spent in the classroom has given me invaluable expertise that I can share with beginning and experienced teachers," and "I think it is imperative that a foreign language methods instructor have been a classroom teacher for several years. Otherwise, they cannot possibly have the credibility, requisite experience, and background to relate theory to practice." The instructors explained how their classroom experience influenced the delivery of the methods course, wanting it to be very "hands-on and learner-centered."

Program Standard 4 addresses the need for a methods course taught by a foreign language specialist "whose expertise is foreign language education and who is knowledgeable about current instructional approaches and issues." Only one of the syllabi received was representative of a general methods course designed to serve across content areas. This study likely does not represent the gamut of possible methodological experiences for foreign language teachers, but rather provides a cross-section sampling of what foreign language-specific methods course content might look like. Program Standard 4 as well as Content

TABLE 1

Methods Instructors' Secondary Classroom Experience

Years of Experience	Time Since Secondary Classroom Experience				
	No experience	0–5 years ago	6–10 years ago	11–15 years ago	>15 years ago
No experience	4				
1–5 years			1	4	2
5–10 years		1		1	6
More than 10 years		5	3	2	3

and Supporting S
the instructors sh
methodological t
vice teachers with
justify and fram
The fact that 18
study had secon
decade ago creat
part to ensure th
pedagogical prac
attending confere
oratively with co
eign language tea
the cyclical sprea
gies (Schultz, 20

Findings and

The syllabi data
analysis categori
professional lite
cited below, aca
general areas es
of preservice te
novice teachers'
ment of the pr
ing reflective pra
developing cont
as pedagogical
linking theory to
National Standa
affective conside
process of foreig
tion. Additional
the areas of L2 t
and field experi
represented how
ponents were cl
The categories
sented below ir
literature.

The Influence Teacher Identi

Lortie (1975)
beliefs about te
13,000 previous
vation. Based c
observation," te
their education
formed notions

and Supporting Standard 3 do suggest that the instructors should be aware of current methodological trends and provide preservice teachers with sufficient SLA theory to justify and frame instructional practices. The fact that 18 of the instructors in the study had secondary experiences over a decade ago creates an obligation on their part to ensure that their own beliefs and pedagogical practices remain up to date by attending conferences and dialoging collaboratively with contemporary secondary foreign language teachers in an effort to thwart the cyclical spread of outdated methodologies (Schultz, 2000; Vélez-Rendón, 2002).

Findings and Discussion

The syllabi data were sorted according to analysis categories as established by the professional literature. Based on studies cited below, academicians have identified general areas essential to the preparation of preservice teachers: recognizing that novice teachers' beliefs affect the development of the professional self, encouraging reflective practice and action research, developing content area expertise as well as pedagogical content knowledge, and linking theory to practice. SLA theory, the National Standards, cognitive theory, and affective considerations further inform the process of foreign language teacher education. Additional data categories emerged in the areas of L2 teacher fluency, assessment, and field experiences. The new categories represented how or where the course components were classified within the syllabi. The categories of data findings are presented below in light of the professional literature.

The Influence of Teacher Beliefs on Teacher Identity

Lortie (1975) postulates that novices' beliefs about teaching emerge from their 13,000 previous hours of classroom observation. Based on this "apprenticeship of observation," teachers in training arrive at their education coursework with intricately formed notions about teaching and teacher behaviors (Britzman, 1991; Grossman, 1990; Wideen, Mayer-Smith, & Moon, 1998). Novices use previous teachers as models or antimodels to shape their own practices (Veléz-Rendón, 2002).

Six of the 10 instructor questionnaire respondents noted that they reflect on their own language acquisition to guide their personal beliefs about SLA, classroom best practices, and, by extension, the methodology they present to preservice teachers. Their personal experiences in the military, the Peace Corps, travel, work, and study abroad have further informed their opinions. They have realized that good grades obtained on discrete assessments during their own foreign language learning did not always translate into communicative competence.

Thirteen of the 31 courses in this study contained content that expressly addressed the assumptions and beliefs that preservice teachers hold. The most common data type, occurring in 12 instances, consisted of preservice teachers' development of a personal philosophy about foreign language teaching and learning. In one course, the instructor asked preservice teachers to reflect on their beliefs and assumptions about foreign language teaching at the onset of the semester; at semester's end, the preservice teachers were asked to consider how those beliefs had been reshaped because of knowledge gained in the methods course.

L2 Teacher Fluency

Foreign language teacher preparation is further complicated by the need for novices to develop a high level of fluency in the language they will teach. Program Standards 1 and 2 and Content and Supporting Standard 1 address the critical role of the development of preservice teachers' L2 fluency. Schulz (2000) cites a failure of university programs to provide new foreign language teacher candidates with the necessary proficiency as a major problem in language teacher education. Because of their lack of proficiency, novice teachers shun more communicative methodologies and rely instead

0297-6

on traditional, grammar-focused teaching. One of this study's instructor participants felt, as well, that the greatest impediment to a novice teacher's success was a lack of strong language skills. She wrote, "If they can't speak [the target language] well, they will not use the language as much in their own classrooms nor can they raise the level of their students above their own level." Cooper (2004) reported that one of novices' greatest deficiencies was in the area of L2 proficiency, and Clement (2003) noted that the candidates recognized their own L2 deficiency as detrimental to the complete success of their student teaching experience.

Liskin-Gasparro (1999) explains why novice teachers may lack the proficiency they need to perform in L2 at the prescribed "advanced-low" level:

> Language departments and teacher-preparation programs are both constrained by wider educational and social forces. That the linguistic proficiency of beginning teachers is a major topic of concern in [foreign language] professional circles is related to such realities as the limited place of foreign languages in K-12 curricula and the marginalized status generally of speakers of languages other than English in the United States. It is one of the great ironies of the late twentieth century that initiatives to improve the linguistic proficiency of beginning foreign language teachers exist side-by-side in state legislatures with language policy measures that discourage the development and maintenance of bilingualism. (p. 285)

Novice teachers may not arrive at their university-level studies having already attained a working fluency in L2. And, given their need to fulfill all of the certification and general graduation requirements, they may not be able to pursue an adequate number of postsecondary classes in the L2 to achieve the prescribed performance levels.

This assumes that the univ-level courses deliver language proficiency

The instructors in this study specifically identified three impediments to preservice teacher proficiency:

1. The instructional delivery strategies by which novice teachers learned L2 in high school or in college. Glisan, Levy, and Phillips (2005) cite outdated traditional postsecondary L2 instruction as problematic to SLA and the perceptions about teaching gained by preservice teachers during their university foreign language courses.
2. The traditional college major curriculum that includes a great deal of literature studies beyond the first four semesters of language acquisition courses. L2 majors are more likely to listen to lectures, take notes, consider literary analysis, and perhaps discuss the literature in English. Tesser and Long (2000) discuss the great divide between the language and literature departments in traditional programs, citing these same difficulties.
3. Novices' own personal desire to improve fluency, as well as their beliefs about how to best achieve it. Because of their apprenticeship of observation, inseparable from the methods under which they learned the foreign language, they may believe that they already have enough language competency to teach well, when in fact they can only perform in set paradigms and do not possess the overall linguistic skills to lead their own students to fluency.

Based on the syllabi data in the current study, fewer than one-third of the courses—eight to be exact—recommend any levels of preservice teacher fluency as an important step toward becoming a secondary foreign language teacher. It is possible that methodology instructors consider or assume that L2 proficiency is developed elsewhere in the undergraduate curriculum, since a program requirement would not necessarily be contained within the methodology course syllabus. Because Lafayette (1993) posits that, in addition to L2 proficien-

cy, new foreign
strong backgrou
SLA theories, ar
applied to instr
pedagogical con
fluency should l
of the methods
junction with d
target language
salient to the lea
paraphrasing, ra

Connecting Th

The literature c
of theory into
ing essential (C
& Walter, 199
instructor quest
a solid foundati
the ability to r
theory and peda
as essential fo
expressed it this
ers, students n
are successful f
For this reason
favor equippin
classroom strat
rationale for th
Reflecting on t
of the primar
students made
tion. For exam
dents to keep sc
in which conn
classroom obse
ings. Eighteen c
ten about theo
syllabi themsel
to which the
that students
tice.

The Role of SI Practices

One of the q
language educa
to acquire a sec
factor for the t
learn a second

0247-7

cy, new foreign language teachers need a strong background in applied linguistics, SLA theories, and how language theory is applied to instruction, in the context of pedagogical content knowledge, L2 teacher fluency should be an expected component of the methods course considered in conjunction with delivering instruction in the target language and how to make language salient to the learners (by using scaffolding, paraphrasing, rate of speech, etc.).

Connecting Theory to Practice

The literature considers the incorporation of theory into preservice methods training essential (Guntermann, 1993; Tedick & Walter, 1995). In this study, several instructor questionnaire participants listed a solid foundation in SLA theory as well as the ability to make connections between theory and pedagogical content knowledge as essential for novices. One instructor expressed it this way: "As developing teachers, students need multiple strategies that are successful for a learner-centered class." For this reason, the instructors seemed to favor equipping preservice teachers with classroom strategies and undergirding the rationale for those strategies with theory. Reflecting on teaching practices was one of the primary ways that methodology students made the theory–practice connection. For example, 13 courses required students to keep some sort of reflective journal in which connections were made between classroom observations and assigned readings. Eighteen courses required papers written about theoretical topics, although the syllabi themselves do not reveal the extent to which the theoretical papers required that students make connections to practice.

The Role of SLA Theory and Classroom Practices

One of the questions central to foreign language education is what is the best way to acquire a second language. It is a critical factor for the teacher who probably had to learn a second language and for the student who may be subjected to a plethora of methodologies, all promising to lead to L2 fluency. The foreign language profession has endured countless fads and methodological swings, each proposing content delivery strategies and claims to raise achievement for all students. Hargreaves (1994) explains:

> Today's solutions often become tomorrow's problems. Future exhibits in our museums of innovation might include whole-language, cooperative learning, or manipulative math. Singular models of expertise which rest on supposedly certain research bases are built on epistemological sand. (p. 60)

One overarching concept cuts across all SLA theories—input. VanPatten states, " . . . in all elaborated theories of acquisition, input is fundamental for acquisition and is needed for the creation of an underlying mental representation of the linguistic system" (2002, p. 763). Only L2 teachers have the added burden of creating activities for students in which both the content and the language to discuss the content together form instruction. This unique feature of language teaching creates special challenges and considerations in the preparation of new foreign language teachers (Sullivan, 2001).

I placed all syllabi content for this study that appeared to present ways of understanding SLA and discussions of specific methodologies into the theory category. This data category focused on the what vs. the how, or in other words, on preservice teachers' learning about methodologies rather than their engaging in discussions or practice regarding the application of the methods. The overarching theories in the syllabi related to SLA, the big picture of methodology, and the grounding of best practices in SLA theory.

After those three larger groupings of data, no remaining data categories appeared prolifically across the syllabi. Rather, individual courses seemed to present highly

specific types of theories such as sociocultural theory, pragmatics, and a variety of methodological models. Krashen's Input Hypothesis (1992), Total Physical Response Storytelling (TPRS) (Ray & Seely, 2002), and communicative language teaching were the most frequently repeated course topics after the three primary subclassifications. Syllabus R stood out as being particularly focused on theory more than on any practical applications of those theories. Syllabus A contained a heavy emphasis on the use of TPRS as a methodology, devoting six entire class meetings to this topic. Also noteworthy is that Syllabi H, N, and S had no theoretical mentions. A wide range of opinions and choices about the best manner to deliver L2 instruction was evidenced by the long list of singular methodologies listed by just one program. There was obviously great diversity in the treatment of SLA theory and in the connections between theory and practice across the methodology courses. The theoretical and instructional debate remains as to what that input should look or sound like in an instructionally mediated environment.

I examined the instructors' backgrounds to determine if there was any connection between the amount of secondary classroom experience and the treatment of theory in the methods course. Syllabi H, N, and S had no theoretical mentions. Syllabi A, O, V, and Z had the most prevalent theoretical course content, based on the number of instances that theory was mentioned in the syllabi. The instructors' backgrounds compared to the amount of theoretical instruction as evident in their corresponding syllabi are contrasted in Table 2.

The two groups have PhD and non-PhD faculty, located in both schools of education/curriculum and foreign language departments, and their secondary experiences range from current to several years earlier. Clearly, no assumption can be made between the emphasis (or lack of emphasis) on theoretical learning and the instructor's secondary teaching background. It is also interesting to note that for the seven courses listed in Table 2, the Omaggio Hadley (2001) text, considered more theoretical than others, is only used in course Z.

This finding serves as an example of the great variation in the content of methodology instruction. The profession has not yet agreed upon and adopted a way to effectively balance theory with the remaining instructional topics. And although much of the syllabi content appears to be influ-

TABLE 2

Comparison of Instructor's Background and Theoretical Course Content

"Heavy" Theory Syllabus		"Light" Theory Syllabus	
A	Current part-time secondary teaching experience, assistant professor in a FL department	H	Over 20 years of secondary experience 5 years ago, instructor in a FL department
O	5–10 years secondary experience 6–10 years ago, lecturer in a FL department	N	6–10 years experience over 10 years ago, adjunct faculty in a school of education
V	More than 10 years secondary experience over 15 years ago, associate professor in a school of education	S	Over 10 years of experience 6–10 years ago, instructor in a FL department
Z	3 years secondary experience, doctoral student in a curriculum department		

enced by the ins
beliefs, again, th
that indicates th
tor backgrounds
instructor behav
content showed
an array of theo
presented to the
didates. The pr
struggling with
practices, confo
methodologies t
promoted as res
quest to identi
practices as dete

Primary sou
edge in the n
texts and suppl
frame the othe
the weekly cl
listed in the sy
topics from the
The three mos
in preservice
Standards for F
in the 21st Cer
1999), *Teacher's*
Language Instru
(2000), and *Tea*
by Omaggio H
resource was
courses require
subscribe to th
complete metho
classroom tech
or post reflectio
providing multi
act electronical
language teache

Standards

With the gro
Standards for l
in the 21st Cer
1999), "At last
of anticipated c
upon which to
tion from elen
(Seabold & Wa
the clear articu

enced by the instructors' backgrounds and beliefs, again, there is no common thread that indicates that certain types of instructor backgrounds will translate into parallel instructor behaviors. Rather, syllabi course content showed that instructors espoused an array of theories and methodologies as presented to their preservice teacher candidates. The profession is obviously still struggling with the identification of best practices, confounded by the plethora of methodologies that have been devised and promoted as responses to the profession's quest to identify effective instructional practices as determined by SLA research.

Primary sources of theoretical knowledge in the methods course were the texts and supplemental readings used to frame the other course content. Indeed the weekly class discussion topics as listed in the syllabi generally referenced topics from the text or the reading list. The three most commonly used books in preservice methods courses were: *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (National Standards, 1999), *Teacher's Handbook: Contextualized Language Instruction,* by Shrum and Glisan (2000), and *Teaching Language in Context,* by Omaggio Hadley (2001). One more resource was the *FLTeach* listserv; 10 courses required that preservice teachers subscribe to the site's discussion groups, complete methodological models, consider classroom technological implementation, or post reflections to the discussion board, providing multiple opportunities to interact electronically with practicing foreign language teachers.

Standards

With the growing acceptance of the *Standards for Foreign Language Learning in the 21st Century* (National Standards, 1999), "At last there is a useful framework of anticipated content knowledge and skills upon which to build models for articulation from elementary school to college" (Seabold & Wallinger, 2000, p. 3). Prior to the clear articulation of student outcomes, the profession engaged in debates about methodology without first having agreed on what the result should look like.

Because the Standards are theory-based, they also serve to inform and undergird teaching practices. One can have knowledge about and an understanding of the Standards without fully understanding how to practically integrate them into curriculum planning, instruction, and assessment. A survey of midwestern foreign language teachers suggested that although teachers are aware of the Standards and believe that foreign language instruction should take place in the target language using communicative approaches, foreign language instruction usually follows a coverage model (Chaffee, 1992), where the course content is determined by the textbook and teaching is viewed as the transfer of information (Allen, 2002). The suggested implication for preservice foreign language teacher education is that:

> Because their language learning experiences were most likely guided by the coverage model, [preservice teachers] need exposure to other models that are based on contextualized, meaningful language use . . . [they] may benefit from opportunities to experiment and to interpret Standards-based models in the context of their own . . . circumstances. (Allen, 2002, p. 525)

Within the Standards lie important instructional components—goal areas, content standards, and sample progress indicators—with which preservice teachers must be familiar if the Standards are to achieve the desired impact. The instructors surveyed also believed that preservice foreign language teachers should have an awareness of the Standards as well as an understanding of "pedagogical directions in the field."

Nineteen of the 31 courses identified an understanding of Standards-based instruction, planning, and assessment in the syllabus. However, fewer than half of the courses, based on the language in

their syllabi, included the discussion of practical ways to achieve application of the Standards to a variety of instructional areas. Only 10 syllabi noted discussions about integrating the Standards into assessment, and eight provided for the creation of Standards-based lessons. Thus, although there appears to be a movement toward incorporating the Standards into instruction, how to achieve that integration does not have a prominent, widespread place in the syllabi examined.

Subject-Area Expertise and Pedagogical Content Knowledge

Knowing how to impart content knowledge in a variety of ways so as to promote student achievement is essential for classroom success (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 1999; Britzman, 1991; Grossman, 1990; Grossman & Stodolsky, 1995). Not knowing how to be an effective classroom instructor leads to reduced satisfaction on the part of both students and teachers, which in turn leads to new teacher attrition (Gold, 1996; Smith & Ingersoll, 2003; Wilkerson, 2000).

Shulman (1990) proposed pedagogical content knowledge as a theoretical construct for preservice teacher educators to think about how teachers learn to engage in teaching practices. Feiman-Nemser and Parker (1995) organized the development of pedagogical content knowledge around four aspects of learning to teach academic knowledge: (1) Deepening one's own understanding of a subject matter, (2) learning to think about academic content from the students' perspective, (3) learning to represent subject matter in appropriate and engaging ways, and (4) learning to organize students for teaching and learning academic content. These authors maintain that teacher educators assume novices have acquired a sufficient body of academic knowledge, and therefore treat pedagogy as something separate from content.

In foreign language teaching, academic knowledge can be described as both knowledge about the target cultures and sufficient L2 competency. A lack of language ability is one of supervising teachers' primary criticisms of student teachers (Cooper, 2004). Feiman-Nemser and Parker (1995) found that not all of the beginners who participated in their study demonstrated a thorough knowledge of content, and yet they concluded that by working with experienced teachers, the novices could improve on content as well as on how to present information to students. In other words, even equipped with a high level of L2 fluency, without the ability to engage students, all that remains is a subject area expert, not a teacher. According to Feiman-Nemser and Parker:

> Beginning teachers do not have a large repertoire of strategies for presenting their content, nor do they have a grounded understanding of what students are like as learners . . . and what problems students may encounter in learning specific content. (p. 33)

Feimen-Nemser and Parker (1995) also discuss the need to teach novices how to organize students for learning. This represents the intersection of pedagogical content knowledge and classroom management. If one considers classroom management from a content-driven perspective, it is knowing how to establish ". . . appropriate routines and procedures, communicate clear expectations, [and] manage different types of tasks and activities . . ." (p. 41) as appropriate for different types of learners that leads to the most effective presentation and retention of new material.

For the purposes of sorting the syllabi data related to the current study, I included any reference to teaching skills, specific classroom strategies, "how to" topics, and any other techniques related to instructional delivery in this data cluster. This section could be called "for the classroom." As one of the largest data categories, it encompassed all of the bits and pieces of teaching tips and strategies intended to enhance content delivery.

The first and most striking finding is that while 26 of the 31 syllabi acknowledge the National Standards, 20 of the syllabi continue to approach instructional delivery in a "four-skills" manner: teaching reading, teaching writing, teaching speaking, and teaching listening. Only Syllabus Q showed full organization of all course content within the constructs of the three modes: interpersonal, interpretive, and presentational. Fourteen of the syllabi specifically targeted the teaching of grammar as a class discussion topic. Some instructors couched the teaching of grammar within more proficiency-based models while others did not.

Nine of the syllabi listed 10 or more separate topics related to instructional delivery. Definite patterns of common course content (two or more similar topics) existed across these nine syllabi with a significant focus on pedagogical content knowledge, such as: oral interpersonal and presentational skills, the writing process, pre- and postreading, culture, the use of authentic materials, teaching culture through literature, grammar in communicative teaching, error correction, incorporating vocabulary, making instruction comprehensible, and varying teaching strategies to meet the needs of diverse learners. This list of common course content might represent a baseline of teaching skills for preservice teachers. It is appropriate that the list of basic teaching skills is lengthy. Cooper (2001) advocates a sufficient variety of instructional strategies to meet the needs of individual teaching styles and personalities. The larger question becomes, how much pedagogical content knowledge is enough for the beginning teacher's repertoire? According to the instructor questionnaires included in this study, equipping preservice teachers with multiple strategies for the classroom is crucial. The gamut of instructional strategies presented across the syllabi was truly vast; the methods instructors collectively suggested 30 different types of instructional theories and 38 unique classroom strategies. Of greater concern are the seven preservice methods courses, which spend very little time on pragmatic classroom strategies. Feiman-Nemser and Parker (1995) cited the lack of a sufficient teaching repertoire as one of the greatest challenges facing new teachers.

The role of practice in learning to teach, so as to hone pedagogical content knowledge and to fully understand the implementation of theory, was highlighted as necessary in the professional literature (Smagorinsky, Cook, & Johnson, 2003; Vygotsky, 1987). The value of practice teaching in this study was shown by the large number of microteaching assignments across the syllabi. Twenty courses achieved the objective of providing preservice teachers with simulated classroom experiences by requiring them to make presentations in the methods class. The microteaching experiences were peer-critiqued, used as a source for self-reflection, and evaluated by the methods instructors. Preservice teachers were required to provide varying degrees of documentation to accompany the microteaching, ranging from complete lesson plans with objectives and assessments to only the materials needed to deliver the microlesson demonstration itself. Other forms of practice teaching included presenting a technology-based lesson in eight courses and videotaping a lesson with actual secondary students in four of the courses. By examining the instances of microteaching and other forms of practice teaching, combined with the number of mentions in the syllabi on the topic of instructional delivery (such as specific methods and classroom strategies), it can safely be concluded that four of the courses contained little or no pragmatic course content related to the development of preservice teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. These four courses focused instead on theoretical topics.

Teaching Culture

Based on Standard 3, culture is intended to cut across the language teaching experience and to be woven into the basic fabric of for-

eign language teaching. Twenty-two of the courses included the teaching of culture as evidenced in the pedagogical content knowledge syllabi data. The syllabi also addressed the teacher's role in mediating culture within the social context of the classroom and the local community. However, when examining the course evaluation components of the methodology classes, culture appeared to be a sideline experience. While some of the microteaches and class presentations were required to be on a cultural topic, for the most part, practice teaching was performed on language topics (i.e., how to teach a particular grammatical feature, how to teach listening).

Teaching Reading

Literature appears as another important program component in Standard 3. In keeping with Krashen's i + 1 theory of comprehensible input, reading becomes an excellent source of new learning and vocabulary acquisition (Krashen, 1985). However, given the apprenticeship of observation model (Lortie, 1975) for teaching reading strategies to beginning and intermediate students (or lack of model if reading was an infrequent activity), teachers may lack the necessary methodology for transmitting those skills. As a result of their own language learning experiences, the only teaching of reading some preservice teachers have seen was in upper-level L2 literature courses they attended as students (Ruiz-Funes, 1999; Tesser & Long, 2000). Bernhardt claims that "most trained teachers have only had between one and six hours of instruction in the teaching of reading" (1991, p. 177).

A further complication of the issue can be seen in an examination by Gascoigne (2002) of the treatment of reading in an assortment of beginning college-level L2 textbooks. She concluded that the treatment of L2 reading was absent or lacked pre- and postreading strategies for students and teachers. Tesser and Long call for the "explicit teaching of reading in all classes," and define explicit as "making salient . . . the *process* that guides our negotiation with a text to acquire or create meaning from it" (2000, p. 606, emphasis in the original).

Although teaching reading appears in the pedagogical content knowledge section of 21 syllabi, teaching language through literature is evident in only two. None of the questionnaire participants specifically noted the teaching of L2 reading as among the most important concepts to convey to preservice teachers. These instructors targeted bigger-picture ideas such as: ". . . understanding how to apply SLA theory to the process of designing curriculum, instruction, and assessment." Two questionnaire respondents indicated that preservice teachers needed to know how to use authentic materials in the classroom, which might imply instruction in the teaching of reading, but the connection was not explicit. There could be an assumption that preservice teachers will know how to teach literature based on their observations as students of literature, or that their own students must learn the language before they have the tools to unpack the literature (Tesser & Long, 2000). The challenge to secondary L2 methodology instruction is helping teachers know how to make the literature accessible to students and take them beyond surface-level comprehension and into critical thinking in the L2. Unless foreign language teachers recognize that reading authentic pieces can be a rich source of input, they may sidestep this skill in favor of interpersonal modes of communication (Wilbur, 2006).

Learner Diversity

Next, the instructional focus turns to the student. Providing instruction for diverse groups of learners weighed in as pedagogically important in the literature, and having a sufficient array of teaching strategies to account for learner diversity is very much related to pedagogical content knowledge (Bailey, Daley, & Onwuegbuzie, 1999; Bragger & Rice, 1999; Cooper, 2001; Gardner & Walters, 2001; Hodge, 1998).

Learner diversity
the courses inclu

All of the s
the consideratio
as a goal or a c
primary focus v
variety of instr
new material co
ers. Diversity h
ages, learning st
physical challe
emotional welln
under the studer
instructors requ
teachers include
accommodation

A small am
related assessm
stated in the syl
effective technic
dents of differ
included the fo
ment to identif
promote studer
deny students
tunities." It wo
3 understands t
students' confid
in keeping with
motivation (19

Learner Div Strategies

The professiona
reminds us that
variety of learn
learn metacogni
egies that acc
and increase l
invaluable (Bra
1982; Ellis, 19
& Mayer, 198
acknowledgem
the importance
In the area of l
included a go
would underst
that reflect lear
may differ in
ing) and create

Learner diversity was a nonissue in six of the courses included in this study.

All of the syllabi except six included the consideration of learner diversity either as a goal or a class discussion topic. The primary focus was being familiar with a variety of instructional strategies so that new material could be salient to the learners. Diversity had several faces; students' ages, learning styles, cultural backgrounds, physical challenges, special needs, and emotional wellness were among the topics under the student diversity umbrella. Three instructors required that their preservice teachers include modifications or learner accommodations for every lesson delivery.

A small amount of data in the syllabi related assessments to student diversity, stated in the syllabi data as, "Demonstrate effective techniques for evaluating FL students of differing abilities." Syllabus 3 included the following goal: "Use assessment to identify student strengths and to promote student growth rather than to deny students access to learning opportunities." It would appear that Instructor 3 understands the importance of building students' confidence in their L2 abilities, in keeping with Ellis' concept of resultative motivation (1997).

Learner Diversity and Learning Strategies

The professional literature about cognition reminds us that in addition to teaching to a variety of learning styles, helping students learn metacognitive skills and specific strategies that accelerate their own learning and increase long-term retention can be invaluable (Bransford, et al., 1999; Brown, 1982; Ellis, 1997; Oxford, 1989; Weinstein & Mayer, 1986). There was widespread acknowledgement in the syllabi collected of the importance of individual learning styles. In the area of learner diversity, 24 courses included a goal that preservice teachers would understand instructional practices that reflect learner diversity (how students may differ in their approaches to learning) and create instructional opportunities that are equitable and adaptable to diverse learners–exceptional students as well as those in at-risk categories. In contrast, the inclusion of class discussions about teaching learning strategies was evident in only one-third of the preservice courses. Because most preservice language teachers have developed a love of and a talent for foreign languages, they may have a difficult time helping students for whom SLA is more challenging. Equipping preservice teachers with various learning strategies should go hand in hand with the development of teaching strategies.

Behavior and Motivation

Another of the data categories established by the professional literature is that of affective considerations (Campbell, 1991; Ellis, 1997; Kim & Hall, 2002). The emotional classroom atmosphere, how teachers manage student behaviors, and motivation are all included in this realm. The literature indicates that secondary students have higher levels of anxiety about foreign language learning compared to other subjects, and they are predisposed to a notion that foreign language learning is challenging or even impossible. And Ellis (1997) identifies resultative motivation—when success is followed by a desire to achieve more—as a potential means to promote long-term foreign language study.

Ten of the syllabi from the current study noted the value of preservice teachers knowing how to create an optimum, supportive classroom. Group dynamics seemed to be an important factor for the creation of a positive classroom setting. The syllabi made references to appropriate use of partner/pair and group activities, valuing the power of peer relationships, and realizing how classmates can influence each other's learning. On the individual side, topics such as student responsibility for learning and intrinsic motivation were also evident in six courses. Motivation and motivational strategies appeared as discussion topics in eight of the syllabi.

Seven of the syllabi listed as a course goal that preservice teachers would demonstrate an understanding of good classroom management. Much of that management can be accomplished with appropriate instructional planning. Classroom management also may include behavior management or discipline, as specifically identified in six other syllabi. One instructor couched nearly all of the methods course content in terms of behavioral and classroom management. One-third of the syllabi do not address affective issues such as classroom environment or motivation as class discussion topics or as course goals. Only one instructor listed anxiety as a discussion topic.

Assessment

This data category represents all of the syllabi information related to assessing secondary students' progress with SLA in the classroom setting. The range of assessment-related topics in the syllabi was as varied as the assessments themselves. As course goals, it was hoped that preservice teachers would understand how to align assessments with the curriculum, how to assess all of the L2 modes, and how to use ongoing comprehension monitoring. As class discussion topics, some courses included evaluating specific language skills, aligning testing with teaching, testing culture, and general test construction. Instructor 4 expressed nearly all of the content in his syllabus in terms of the links between instruction and assessment. The variety of assessment topics could be a result of instructor beliefs related to desired student outcomes. One methods instructor explained that schools may espouse a curriculum that relies heavily on written testing to formulate grades, and that traditional written assessments do not necessarily reflect current pedagogies, nor do they necessarily lead to student fluency. He wrote:

> Schools are determined to follow a more traditional path to grades and they are highly recognized for having brilliant students and high test scores, so the local community is unwilling to espouse change. But the kids know they don't understand anything and they can't say anything.

Looking once again at Standards-based teaching, we are reminded that 19 of the courses devoted class time or course goals to some sort of Standards-based teaching. However, only 12 of the syllabi listed any course content related to proficiency-based or authentic assessments. This may be attributed to the fact that the profession is still evolving into Standards-based teaching, and not yet considering the claims we want to make about what students can do and then identifying the sources of evidence needed to support those claims. Traditional curricular planning may not always begin with the end product in mind (Wiggins & Mctighe, 2005), as demonstrated in these syllabi, with more attention paid to the Standards in the teaching portion of the syllabi rather than in the assessment section.

Reflective Practice and Professional Development

Novice teachers may graduate from their teacher-preparation programs with a sense that they are "done." For this reason, it is important that preservice teacher education demonstrates the need for risk-taking, collaboration, and reflection that can result in effective ongoing change and enhanced success (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2001; Hargreaves, 1994). Vélez-Rendón (2002) calls for teaching developing educators to plan, execute, and examine their own action-research inquiries. By conducting small-scale classroom studies, educators can make more informed and better decisions about their instructional practices (Kwo, 1996; Mok, 1994; Zephir, 2000). Reflective practices are essential to the development of effective teaching skills (Cochran-Smith & Fries 2001; Hargreaves, 1994; Vélez-Rendón, 2002; Zephir, 2000).

This data category includes all preservice course content related to the consideration of why teachers teach as they

do, how they reshape their practices based on experience, and what tools they use to examine their practices. Some type of ongoing evaluation of teaching practices was evident in 21 of the 31 syllabi. The most common course goal related to reflection, found in almost half of the syllabi was, "Use reflective practices to improve over time; understand the importance of reflection and self-assessment."

First, six courses included reflective exercises on foundational teacher beliefs. The assumption was that if teachers reflected on their own personalities, learning styles, and their L2 learning experiences, they would better understand their own concepts of what a foreign language teacher should be and do. Additionally, preservice teachers were asked to reflect on their classroom observation experiences and in some cases keep a journal about those reflections. Other courses included topics of how to self-assess teaching effectiveness; only one course included content about conducting action research.

Closely related to developing a spirit of lifelong reflective practice is the larger picture of developing preservice teachers' sense of professional identity. The most common means to the development of professional identity, as encouraged in 13 of the syllabi, was active membership in professional organizations, likely as a reflection of Content and Supporting Standard 6, which is related to professionalism. Instructor K even required that students present a topic of interest at the local foreign language conference. Some instructors who responded to the questionnaire felt that knowledge gained from attending conferences and related professional development events had shaped their careers and methodology teaching. Additionally, the network of professional relationships that developed as the result of personal involvement in teaching-related organizations provided an ongoing avenue for discussions and learning.

Professional Identity

One aspect of professionalism in the syllabi was related to teacher behaviors and conduct in the school setting: relationships with students, colleagues, and the greater school community. As a course goal, preservice teachers were "to become clear, pleasant, articulate, and caring role models." Preservice teachers were directed to consider cultural norms in the local community, and to act as agents of good will among the variety of cultures that might make up that community. And in keeping with one of the Standards' five C's—community—preservice teachers were encouraged by one instructor to help students make connections with their language-learning experiences and their community.

In eight courses, preservice teachers were asked to consider the effect of their listening, communicating, and role modeling. These course topics are not, however, widespread across the syllabi. It may be that because these behaviors are so closely tied to personal relationships and experiences, methodology instructors consider this topic best left to student teaching and similar experiences. Discussions and role-playing activities can be valuable in the quest to raise the bar for teacher professionalism and equipping novice teachers with the tools to cultivate respected and respectful interactions. Many studies cite a lack of respect for teaching as a reason why it remains an unattractive career and why new teachers leave the profession (Gold, 1996; Ingersoll & Smith, 2004; Wilkerson 2000). Two of the foreign language teacher-preparation programs in this study were discontinued in the fall of 2005 due to lack of enrollment. This finding supports the greater concern that, for a variety of reasons, fewer postsecondary students are attracted to a career in L2 teaching in the face of a growing shortage of highly qualified foreign language teachers. By increasing new teachers' professionalism, they may be better equipped to gain respect in the local education community and experi-

ence increased satisfaction from their chosen profession.

Classroom Experience

The importance of field experiences supervised by qualified and knowledgeable faculty is set forth in Standards 5 and 6, which are related to field experiences. It was not within the scope of this study to determine the qualified nature of field supervisors. The Standards do call for field experience during the methods course, prior to the student teaching experience in foreign language classrooms. One of the courses in this study was a generic methods course designed to serve all curricular areas. Five of the courses offered no concurrent practicum experience. In the 26 courses that did have a related field experience, there was wide variation in the number of hours of observation required, ranging from 2 to more than 50. While the syllabi did not generally specify that the observations take place in foreign language classrooms, related course content (e.g., classroom discussions on the methodologies used), indicated that experiences took place in secondary foreign language settings. One class completed observations in postsecondary foreign language courses and another group was required to observe an immersion class.

Eleven syllabi included exercises to connect the practicum experience with the theories from the readings, most often in the form of reflection journals and papers. These sorts of on-the-job training experiences may help resolve the concerns that surfaced in the Cooper survey (2004) about the need to connect theory to practice. And given that connections to past learning appear to be key to successful new learning of all sorts (Bransford et al., 1999), those "real" classroom connections must be made in order for the preservice teachers to be able to synthesize what they have learned in the methods course.

Conclusions

The single most striking feature of the findings from this study was the extensive variety it uncovered. From the wide variances in the instructors' backgrounds, to the inconsistencies across the syllabi findings, to the many ways that instructors evaluated the preservice teacher candidates, the range was indeed vast. There was no connection between the methods instructors' secondary background (or lack of) and the delivery of the methods course. Neither did the syllabi data collected from methods courses situated in foreign language departments versus those collected from courses housed in schools of education show any common similarities or differences with relation to specific types of course content. And yet, the standards that have been set forth by national, state, and local agencies are fairly specific, as are some of the critical components of preservice teacher education. For example, basic essential features such as action research and reflective practice—those elements that serve to connect theory with practice—remain absent from many of the courses in this study.

It appears that preservice teacher methodological training may not be keeping pace with the social and professional forces that depend on it. The lack of clear and complete shifting to Standards-based instruction and assessment is the most profound piece of evidence to support this claim. Vélez-Rendón (2002) called for a "wider array of competencies" in order to effectively actualize L2 instruction in this century. Yet the findings in this study are not convincing that preservice teachers are leaving the experience equipped with the pedagogical content knowledge to meet the needs of diverse learners. While there does appear to be a wide array of available methodologies, the methodological assortment seems to be linked to varied instructor beliefs about teaching practices rather than to students' learning differences. The profession must somehow demystify foreign language teaching practices and identify a

more systematic means of unveiling those practices for new teacher candidates.

Data presented at a foreign language conference indicate that few programs that have submitted reports to the ACTFL/NCATE accreditation review process[1] have met the program requirements (Glisan et al., 2005). The primary downfall resides in the supporting materials the teacher candidates submit as evidence that they are meeting the Standards. Although the teacher-preparation programs and methods course syllabi submitted for accreditation may indeed reflect Standards-based practices, the course content does not necessarily result in Standards-based teaching as reflected in the candidates' materials submitted to NCATE. Thus, it would appear that teacher-preparation programs must take additional steps to ensure that both instructional and assessment practices, not just supporting theory and jargon, are demonstrably Standards-based.

Currently, we are talking the talk but not yet walking the walk. One syllabus listed the class discussion in this way: "The evolution of methods into Standards-based." Because the instructional practices of most current secondary and postsecondary foreign language instructors predate the birth of the National Standards, teacher candidates are not yet experiencing a widespread application of them in their own language learning settings, during their field experiences, or in the methods courses. But the evolution is somewhat evident. The methodology texts most commonly used in the preservice courses provide deep knowledge about the Standards. It therefore becomes a matter of translating knowledge about the Standards into more Standards-based instructional and assessment practices.

We need to identify effective instructional practices through the lens of what best enhances student learning, then issue a call for knowledge about how to use L2 in salient ways to foster the use of L2 in instruction that leads to student comprehension and retention. We also should equip preservice teachers with both teaching and learning strategies to facilitate deep learning. Finally, we need to plan for assessment and instruction within the framework of proficiency-based objectives (i.e., claims, evidence, and instruction) to keep the student rather than the subject matter in the forefront of teaching practices. Because L2 acquisition is highly complicated and varies contextually, teacher education should encourage new teachers to rely on their own solid L2 fluency, theory, best practices, and reflective risk-taking.

Recommendations for Further Research

Further longitudinal studies should be conducted at two or three foreign language teacher-preparation sites, following preservice teachers through all of their education coursework, methods courses, intern teaching, and the first two years of induction teaching. Certain facets of novice teacher preparation develop over time and with experience, such as pedagogical content knowledge. Longitudinal studies could include how the secondary/postsecondary relationships affect new teacher development (Watzke, 2003).

In addition, since none of the methodology instructors in this study claimed fluency in some of the less commonly taught languages, it may be relevant to question how our current postsecondary system will prepare new teachers adequately to meet the growing demands in these areas. And while issues related to SLA theories and learner diversity are somewhat universal to secondary foreign language pedagogy, some instructional strategies are language-specific, raising the question of how we will equip new teachers of less commonly taught languages with adequate pedagogical course knowledge.

About 20% of students enrolled in U.S. public schools claim a language other than English as their first language (Toppo, 2003), a fact that is changing the nature of L2 instruction. The syllabi data collected in this study identify three instances of

considering the needs of heritage learners. As our demographics continue to shift, an examination of the methodologies that meet the needs of all learners, regardless of their first language, will be essential. In addition, we must consider the potential benefits of making connections between English and the language being taught for the purpose of fostering the development of students who can function appropriately in multiple languages.

Final Considerations

To advance preservice foreign language methodology instruction, keeping learner diversity in mind while considering the Standards, SLA theories, and how those theories translate into best practices will likely keep the profession moving in a positive direction. Vélez-Rendón (2002) states:

> There is consensus that the main goal in second language learning is the development of language proficiency and cultural awareness. To achieve this goal, language teachers must be able to implement a number of interactive relationships that place the learner at the center. These include opportunities for learners to interact with the target language, with the other actors in the classroom, and with the instructional environment in which learning occurs. (p. 462)

Right now, it appears that a lack of consensus exists in the field about the *how* rather than the *what*. Methodology instructors seem to be working toward the development of competent new foreign language teachers. However, across the syllabi, inconsistencies continue to exist especially in the areas of the appropriate use of L2 in the classroom, how to address learner diversity with a sufficient variety of instructional strategies, and how those intersect with Standards-based assessment and instruction.

A first step in a positive direction would be a national movement to identify best practices of methods instruction and to identify certain instructors and their courses as a model for others. ACTFL support to provide an enhanced network for methods instructors to share best practices could further the professional dialogue on this topic. ACTFL might also consider developing guidelines for credentialing methods instructors. The importance of excellent methodological training for new foreign language teachers cannot be understated; how each novice learns to teach will affect hundreds of students for years to come. As a profession, we must break the cycle of repeating our past and continue to move together into the 21st century.

Note

1. *ACFTL Program Standards for the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers* was approved in 2002 by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Institutions accredited by NCATE must address these standards in their programs.

References

ACTFL program standards for the preparation of foreign language teachers. (2002). Yonkers, NY: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.

Allen, L. (2002). Teachers' pedagogical beliefs and the standards for world language learning. *Foreign Language Annals, 3*(5), 518–528.

Bailey, P., Daley, C., & Onwuegbuzie, A. (1999). Foreign language anxiety and learning style. *Foreign Language Annals, 32*(1), 63–73.

Bragger, J., & Rice, D. (1999). The message is the medium: A new paradigm for content-oriented instruction. *Foreign Language Annals, 32*(3), 373–392.

Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (1999). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school.* Washington DC: National Academy Press.

Britzman, D. (1991). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Brown, A. (198 *understanding.* and Newman.

Campbell, C. siastic foreign the challenge. *approaches in* 79–91). Rowle

Chaffee, J. (19 across the cur *Critical think* (pp.25–35). Sa

Cochran-Smit Stick, stones, of reform in t *Researcher 30*(

Cooper, T. (2 ing style and *Annals* 34(4),

Cooper, T. (2 teachers in G sional prepara *Language Anna*

Ellis, R. (1997 Oxford, UK: O

Feiman-Nemse Making subjec tion in learnir *Education, 41*(

Gardner, H., & version. In F *selections in edu* CT: Dushkin F

Gascoigne, C ing: Recomm *Language Annc*

Glisan, S., Le March). *The A tion process.* F meeting of th Teaching of Fc

Gold, Y. (199 Attrition, me P. Sikula, T. J Educators (E *teacher educati Teacher Educa* Macmillan Lit

Goodlad, J. *nation's schoo* Publishers.

Grossman, P. *Teacher knowl* York: Teacher

Brown, A. (1982). *Learning, remembering, and understanding.* Cambridge, MA: Bolt, Beranek and Newman.

Campbell, C. (1991). Motivating unenthusiastic foreign language students: Meeting the challenge. In W. Hatfield (Ed.), *Creative approaches in foreign language teaching* (pp. 79–91). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Chaffee, J. (1992). Teaching critical thinking across the curriculum. In D. Barnes (Ed.), *Critical thinking: Educational imperative* (pp.25–35). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Fries, M. (2001). Stick, stones, and ideology: The discourse of reform in teacher education. *Educational Researcher 30*(8), 3–15.

Cooper, T. (2001). Foreign language teaching style and personality. *Foreign Language Annals 34*(4), 301–317.

Cooper, T. (2004). How foreign language teachers in Georgia evaluate their professional preparation: A call for action. *Foreign Language Annals, 37*(1), 37–48.

Ellis, R. (1997). *Second language acquisition.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Parker, M. (1995). Making subject matter part of the conversation in learning to teach. *Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(3), 32–43.

Gardner, H., & Walters, J. (2001). A rounded version. In F. Schultz (Ed.), *Sources: Notable selections in education* (pp. 308–318). Guilford, CT: Dushkin Publishing Group.

Gascoigne, C. (2002). Reviewing reading: Recommendations vs. reality. *Foreign Language Annals, 35,* 343–348.

Glisan, S., Levy, S., & Phillips, J. (2005, March). *The ACTFL/NCATE teacher accreditation process.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, New York.

Gold, Y. (1996). Beginning teacher support: Attrition, mentoring, and induction. In J. P. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, E. Guyton, & A.o.T. Educators (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: A project of the Association of Teacher Educators* (pp. 548–594). New York: Macmillan Library Reference, USA.

Goodlad, J. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Grossman, P. (1990). *The making of a teacher: Teacher knowledge and teacher education.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Grossman, P., & Stodolsky, S. (1995). Content as context: The role of school subjects in secondary school teaching. *Educational Researcher, 24*(8), 3–11.

Guntermann, G. (Ed.). (1993). *Developing language teachers for a changing world.* Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Guntermann, G. (2000). *Teaching Spanish with the five C's: A blueprint for success.* Orlando, FL: Harcourt College Publishers.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). *Changing teachers, changing times: Teachers' work and culture in the postmodern age.* London: Cassell.

Hodge, M. (1998). Teaching foreign language to at-risk learners. *Inquiry, 2*(1), 68–78.

Hower, K. (1996). Designing coherent and effective teacher education programs. In J. P. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, E. Guyton, & A.o. T. Educators (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: A project of the Association of Teacher Educators* (pp. 231–226). New York: Macmillan Library Reference, USA.

Imig, D., & Switzer, T. (1996). Changing teacher education programs: Restructuring collegiate-based teacher education. In J. P. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, E. Guyton, & A.o. T. Educators (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: A project of the Association of Teacher Educators* (pp. 213–226). New York: Macmillan Library Reference, USA.

Ingersoll, R., & Smith, T. (2004). Do teacher induction and mentoring matter? *NAASP Bulletin, 88*(638), 28–41.

Kim, D., & Hall, J. K. (2002). The role of an interactive book reading program in the development of L2 pragmatic competence. *Modern Language Journal, 86*(3), 332–349.

Krashen, S. (1985.) *The input hypothesis.* Beverly Hills, CA: Laredo Publishing.

Krashen, S. (1992). *Fundamentals of language education.* Lincolnwood, IL: Laredo Publishing.

Kwo, O. (1996). Learning to teach English in Hong Kong classrooms: Patterns on reflection. In D. Freeman & J. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp. 295–319). New York: Cambridge University Press.

LeCompte, M. (2000). Analyzing qualitative data. *Theory Into Practice, 39*(3), 146–154.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

0297-20

Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? *Educational Researcher,* March, 13–17.

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook, 2nd ed.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mok, W. (1994). Reflecting on reflections: A case study of experienced and inexperienced teachers. *System, 22,* 99–111.

National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project (1999). Standards for foreign language learning in the 21st century. Yonkers, NY: Author.

Omaggio Hadley, A. (2001). *Teaching language in context.* Stamford, CT: Heinle & Heinle.

Oxford, R. (1989). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* New York: Newbury House.

Ray, B., & Seely, C. (2002). *Fluency through TPR storytelling.* Berkeley, CA: Command Performance Language Institute.

Ruiz-Funes, M. (1999). Writing, reading, and reading-to-write in a foreign language: A critical review. *Foreign Language Annals, 32,* 514–526.

Ryan, G., & Bernard, H. (2000). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K., Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 769–802). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Schulz, R. (2000). Foreign language teacher development; MLJ perspectives 1916–1999. *Modern Language Journal, 84*(3), 496–522.

Seabold, C., & Wallinger, L. (2000). An update on the status of foreign language education in the United States. *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 84*(612), 1–9.

Shrum, J., & Glisan, S. (2000). *Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Shulman, L. (1990). *Research in teaching and learning : A project of the American Educational Research Association.* New York: MacMillan.

Smagorinsky, P., Cook, L., & Johnson, T. (2003). The twisting path of concept development in learning to teach. *Teachers College Record, 105*(8), 1399–1437.

Smith, T., & Ingersoll, R. (2003). *Reducing teacher turnover: What are the components of effective induction?* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Sullivan, J. (2001). The challenge of foreign language teacher preparation: Addressing state teacher standards. *Clearing House, 74*(6), 305–308.

Tedick, D., & Walker, C. (1995). From theory to practice: How do we prepare teachers for second language classrooms? *Foreign Language Annals, 28*(4), 499–517.

Tesser, C., & Long, D. (2000). The teaching of Spanish literature: A necessary partnership between the language and literature sections of traditional departments. *Foreign Language Annals, 33*(6), 605–613.

Toppo, G. (2003, July 3). The American teacher. *USA Today*, pp. 1D-2D.

VanPatten, B. (2002). Processing instruction: An update. *Language Learning, 52*(4), 755–803.

Vélez-Rendón, G. (2002). Second language teacher education: A review of the literature. *Foreign Language Annals, 35*(4), 457–467.

Vygotsky, L. (1987). Thinking and speech. In R. Rieber & A. Carton (Eds.), *L. S. Vygotsky, collected works* (pp. 39–85). New York: Plenum.

Watzke, J. (2003). Longitudinal study of stages of beginning teacher development in a field-based teacher education program. *The Teacher Educator, 38*(3), 209–229.

Weinstein, C., & Mayer, R. (1986). The teaching of learning strategies. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 315–327). New York: Macmillan.

Wideen, M., Mayer-Smith, J., & Moon, B. (1998). A critical analysis of the research on learning to teach: Making the case for an ecological perspective on inquiry. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 130–178.

Wiggins, J., & Mctighe, G. (2005). *Understanding by design.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wilbur, M. (2006). Engaging students in the L2 reading process. In C. M. Cherry (Ed.), *Languages for today's world: Dimension 2006* (pp. 1–11). Valdosta, GA: SCOLT.

Wilkerson, C. (2000). Attrition of foreign language teachers: Workplace realities. *Foreign Language Annals, 33*(1), 31–34.

Zephir, F. (2000). Focus on form and meaning: Perspectives of developing teachers and action-based research. *Foreign Language Annals, 35*(1), 305–319.

APPENDIX

Postseconda

(The num

1. I have
(
(
(
(1

2. I most
(
(
(
(
(1

3. I teacl
(2
(
(

Survey R
Survey R
and volu

4. My ra
(
(
(
(1
(

5. My ap
(2
(
(
(

6. Please
(1
(
(
(
(
(
(

APPENDIX A

Postsecondary Preservice Methods Instructor Survey with Responses

(The number of respondents is noted in parentheses before each question.)

1. I have taught foreign language courses in a secondary school for: (choose one)
   - (4) __ 0 years
   - (7) __ 1–5 years
   - (8) __ 5–10 years
   - (13) __ over 10 years

2. I most recently taught foreign language courses in a secondary school:
   - (4) __ no secondary experience
   - (6) __ 0–5 years ago
   - (4) __ 6–10 years ago
   - (7) __ 11–15 years ago
   - (11) __ over 15 years ago

3. I teach the Foreign Language Methods course:
   - (23) __ because I want to.
   - (5) __ because I am assigned to.
   - (4) __ other:

Survey Respondent G: "It is my chosen and prepared professional field."
Survey Respondent Z: "I am assigned to teach it on a rotating schedule, but I love it and volunteered to do it more as necessary if my colleagues don't want to anymore."

4. My rank at the university is:
   - (9) __ teaching assistant or instructor
   - (2) __ adjunct professor
   - (7) __ assistant professor
   - (10) __ associate professor
   - (4) __ full professor

5. My appointment is in the following department:
   - (21) __ Foreign Language
   - (9) __ School of Education (Curriculum & Instruction or similar department)
   - (2) __ Both
   - (0) __ Humanities
   - __ other:

6. Please list the languages, besides English, in which you are fluent.
   - (14) Spanish
   - (4) French
   - (6) Spanish & French
   - (1) Spanish & German
   - (1) French & German
   - (2) Spanish, French, Portuguese
   - (1) German, Spanish, French, Italian, and some Portuguese

7. Is the Foreign Language Methods course taught in conjunction with some sort of concurrent practicum experience in a secondary school?

   All methods courses except three are taught with a concurrent practicum or observation experience.

8. How many new secondary foreign language teachers will your institution likely graduate between January and August 2005?
   (12) __ 0–5 graduates
   (5) __ 6–10 graduates
   (10) __ 11–19 graduates
   (1) __ 20–25 graduates
   (4) __ Information not available/provided

APPENDIX B

Postsecondary Methodology Instructor Survey Questions

1. How long have you been teaching the Foreign Language Methods course ?

2. What is your position at the college or university where you teach?
   In which department?

3. Describe your professional background and experiences.

4. In what way(s) do your background and experiences influence your delivery of the preservice Foreign Language Methods course?

5. In your opinion, what are the most important concepts to convey to preservice foreign language teachers during the methods course?

6. Describe the relationship between theory and practice in your methods course.

APPENDIX

Sample Syll

National Star
Key words: S

Description of Course Content	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	4	5
G: NCATE/INTASC/NBPTS/state standards		x	x			x										x										x	x		x		x

0297-23

APPENDIX C

Sample Syllabi Findings

National Standards

Key words: Standards, ACTFL

Description of Course Content	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	1	2	3	4	5
G: NCATE/INTASC/NBPTS/state standards		x	x			x										x										x	x		x	x
G/CDT/A: National Standards (ACTFL)	x	x	x					x	x		x	x	x								x			x	x	x	x		x		
G: Understand and integrate Standards in planning, instruction, and selecting and designing instructional materials	x							x	x	x		x			x	x	x			x	x							x	x	
CDT: Understand ACTFL rating scale and proficiency-based curriculum									x																					x	
A: Create lesson plans with the corresponding Standards listed in the lesson objectives					x	x															x			x						x	
G: Lesson design reflects theoretical underpinnings of second language acquisition (SLA)																					x	x	x		x					x	
CDT: Sources and resources for achieving the 5 Cs														x																	
CDT: The evolution of methods into Standards-based															x																
G/CDT: National Standards and assessment															x						x	x									
CDT: Assessing Standards-based L2 performance in context									x	x	x			x								x						x	x		
G: Apply ACTFL proficiency standards to teachers			x	x			x		x		x									x		x				x			x		
CDT: Reflect on own SLA experience and attained level of Standards										x	x								x				x							x	