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The purpose of this study was to understand the methods and approaches used by world language teachers as well as to investigate their values and beliefs about world language instruction. It aimed to identify barriers that inhibit world language teachers from the successful implementation of communicative language teaching (CLT). The participants consisted of four world language teachers: one pre-service teacher, two novice teachers, and one experienced teacher. Each of the classes taught by the participants was observed approximately four times, where field notes were collected and an observation protocol was completed. The world language teachers completed a questionnaire regarding their biographical information, teaching experience, and instructional practices. After, an interview was conducted in order to learn more about their daily instruction and their beliefs surrounding world language pedagogy.

Through the analysis of the multiple data sources collected throughout this study, it is evident that world language teachers use a variety of methods and approaches to language instruction. Nevertheless, world language teachers continue to communicate in the world language more than the students, teach grammar explicitly, omit culture components or teach culture components separate from language instruction, and teach the four skills separately. World language teachers believe the purpose of learning a world language is to communicate in that language in an authentic and meaningful manner. However, not all world language teachers’ beliefs are reflected in their daily
classroom instruction. Lastly, four barriers that inhibit world language teachers from effectively implementing CLT into the classroom: lack of materials and resources, support, student resistance, and knowledge of CLT.

In conclusion, world language teachers need to consciously be aware of the beliefs they possess towards second language instruction in order for successful implementation of CLT. Additionally, these teachers need to be informed of the strategies that exist to overcome these several barriers. This will ensure that all students are provided with ample opportunities to develop their communicative competence in the world language.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

There are various trends and issues in curriculum and instruction evident in the United States educational system that are currently being discussed among many educators, researchers, politicians, and institutions. Among these concerns, world language instruction continues to be a matter affecting students’ language learning. There are numerous middle schools and high schools across the nation, which offer world language courses. Currently in the state of Ohio, students do not need to earn a foreign language unit (one year) in order to graduate from high school. Instead, a foreign language unit merely counts toward a student’s elective requirements for graduation (Ohio Department of Education, 2011b). However, the majority of universities require at least two years of a foreign language course either taken in high school or at the university. One semester of a foreign language course at the university level is equivalent to a one year of a high school class. Furthermore, if a student in Ohio wishes to earn a diploma with honors, they are required to earn three units of a foreign language, which could either be three units of one language or two units each of two different languages (Ohio Department of Education, 2011a). Therefore, many high school students and even university students in the state of Ohio are taking different world language courses for a variety of reasons. And because of this high demand, it is imperative that effective instruction occur in the world language classroom.

There currently is debate occurring among researchers, teachers, administrators, and institutions worldwide about how a second language should be taught, versus what is actually taking place in the world language classroom (Antón & DiCamilla, 1998; Berns, 1984; Burke, 2011a; Canale & Swain, 1980; Cook, 2001; Ellis, 1997; Savignon, 2007; Schwartz, 2002). According to Burke (2011a), “many U.S. world language teachers-elementary, secondary, and
post-secondary- continue to focus primarily on grammar and translation and use English as the medium of the instruction when designing curriculum and teaching lessons” (p. 1), even though experts state that meaningful communication in the second language should be the focus in the world language classroom (Berns, 1984; Burke, 2011a; Canale, & Swain, 1980; Ellis, 1997; Savignon, 2007; Schwartz, 2002). The communicative language teaching (CLT) approach promotes this kind of meaningful communication in the target language through the development of communicative competence (CC) (Burke, 2005; Savignon 1987).

Second language learning and teaching in schools is not a new concept, but rather something that has been around since at least the eighteenth century (Chastain, 1988; Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). Musumeci (1997) suggests that language teaching was being discussed and developed in Western Europe as far back as the fourteenth century. There have been many approaches and methods to language teaching that have been developed throughout the years in order to assist language learners in the process of acquiring a second language.

Statement of the Problem

Current world language teachers are using a variety of different methods and approaches to teach a second language (Burke, 2005, 2011a; Chastain, 1988; Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). However, the majority of world language teachers are not utilizing CLT in their classroom instruction (Burke, 2005, 2006, 2010, 2011a) and there are various reasons for this occurrence. A common reason is because of the beliefs and values these teachers’ posses about world language pedagogy, which is often a result of the way in which they were taught a second language (Burke, 2011a). Another reason is that not all world language teachers are familiar with this particular approach to language teaching. Both reasons may be a result of the education the teacher received during post-secondary schooling (Burke, 2006). In addition, the lack of
support world language teachers receive from other teachers, administrators, parents, students, and language researchers may contribute to their inability to successfully implement CLT (Burke, 2005, 2011a). Lastly, it is extremely important for future and current world language teachers to receive professional development, which generally does not occur, on the communicative approach in order to be able to effectively employ this approach (Burke, 2005).

**Research Questions**

This study explores world language pedagogy and the implementation of CLT in the classroom through examining four world language teachers; one experienced teacher, two novice teachers, and one pre-service teacher. The purpose of this study is to comprehend what type of methods and approaches current world language teachers are using in their daily instruction, as well as their ideas and perceptions of world language pedagogy. In addition, this study will identify barriers that impede world language teachers from the implementation of CLT. The research questions posed to address these issues are as followed:

1. What methods and/or approaches are world language teachers using and why?
2. How do world language teachers’ values and beliefs of language teaching and learning affect their instruction?
3. What barriers are inhibiting world language teachers from implementing CLT?

**Rationale of the Study**

Based on my personal experience as a previous world language learner, pre-service world language teacher, world language researcher, and observer of several world language classrooms, I firmly support research that states the importance of providing opportunities for students to communicate in the target language through completing communicative activities (CA) and assessments promoted by the communicative approach (Berns, 1984; Burke, 2005, 2006; Canale
& Swain, 1980; Ellis, 1997; Savignon, 1987, 1997; Schwartz, 2002). As a result of my personal experiences, I am aware that the majority of world language teachers continue to focus on grammar, translation, and use English as the medium of instruction rather than promote authentic communication in the world language. This approach to world language instruction does not agree with the second language approach CLT, which the majority of studies state is best (Burke, 2005, 2006; Ellis, 1997; Savignon, 1997; Schwartz, 2002). I am also aware that the methods and approaches world language teachers continue to utilize are negatively affecting language learners’ ability to communicate in the language. Burke (2011a) agrees by stating, “as a result, many students continue to fail to develop an appropriate degree of communicative competence” (p. 1). Students must develop their CC in order to communicate in oral and written form in their world language.

As a student who has studied a world language for over nine years and struggled to develop the CC required to obtain a license to teach Spanish, I know too well the effects traditional, grammar-translation, approaches to instruction can have on a world language learner. Throughout the many years I have studied a second language, Spanish, I only encountered a few teachers who used the CLT approach, and only to a small extent. Therefore, it is extremely important for everyone to be familiar with what is actually taking place in our students’ world language classes versus what the research on language acquisition suggests should be occurring during instruction in the world language classroom (Burke, 2005, 2006, 2010, 2011a; Ellis, 1997; Savignon, 1997; Schwartz, 2002).

This study will inform world language teachers of barriers that inhibit world language teachers from implementing CLT. My research will identify specific ways that future and current world language teachers can implement CLT successfully to ensure that students are
learning to *use* the language instead of learn only about Spanish grammar. Knowing and understanding the grammar rules of a language does not mean you are able to use the language in everyday situations. Rather the goal of learning a second language should be to communicate in the language through multiple medias such as reading, writing, and speaking, with others, and especially native speakers. By conducting this research, I wish to inform students, teachers, administrators, parents, and researchers of issues associated with world language teaching and learning so that they may better support teachers in changing their current methods and approaches to benefit student learning.

**Definition of Terms**

The following is a list of important terms and their definitions that are used throughout this study.

**World language teacher** – another term for a second language teacher or a foreign language teacher

**Target language** – another term for foreign language, second language, or world language

**Communicative language teaching (CLT)** – an approach to world language instruction that promotes meaningful communication in the classroom through the development of communicative competence (Burke, 2005, 2006, 2011a; Ellis, 1997; Savignon, 1997; Schwartz, 2002)

**Communicative activity (CA)** – activities that promote the development of communicative competence; both students and the teacher use the world language to negotiate, interpret, and express through spoken, written, and/or listening activities (Burke, 2005, 2006)

**Grammar-translation (G-T) teacher** – a world language teacher who uses the grammar-translation method to teach a world language (Burke, 2006)
**Hybrid teacher** – a world language teacher who uses a mixture of the grammar-translation method and the communicative approach to teach a world language (Burke, 2006)

**CLT teacher** – a teacher who uses the communicative approach to teach a world language

**Communicative competence (CC)** – is comprised of four components; grammatical competence, discourse competence, strategic competence, and sociolinguistic competence which all provide a model for curriculum and design that promote communication in the target language (Burke, 2005; Savignon, 1997; Schwartz, 2002)

**Summary**

The focus of this study is to identify and examine which methods and approaches world language teachers are using in the classroom as well as their values and beliefs on language teaching and learning. In addition, this study will illustrate barriers that inhibit novice world language teachers from the implementation of CLT. My hope is that this study will inform future and current world language teachers of what is occurring in world language classrooms and in turn, improve world language pedagogy so that students may be able to develop communicative competence.

The following chapters discuss the research study I conducted. Chapter 2 discusses in detail the current research on world language instruction. Chapter 3 explains and describes the methods and procedures used to conduct this study. The results from the study are presented in Chapter 4. Lastly, in Chapter 5 I discuss my findings; by answering my three research questions, drawing conclusions, and providing future recommendations and suggestions for world language teachers.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter discusses different aspects of second language learning and teaching. First, a brief history of the development of language teaching is provided along with the description of the language teaching approach or method popular during various time periods. Then, three world language teacher profiles are identified and explained. Next, barriers to the implementation of CLT are discussed. Finally, the impact of world language teachers’ values and beliefs on instruction are examined.

**History of the Development of Language Teaching**

Methods and approaches for teaching world languages effectively have developed throughout the years (Chastain, 1988; Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001) due to societal changes and demands. Three key terms to understand in relation to second language instruction are approach, method, and technique. These terms intertwine with one another to develop the ideology of world language instruction.

An approach to language teaching is a set of theoretical principles (Hadley, 2001) or “basic assumptions that are the foundation of a method” (Glisan & Shrum, 2009, p. 484). A method is a procedural plan for presenting and teaching a language based on a certain approach (Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). A technique is a strategy or strategies used to implement the particular method (Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). Chastain (1988), Glisan and Shrum (2009) and Hadley (2001) provide explanations of the different world language teaching approaches and methods that have developed in the U. S. throughout the years starting with the nineteenth century to present day.
The Major Language Teaching Methods

**The grammar-translation (G-T) method.** Chastain (1988), Glisan and Shrum (2009), and Hadley (2001) describe the influence Latin and Greek educators have had on language teaching during the nineteenth century. The G-T method was utilized during this time period to teach modern and classical languages. This method of teaching a language was based on the theoretical belief that the mind needed to be trained through analyzing and memorizing grammar rules of the target language and translating from the target language to the native language and vice versa (Chastain, 1988; Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). According to Chastain (1988), “grammar-translation teaching satisfies the desires of the ‘mental faculties’ school of thought and the traditional humanistic orientation…” (p. 86). The goal was for students to study the literature of the target language and expand the knowledge of their native language (Chastain, 1988; Hadley, 2001). Common techniques for teaching Latin and Greek were and still are; translation, learning grammar rules, and memorization of bilingual word lists (Chastain, 1988; Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). In addition, there is little to no stress on the use of oral skills when teaching the world language (Chastain, 1988; Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001) and there are limited opportunities for the students to listen or speak in the target language (Chastain, 1988; Hadley, 2001). Plotz, a German scholar, was an influential person to this method (Glisan & Shrum, 2009). One drawback to the G-T method is that language learners do not achieve the proficiency goals necessary to communicate or function in the target language (Hadley, 2001).

**The direct method.** The G-T method was not popular among all scholars, and as a result, the direct method arose during the twentieth century (Glisan & Shrum, 2009). During this era focus began to be placed on learning modern languages due to the political influence on
society such as the need for soldiers to communicate in the language of the enemies (Chastain, 1988). This method is based on the rationalist perspective of language learning, “that assumes that humans have an innate capacity for the development of language, and that we are genetically programmed to develop our linguistic systems in certain ways” (Hadley, 2001, p. 54). Hadley (2001) states that advocates of the direct method believe that students learn language through listening and speaking the target language. One main principle of this method is the idea of creating meaning with the world language through the use of visual aides. Another main principle is the ability of learners to acquire inductively grammar rules through imitation, repetition, speaking and reading activities (Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). Also, this method is based on the idea that a second language is learned in the same way the learner learned their native language, through associating words and phrases with actions and objects instead of the native language (Hadley, 2001).

The techniques used to implement this method included the exclusive use of the second language, use of visuals, teaching grammar inductively, and promoting correct pronunciation (Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). Proponents of the direct method include Berlitz in the nineteenth century and Comenius, Gouin, Jespersen, and de Sauzé in the twentieth century (Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). A drawback of the direct method is that the instruction of the language does not provide logical and sequential practice of the language. This can lead to students’ inaccurate use of the language (Hadley, 2001).

**The audiolingual method (ALM).** The behaviorist theory began to influence language educators in the 1940s when ALM surfaced (Chastain, 1988; Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). This method is based on the empiricist perspective of language learning, which considers the learner responsible for their learning and control over their ability to function in the language
Furthermore, ALM is rooted from the idea of structural or descriptive linguistics; the oral form of learning a language (Hadley, 2001). ALM involves a more scientific approach to language teaching (Hadley, 2001) and is viewed as a mechanical process rather than a mental one (Chastain, 1988). Students’ first language is not referenced when teaching the second language (Chastain, 1988; Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). Students learn through stimulus-response techniques: drills, grammar explanations, and the natural way of learning through, - listening, speaking, reading, and writing (LSRW) activities. With ALM, students experience a dialogue, pattern drills, and application activities that are found in their textbooks (Chastain, 1988; Hadley, 2001).

Teaching today still ask students to compare the first language with the second language, although the use of the second language was recommended to be the main focus (Chastain, 1988; Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). Grammar rules are taught by induction, language skills are taught by the utilization of the LSRW sequence (Chastain, 1988; Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001), and culture is considered an important component, but it is viewed as something taught separate from the language (Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). ALM supporters were Fire, Lado, Skinner, Bloomfield, and Brooks (Glisan & Shrum, 2009). Two potential drawbacks to the ALM method that Hadley (2001) mentions are that it does not produce bilingual speakers or meet the needs of students learning styles and preferences.

The cognitive anti-method and the cognitive-code method. Two mentalist perspectives on teaching, the cognitive anti-method and the cognitive-code method (Hadley, 2001), arose in the late 1960s and early 1970s as a reaction to the behaviorist view of language learning such as ALM (Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). These two mentalist views on language teaching contrasted from one another (Hadley, 2001).
The main principle of the cognitive-code method is that learners must be able to attain control over the rules of the second language through meaningful learning (Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). This allows the language learner to generate their own expressions and link their prior knowledge to new information. The language is taught creatively in order to enhance meaningful learning and grammar is thoroughly explained to students (Chastain, 1988; Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). According to Chastain (1988), “the goal is to develop students’ competence to the point at which they can formulate their own replies to previously unmet language situations” (p. 91). Therefore, a teacher using the cognitive-code method creates meaningful lessons that allow the students to apply the target language appropriately (Chastain, 1988; Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). Advocates of the cognitive-code approach were Chomsky and Ausubel (Glisan & Shrum, 2009). One major disadvantage of this approach is that world language teachers spend too much time on grammar explanation in the first language (Hadley, 2001).

In contrast to the cognitive-code method, the main principles of the cognitive anti-method are based on first language acquisition and creating a natural learning environment for students. According to Ellis (1990), “second-language learning is controlled by the learner rather than the teacher” (p. 35). In addition, all language learners have the ability to learn and acquire a language. The form of the target language is not important to acquiring the language, therefore the analysis of the target language and explanation of grammar rules are unnecessary in the classroom. Due to the nature of how a learner learns a language, “globally”, instruction does not need to be sequential in nature (Hadley, 2001, p.114). Errors made by the learner in the world language should not be corrected but tolerated, because learners will correct and discover their own errors over time. Two adherents of this method were Newmark and Reibel. The ideas that
the structure and form of the target language are not supposed to be taught explicitly and that instruction should not follow a sequential order are drawbacks or controversial aspects to this method (Hadley, 2001).

**Communicative language teaching (CLT).** Hadley (2001) explains CLT as an approach rather than a method because it represents a philosophy of language teaching. Chastain (1988) further explains, “communicative language teaching (CLT) is not a classroom approach in the same sense as used in this text, that is, there is no well-defined set of techniques and activities for the classroom in this ‘approach’” and “CLT is better categorized as an emphasis or aim rather than an approach” (p. 106). CLT is based on the notional-functional approach of language teaching, which emphasizes communication in the language rather than grammatical form or structure (Berns, 1984; Canale & Swain, 1980; Chastain, 1988; Hadley, 2001; Savignon, 1997).


The development of all four of the components of CC assists in the second language learners’ ability to function and communicate in the world language (Burke, 2005, 2006, 2007; Canale & Swain, 1980; Savignon, 1987, 1997, 2007). Savignon (1987, 1997) identified five components that comprise a communicative curriculum: language arts, language for a purpose,
personal language use, theatre arts, and beyond the classroom. These different parts are not suppose to be taught separately but rather blended in world language instruction in order to assist language learners in the development of communicative competence (Savignon, 1980, 1997).

**Total physical response (TPR) and the natural approach.** TPR (Asher, 1982, 1984) and the natural approach to language teaching (Krashen, 1982) became popular during the 1970s and the 1980s as a result of studies completed on first language acquisition (Glisan & Shrum, 2009). Both of these approaches believed that communication was a main proponent of language learning (Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). Asher (1982, 1984) developed the TPR approach to language learning. The two basic principles are that students need to comprehend the language before being able to speak it, thus, speech will emerge naturally through the internalization of the language and that learners understand more through physical movements to commands (Chastain, 1988; Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). A downside to this approach is that language learners may or may not become proficient in the target language (Hadley, 2001).

The natural approach, developed by Terrell and Krashen (1982) involved creative and communicative practice with limited error correction, activities that promote acquisition and communication, and the teaching of grammar inductively (Chastain, 1988, Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). A weakness to this approach is that there is a “lack of form-focused instruction or corrective feedback in classroom instruction” (Hadley, 2001, p. 123).

**Other Less-Influential Methods and Approaches**

A few other approaches to language teaching that were used during the 1970s focused more on the development of the individual and humanistic methods (Glisan & Shrum, 2009). One approach known as the silent way, developed by Gattegno (1976) assumed that teachers
should allow students to take responsibility of their own learning by making their own
 corrections through trial and error (Chastain, 1988; Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001).

The next approach, community language learning or counseling-learning, was introduced
by Curran (1976). The approach has the teacher remain passive and serve as a counselor in order
to reduce anxiety among the students since students learn best when working as a community
with other students (Chastain, 1988; Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001). Suggestopedia was
another approach used during this time period and was introduced by Lozanov (1978, 1982).
Lozanov believed, “relaxation techniques and concentration assist learners in releasing the
subconscious and in retaining large amounts of language” (Glisan & Shrum, 2009, p. 366).

The Dartmouth intensive language model (DMIL), developed during the 1970s by
Rassias (1983), a professor at Dartmouth College (Chastain, 1988; Glisan & Shrum, 2009), was
due to the effects of drama on language teaching (Glisan & Shrum, 2009). Chastain (1988)
mentions five aspects of language learning of this approach as: grammar, comprehension,
vocabulary, fluency, and accent. Glisan and Shrum (2009) explained that the world language
teacher must only use the target language and correct all errors during instruction.

**Proficiency-Based Language Instruction**

According to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Language (ACTFL)
website, the organization was established in 1967 (2010). ACTFL published the *ACTFL
Provisional Proficiency Guidelines* in November, 1982. The proficiency guidelines were, “a
series of descriptions of proficiency levels for speaking, listening, reading, writing, and culture in
a foreign language” (Liskin-Gasparro, 1984, p. 11). These guidelines influenced the language
teaching approach, which was created during the 1980s and 1990s. This approach is based on
the communicative approach to world language instruction. When the teacher aims for
development of proficiency, the learner knows the language and they are able to communicate in a wide variety of contexts with accuracy in grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic competence. Some techniques used consist of the teacher creating opportunities for self-expression and creativity, using the language in different contexts, providing authentic texts as references, interacting in the language whether between teacher and student or student and student, and integrating the culture into the language (Glisan & Shrum 2009).

**Standards-Based Language Instruction**

In 1996, the standards-based approach was developed by ACTFL also in cooperation with the American Association of Teachers of French (AATF), the American Association of Teachers of German (AATG), and the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP). This approach is similar to the proficiency-based language approach developed in the 1980s and 1990s and also promoted the communicative approach to world language instruction, but stressed that the learner is central role to the learning of a foreign language, and competence in a language and culture helps to develop and improve a learner’s communication and higher order thinking skills.

**World Language Teacher Profiles**

In a study conducted by Burke (2006), she identifies three world language teacher profiles: the grammar-translation (G-T) teacher, the CLT teacher, and the hybrid teacher (a mix of the two other teacher profiles). This section will discuss the characteristics of each teacher profile in addition to common methods, activities, and assessments they utilize in their daily instruction. It is important to understand that these profiles fall on a spectrum and a world language teacher may fall in between profiles rather than in a set profile.
Grammar-Translation (G-T) Teacher

One type of world language teacher is the G-T teacher who develops lessons that are centered around specific grammar forms (Burke, 2006). Grammar is taught explicitly by teaching the students grammar rules in their first language. Students practice those rules through completing grammar practice worksheets. Students translate words, phrases, or sentences from English to the target language and vice versa. Teacher-centered activities, where the teacher does the majority of the communication are common (Burke, 2006, 2011a). According to Burke (2006), “in general, grammar-translation teachers talk during lessons and students are expected to answer the questions in a prescribed manner” and “grammar-translation teachers are disturbed by ‘incorrect’ pronunciation and improper use of vocabulary words” (p. 156).

The dominant language used by G-T teachers is English, and teachers teach the four skills, reading, writing, speaking and listening separately (Burke, 2006, 2010, 2011a). Common activities they utilize are story translation, presentation of vocabulary words in a list that provides the English and target language word, reviewing grammar and vocabulary words through drill and translation games, and completion of grammar and vocabulary worksheets that consist of filling in the blank, multiple choice, and matching. These types of teachers tend to be influenced by old or traditional, yet, outdated methods of language teaching that have been valued by U.S. world language teachers for decades due to various factors (Burke, 2006, 2011a).

The Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) Teacher

The teacher profile on the other side of the spectrum is the CLT teacher (Burke, 2005, 2006, 2011a). According to Burke (2011a), “CLT teachers create curriculum and instruction that promote students’ development of communicative competence” (p. 2). A CLT teacher focuses on communication in the world language and helps facilitate students’ development of the four
components of CC; grammatical, discourse, strategic, and sociolinguistic through the implementation of CA’s (Burke, 2005, 2006, 2010, 2011a; Ellis, 1997; Schwartz, 2002; Savignon, 1997). Together these four components assist students in being able to function and communicate in the world language (Burke, 2005, 2006, 2010, 2011a; Savignon, 1997). In a communicative classroom, the four skills are not taught separately, but rather together through interpreting, negotiating, and expressing meaning through the completion of CA’s that promote students to complete tasks using the target language (Burke, 2005, 2006, 2010, 2011a; Savignon, 1997; Schwartz, 2002).

Grammar is most often taught implicitly while using language in context, but may be taught explicitly when determined appropriate by students and the teacher in order for students to better understand specific grammar rules that will enhance their communication (Burke, 2005, 2006, 2010, 2011a; Savignon, 1997). The teacher and students communicate in the world language the majority of the time during class instruction (Burke, 2005, 2006, 2010, 2011a; Savignon, 1997; Schwartz, 2002). Culture is taught using the target language to encourage communication and to improve students’ CC (Burke, 2006, 2010, 2011a; Savignon, 1997).

**Hybrid Teacher**

The next teacher profile, the hybrid teacher, is a combination of the G-T teacher profile and the CLT teacher profile (Burke, 2006). On a continuous spectrum the hybrid teacher profile falls somewhere between a G-T teacher and a CLT teacher and may fall closer to one profile over the other. In her present research with fifty pre-service teachers and twenty-six secondary teachers in the Midwest, Burke (2011b) has found that most of these teachers are considered a hybrid teacher. Of these hybrid teachers in the study, 21.4% fall in the middle of the spectrum, using CLT and G-T methods equally, while the majority of these hybrid teachers (48.20%) teach
using G-T methods most of the time and only rarely use CLT methods. Compared to 25% of the hybrid teachers who are using mostly CLT methods with some G-T influence. No teachers from this study were found to use only CLT (Burke, 2011b).

A hybrid teacher possess common characteristics of the G-T teacher such as the focus of grammar in lessons, the dominant use of English during instruction, the emphasis on the correct and accurate use of the target language, and teaching the four skills separately (Burke, 2006). However, unlike the G-T teacher, a hybrid teacher provides students with more opportunities to use the language as a tool for communication through various activities (Burke, 2006, 2011a). For example, hybrid teachers allow for some student-centered activities, understand the importance of teaching culture, and provide students with opportunities to use grammar and vocabulary words to construct original sentences in the target language (Burke, 2006). Overall, this teacher profile provides students with more opportunities to use the target language as a meaningful tool of communication (Burke, 2006, 2011a).

**World Language Teacher’s Beliefs**

It is apparent world language teacher’s beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions toward second language teaching and learning impacts their own classroom instruction. Richards, Gallo, and Renandya (2001) state, “teachers’ beliefs strongly affect the material and activities they choose for the classroom” (p. 42). There are many factors that impact world language teachers’ beliefs and values, which include prior language experience both negative and positive, teacher education, and classroom instruction. Although, these all have an impact on teacher’s beliefs and instruction they vary in the degree (Borg, 2003).

According to a study conducted by Richards et al. (2001), two main beliefs about language teaching and learning held by second language teachers are the role of grammar
instruction and beliefs about learners. Borg (2003) further emphasizes world language teachers beliefs on grammar instruction “their experience as teachers and learners which emerged again here as a particularly powerful influence on their view about grammar teaching” (p. 99) and “influenced by the interaction of a range of cognitions, such as beliefs about the best was to learn grammar, about the value of talk about the language, and about students’ knowledge of and experience of terminology” (p. 101). Teacher’s instruction is shaped by a variety of factors; concern for language management, student understanding and motivation, instructional management, unexpected student behavior, and cognitive process of the language (Borg, 2003).

Not only is it essential to be aware of the beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions of world language teachers towards second language pedagogy, it is critical to understand teachers on going changes towards instruction and the sources of theses changes. Professional educators are constantly reflecting on their own instruction as a means to promote positive change. The type of change and extent of change varies, but general modifications made by world language teachers include student learning, teaching philosophy, materials and resources, and language learning activities. Furthermore, these changes in world language instruction are a result of a variety of sources. The three sources for change identified by a study of teachers’ beliefs and process of change in second language teaching were in-service courses, seminars or conferences, and student feedback. A few of the teachers who participated in this study illustrated how beneficial the in-service courses and conferences/seminars were to their instruction, because “teachers meet their counterparts in other schools and have chance to share ideas, find out what else is being done to handle similar material and how others are overcoming similar problems” (Richards, Gallo, and Renandya, 2001, p. 49).
Barriers to CLT

There are various barriers that limit or cause difficulties for world language teachers to implement CLT (Burke, 2011a). The ideas of deep structure, conventional wisdom, and the common script are the main constraints to implementing CLT, which impede many current and future world language teachers from creating a communicative classroom.

Conventional Wisdom and Deep Structure

“For centuries, teachers worldwide have chosen not to put second language acquisition theory into practice because of their beliefs, values, and past experiences related to world language pedagogy” claims Burke (2011a, p. 4). These common values and beliefs, or what Burke (2011a) terms as conventional wisdom, and the instructional practice, or deep structure are two major barriers to successful implementation of CLT for numerous world language teachers (Burke, 2011a).

Tye (2000) defines deep structure as the values and assumptions of education, its function and role that are held by society. Conventional wisdom is the “ideological glue” that holds these values and assumptions together (Tye, 2000, p. 37). According to Burke (2011a), world language teachers continue to teach in the same they were taught, “teachers’ beliefs, based on their values and experiences as world language students significantly influence their methods” (p. 2). Metz (1990) similarly describes schools as following a common script, where the school is the stage, the actors are the students, teachers, and administrators, and the plot is the classroom instruction and school structure. This common script is apparent in most schools across the nation and is shaped by the history of education (Metz, 1990).

Burke (2011a), Metz (1990), and Tye (2000) agree all schools have a common theme and structure they follow, which is reinforced through society’s ideas and beliefs of the purpose of
education. In order for reform or change at the school level or in this case the classroom level to occur, educators need to be aware of the existence of deep structure, conventional wisdom, and the common script (Burke, 2011a; Tye, 2000).

**Summary**

There are different methods and approaches to second language learning and teaching that have developed throughout history. These second language methods and approaches have influenced current world language instruction. In addition, three world language teacher profiles that were influenced by these methods and approaches to world language instruction are G-T, hybrid, and CLT. Additionally, world language teachers’ beliefs and values of second language teaching continue to affect daily instruction. Lastly, barriers exist that inhibit world language teachers from the effective implementation of CLT into the classroom.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter explains the methods and procedures used to conduct this research study, which include the research design selected, the participants of the study, instrumentation and procedures, and data analysis. In addition, the validity, reliability, and limitations of the study are briefly discussed. The research conducted focused on investigating the methods and approaches current world language teachers utilize in their classroom, as well as the teachers’ beliefs concerning these methods and approaches. In addition, this study aimed to identify barriers that currently inhibit world language teachers from the implementation of CLT. The research questions were:

1. What methods and/or approaches are world language teachers using and why?
2. How do world language teachers’ values and beliefs of language teaching and learning affect their instruction?
3. What barriers are inhibiting world language teachers from implementing CLT?

Methods

Research Design

The research design utilized for this study was the qualitative method. Glesne (2006) states, “qualitative research methods are used to understand some social phenomena from the perspective of those involved, to contextualize issues in their particular socio-cultural-political milieu…” (p.5). This method of research was chosen in order to better understand the reason why world language teachers use certain methods and approaches to teaching a world language through focusing on four specific world language teachers.

The method of qualitative research used is known as case study research, which “is a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a bounded system (a case) or multiple
bounded systems (cases) over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information, and reports a case description and case-based themes” (Creswell, 2007, p.73). A case can be identified as a characteristic, trait, or behavior (Lichtman, 2006). In this instance a case refers to the study of a particular behavior, instruction, more specifically the implementation of CLT. The type of case study conducted was a collective case study, which involves looking at more than one case (Glesne, 2006). Four different world language teachers were investigated, each becoming one case: one pre-service teacher, two novice teachers, and one experienced teacher. This approach was chosen because it is the most appropriate way to examine the classrooms of four different world language teachers in order to inquire what is occurring in world language classrooms and the beliefs and ideas behind these particular teachers classroom instruction. Also, through the examination of these four cases, common themes were identified and examined in order to better understand world language teachers’ instruction styles and beliefs.

Participants

This study focused on four world language teachers who were at different stages in their career. The participants included one pre-service world language teacher, two novice world language teachers, and one experienced world language teacher. All four participants graduated with a Bachelor of Science from the same average sized Midwestern American university, Windy State University¹, but not necessarily in the same year. Three of them have licensures in a world language to teach in the state where they reside. One holds a Master of Arts, while another is working on earning a dual Master of Arts in Spanish and History with a focus in Latin American History.

¹ All names of teachers and schools have been changed to protect those who participated in this study.
Three of the participants received instruction about the communicative approach prior to this study. All studied for at least a semester abroad; three of which studied at the same small private university in Spain during different semesters, where the other studied at a university in France. Three of the world language teachers taught at a high school and one taught at a university. A brief description of each world language teacher who participated in this study is included in order to comprehend the background knowledge and education history of each teacher.

The pre-service world language teacher chosen to participate in this study was Beverly who earned her Bachelor of Science in Education with a specialization in Spanish and her license to teach Spanish in grades kindergarten to twelve in May 2011. During the data collection stage of this study she was a student teacher at a Midwestern, American, averaged sized suburban high school, Paramount High School, where she taught one class of Spanish I and two classes of Spanish III. Before completing her student teaching she studied for one semester in Spain. She took a world language methods course at the university during her methods/student teaching block that promoted the use of CLT, which was taught by Dr. Bloom. Beverly developed and implemented parts of a learning expedition\(^2\) at her student teaching field site as part of a project requirement for the world language methods course (see Burke, 2007). In order to maintain competence in the world language Beverly regularly reads, watches television, and speaks with friends in the language. Also, she travels whenever possible to places where she can practice using the language.

\(^2\) A learning expedition is a curriculum design that is centered around the ten design principles and five core practices as a way to promote CLT in the classroom and consists of in-depth experiences and learning experiences (Burke, 2007).
One of the novice teachers who participated in this study was Kelly, who currently teaches Spanish at a Midwestern American small rural high school, Water High School. This is Kelly’s first year teaching. She is teaching two classes of Spanish I, three classes of Spanish II, one class of Spanish III, and one class of Spanish IV. Kelly graduated the previous year, May 2010, with a Bachelor of Science in Education with a specialization in Spanish and her Spanish licensure in grades kindergarten to twelve. Prior to graduation from the university Kelly studied for a semester in Spain and attended a world language methods course taught by Dr. Bloom at her university that discussed and explained CLT. Through this course she had the opportunity to develop and implement several CA’s at her student teaching field site. In her spare time, which she claims is minimal, Kelly tries to read books, poetry, and websites in Spanish in order to maintain her proficiency in the language.

Maria was the other novice world language teacher who participated in this study. Maria graduated with a dual Bachelor of Arts in International Studies and History in May 2010. She studied for a year in Spain as part of her undergraduate studies. Currently, she is studying at the same university to earn a dual Master of Arts in Spanish and History with a focus in Latin American History and is expected to graduate in May 2013. As part of her assistantship in this Master’s program she was a graduate teaching assistant (GTA) for the year and taught beginning level Spanish courses offered by the university. In the fall of 2010 she taught one elementary Spanish level one course (SPAN 1010) and in the spring of 2011 she taught one elementary Spanish level two course (SPAN 1020). This study focuses on Maria’s SPAN 1020 course, which she taught during the spring semester. In the fall of 2010 Maria received instruction on CLT as part of a required teaching methodology course (SPAN 6010 – Teaching College Spanish) for GTA’s taught by faculty member, Dr. Kohl. Maria maintains her competence in the
language through various ways, which include the courses she takes in the language for her MA degrees, speaking with her mother who is from Mexico, and a few of her Puerto Rican friends, and listening to Spanish music.

The last participant, Lisa, is an experienced world language teacher who has been teaching French for twenty-six years. She currently teaches at an average sized suburban high school, Paramount High School. This year she taught two French I classes, two Honors French IV classes, and one AP French V class. Lisa holds two degrees: a Bachelor of Science in Education with a specialization in French, and a Master of Education in English as a Second Language. Also, she studied for a year in France. She has not taken any courses that address the CLT method of teaching. She tries to travel to France at least once a year. Approximately every other year she has the opportunity to take a group of her French students from Paramount High School to France during Spring Break. She has friends with whom she only speaks French, and corresponds via Facebook and email with friends from France in order to maintain her proficiency in the language.

The pre-service and two novice world language teachers were selected based on their experience teaching a world language as well as their knowledge of CLT. A high school level and university level teacher were selected in order to identify their differences and similarities in teaching methods and approaches and as a way to learn more about the instruction taking place at both institutions. The pre-service world language teacher was selected in order to gain an understanding of the effect the pre-service world language teaching experience had on her daily instruction. The experienced world language teacher was chosen in order to have a better understanding of what occurs in a CLT classroom and to compare her beliefs and values for world language pedagogy with those of the beginning teachers.
 Instrumentation and Procedures

Four world language teachers were pre-selected to be participants in this study based on the location of where they taught, and their world language experience. The researchers advisor recommended these teachers as suitable candidates for this study. Once the selection was made, a recruitment email was sent to the world language teachers informing them of the study being conducted and asking if they would be willing to be a participant. After each world language teacher responded to the initial email a meeting was arranged. At this meeting each participant signed an informed letter of consent (Appendix A) and had the opportunity to ask me any questions about the study and their role as a participant. In addition, dates and times to observe the world language teachers classes were scheduled.

Teacher Questionnaire

Several different methods were used to collect data for this study. The first tool used to collect data from each participant was a pre-constructed open-ended teacher questionnaire (Appendix B). The questionnaire was constructed based on a study conducted by Burke (2005) and my own experience as world language student, teacher, and researcher.

After the first meeting with each world language teacher, an email was sent with the teacher questionnaire attached. Teachers were asked to fill it out, and send it back at their convenience. The questionnaire consisted of two parts; the first part contained nine questions relating to biographical information and the second part included eleven questions regarding world language instruction. The first nine questions addressed each teacher’s language teaching background and experience. In the second part of the questionnaire, questions one through three and nine dealt with the teacher’s daily instruction as a way to provide information about each teacher’s perceptions of their own instruction. The responses from questions four to eight were
used to provide information about each teacher’s understanding and beliefs of CLT and communicative activities. Questions ten and eleven provided insight to whether each teacher felt they had support from others in regards to the implementation of CLT, which could be considered a barrier.

**Teacher Interview**

After receiving and reviewing each world language teacher’s responses provided in the questionnaire, a time and day to conduct the interview was scheduled. The same initial interview was conducted with all four of the world language teachers who participated in this study. The interview questions used were pre-constructed based on my research questions (Appendix C) (Glesne, 2006). Not all of the pre-constructed follow up questions were asked for each interview. These questions were designed solely to clarify and provide further explanation to some of the questions from the questionnaire and to offer more detail and insight to the teacher’s ideas and thoughts about world language instruction. This method was used as a way to learn more about the teacher’s experience, beliefs, and ideas about teaching a world language, as well as to understand what kinds of language teaching approaches and methods are currently being used in a typical American classroom.

The interview consisted of ten questions, five of which were follow up questions from the questionnaire. Each interview conducted was recorded on a tape-recorder, and then transcribed. Interviewing is an effective method used to collect data in qualitative research. For example, Seidman (1998) states, “at the root of in-depth interviewing is an interest in understanding the experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience” (p. 3). Glesne (2006) agrees that one can learn much from interviewing different people affected or who influence your area of interest.


**Classroom Observations**

Participant observation is an important component to data collection that is considered an art with specific and appropriate ways to conduct it (Wolcott, 1995). Lichtman (2006) emphasizes the significance of observation as a tool for collecting data, “observing humans in natural settings assists in understanding the complexity of human behavior and interrelationships among groups” (p.139). Two different types of observations tools were utilized. Creswell (2007) suggests using an observation-protocol as a way to record notes in the field, which was used as a means to record specific notes dealing with characteristics of the three teacher profiles: grammar-translation, hybrid, and communicative language teaching (Burke, 2006) (Appendix D). Glesne (2006) identifies another tool of participant observation know as analytic notes, comments or reflections a researcher writes during or after an observation. These analytical notes are another way to analyze and further understand your observations (Glesne, 2006). Therefore, a notebook was used to record the researchers reflections and thoughts on the notes that were documented during each of the classroom observations.

Throughout this study many of the classes taught by these four world language teachers were observed. The number of times each teacher’s classes were observed varied due to a number of circumstances. Beverly’s Spanish III class was observed four times and her Spanish I class three times. Kelly’s Spanish I through IV classes were observed four times. Maria’s SPAN 1020 class was observed three times. Lisa’s AP French IV and I class were observed four times, and her French IV class three times. During these visits detailed notes on the instruction taking place and the interactions between the students and teacher were recorded in a notebook. Additionally, a pre-created observation-protocol dealing with the typical characteristics of the three types of teacher profiles (Burke, 2006) was filled out for each of the classes observed.
(Creswell, 2007). The observations of the teacher’s instruction helped to better understand what was occurring in these teachers’ classes and to determine what methods or approaches each teacher utilized for instruction.

**Procedures**

**Data Analysis**

The interview and questionnaire responses were analyzed using a method known as coding (Erickson, 1986). First, each of the recorded interviews conducted with the world language teachers were transcribed. Next, an initial reading of each transcription and questionnaire response was completed to determine the main themes and ideas. Then, assertions that were found throughout both the interview transcriptions and questionnaire responses were identified. Assertions are statements that are believed to be true and can be supported by the data. Following this, the transcriptions were read again to choose warrants, disconfirming evidence, and key linkages that supported the original assertions. A warrant is evidence or support of an assertion, which comes from the data collected. This may include quotes from an interview or specific activities observed in the classroom. However, disconfirming evidence is data collected that does not support one of the assertions. An important quote or observation that helps to link or connects the assertions identified. Lastly, all of these were used to create a vignette, a thick description of the interpretation and analysis of the data collected (Erickson, 1986).

The same process of data analysis, coding, was used for the observation notes and reflections collected in my journal. The observation protocols completed for each classroom observation were analyzed by identifying what type of world language teacher they would be considered for that particular lesson according to the characteristics of the teacher profiles.
described by Burke (2006). Then, all of the completed observation protocols for each world language teacher were used to determine where that teacher would fall on the world language teacher profile spectrum (Burke, 2006). All three forms of data collection were compared and contrasted among the four world language teachers who participated in this study through triangulation (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

Establishing Trustworthiness

According to Lincoln and Guba (1985) there are four techniques for establishing trustworthiness in research data. These techniques help to make research data reliable as well as valid. One of the techniques is credibility, which demonstrates that the data collected is valid or believable. A way to accomplish this is through a method known as triangulation, which is the use of three or more sources of data collection (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). The data collected in this study was triangulated by utilizing three different instruments for data collection: questionnaires, interviews, and observation notes.

Through the data collected from the questionnaires, interviews, and classroom observations, the approaches and methods used by each world language teacher were compared and contrasted as well as their beliefs on CLT and their own language instruction. Also, the data collected from the questionnaires and interviews were compared and contrasted to the observation notes collected. Additionally, several barriers that were inhibiting the two novice world language teachers and the pre-service world language teacher from promoting CLT in their classroom were identified and explained.

Another technique used to establish trustworthiness is transferability. This was accomplished through the construction of think descriptions of each teacher’s classroom and daily instruction from the data collected. Dependability was utilized through the clear
description of the procedure I used to collect my data. Conformability was demonstrated through the direct quotes, collected from the questionnaires and interviews, from the world language teachers provided in the narratives. Lastly, a reflexive journal was utilized in order to record my opinions and values about the research and data collected in order to provide my own interpretations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Trustworthiness of the data gathered from this research study was established through the use of these techniques.

Subjectivity of the researcher is something that is inevitable no matter what type of research is conducted, quantitative or qualitative. Peshkin (1988) states, “one’s subjectivity is like a garment that cannot be removed. It is insistently present in both the research and nonresearch aspects of our life” (p. 17). Although, this study is different from others it is similar due to the fact that my subjectivity was present through the collection and analysis of the data. However, I was aware of the subjectivity I brought to my research as well as my experience in this subject matter. By being aware of this, I was able to ensure that it did not affect my interpretation of my data collection. Furthermore, I was able to use this to my advantage by creating and establishing relationships between each of the participants. I believe that my subjectivity is just another piece of the bigger picture of this whole study.

**Limitations**

As with any research study conducted there are limitations. One limitation to this research study was the amount of time to collect and analyze the data. The study was only conducted over a four to five week time period where each candidate’s classes were observed approximately four times as opposed to observing the classes throughout the school year. Interviews of each participant were conducted during this time frame as well. Also, since the observations were conducted in the months of April and May school was coming to a close,
which may affect daily classroom instruction as well as the attitudes and perceptions of teachers and students.

Another limitation was the location of the study. This study was conducted in the Midwestern region of the United States; therefore results may vary in other regions of the country. Also, this study focused on world language classroom in the high school and university setting. If it had been conducted in other school levels, such as in an elementary or middle school, the results may have been different.

Although there were limitations to this study it is still valid and reliable due to the nature and intended purpose of the study. The four participants of the study varied in experience such as years of teaching and education on language teaching and learning. Furthermore, the teacher’s taught at different school settings and levels of the language varying from beginning level to more advanced levels for example an AP course. This all added to the overall quality of this study.

Summary

This chapter discussed the methods and procedures used to conduct this research study. The research design, participants, and instrumentation used for this study were described. Then, the process of data collection and data analysis were explained. The data collection of this study serves as a way to further understand what methods and approaches world language teachers’ use in instruction, their beliefs and ideas of world language pedagogy, and the barriers world language teachers attribute to why they do not implement CLT on a more consistent basis.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Four different world language teachers who taught in different settings and levels of language courses participated in this study. The data collected from observation notes, observation protocols, questionnaires, and interviews were analyzed in order to determine the daily instruction that occurred in each participant’s classroom, the beliefs of world language learning and teaching held by the world language teachers, and the barriers of implementing CLT into the classroom. First, vignettes of each teacher are presented, describing their classrooms and daily instruction. Then, the type of communication, grammar instruction, cultural aspects, and activities utilized during instruction by the world language teachers are discussed. Next, the world language teachers’ beliefs about learning a second language are examined. Lastly, four barriers to implementing CLT that were identified by the world language teachers are explained.

World Language Instruction

Participants’ Classrooms

A narrative describing each world language teacher’s classroom and daily instruction was developed through the analysis of observation notes, observation protocols, questionnaires, and interviews of each teacher. These vignettes demonstrate the methods and approaches utilized in each participant’s classroom. In addition, the kind of world language teacher is identified and explained for each participant according to Burke’s (2006) continuum of world language teacher profiles.

Beverly. Beverly was completing her student teaching at Paramount High School, a suburban middle-class high school. She taught two different levels of Spanish classes: Spanish I and III. Each class was approximately fifty minutes and met once a day during the normal
school week. The classes consisted of twenty to thirty students, which varied from class to class and day to day. The students' desks in the classroom were set up in rows facing the dry erase board located in the front of the room. On the ceiling in the middle of the classroom there was a projector that Beverly used with her own laptop to project documents, self-designed PowerPoint presentations, and computer activities provided by the textbook on to the dry erase board.

There were decorations and posters promoting the culture of different Spanish speaking countries and the language on all four walls of the classroom. The textbook used for her Spanish one classes was *Realidades 1* (Boyles, Met, Sayers, & Wargin, 2008) and *Realidades 3* (Boyles, Met, & Sayers, 2008) for her Spanish III classes. Along with the textbook Beverly utilized some of the other resources provided with the textbook, which included the writing, audio, and video workbook (WAVA) (Pearson Prentice Hall, 2003b, 2008) the practice workbook (Pearson Prentice Hall, 2003a, 2004b), and a teacher resource book (Pearson Prentice Hall, 2005a, 2005b, 2005c). These textbook and additional resources provide instruction and activities that promote the use of the communicative approach (Boyles, Met, Sayers, & Wargin, 2008).

From the analysis of the observations in Beverly’s Spanish I and III classes and her responses from the interview her instruction of these two classes followed a general structure. If the students were assigned homework the night before the first part of class would be spent checking and reviewing the assignment. Next, she reviewed with the students what they learned the day before and informed them of the plan for that class. Then, she either introduced a new topic, such as vocabulary words or a grammar feature, or students practiced a concept they had recently learned through the completion of multiple activities. She utilized a combination of textbook activities and self-designed lessons. Beverly expanded on this in her interview explaining that her cooperating mentor teacher (CMT) requested that she “…got an actividad
here and there from the book”, but that the activities she did use outside of the textbook was over “the same stuff that was being taught [in the textbook] I was just doing it in my own way”.

Based on the analysis of the observation protocols completed after each observation of Beverly’s classes, according to Burke (2006) she would fall on the world language teacher profile spectrum between a hybrid and a CLT world language teacher (see Fig. 1). Grammar was often a focus of many lessons through explicit instruction, which is a common practice of hybrid teachers (Burke, 2006). However, the target language was the medium of communication and students were provided with numerous opportunities to use and practice the language through student-centered communicative activities. This is a characteristic of a CLT teacher. It is important to note that Beverly’s instruction may have been impacted by her CMT’s beliefs on world language instruction. She explained during her interview that she was not able to create and plan the lessons and activities for the two classes she taught, because she had to follow the textbook and her CMT’s requests, but she was able to implement occasionally lessons and activities she planned and created. Several of these lessons and activities were observed during this study. Furthermore, she expressed during her interview, “I was restricted a lot more during student teaching. In my own classroom I definitely do them [communicative activities] more often”.
Figure 1. World Language Teacher Profile Spectrum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kelly and Lisa – Level I</th>
<th>Beverly and Maria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelly – Level II, III, IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa – Level IV &amp; V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Note: This figure was developed based on the world language teacher profile identified by Burke (2006).

Kelly. As a first year teacher Kelly taught seven Spanish classes, Spanish I through IV, at a small rural high school, Water High School. Each class met for approximately forty minutes, five times a week. However, her Spanish IV class was an hour long since it was the same hour as lunch. Her classes varied in size ranging from twelve students in her Spanish IV class, to thirty students in one of her Spanish II classes. The students’ desks were arranged in rows facing the dry erase board. There was a Smart Board in the center of the dry erase board. The four walls of the classroom were nicely decorated with various posters that displayed maps of Spanish speaking countries, famous places in a variety of Spanish cities, and student work. Through informal conversations with Kelly during my visits she explained that when she arrived at her new classroom before school started, she did not have much material to decorate her classroom. Fortunately, in one of the cabinets, she found a few boxes of posters the past Spanish teacher left behind.

She used the *Realidades 1* (Boyles, Met, Sayers, & Wargin, 2004) textbook with all of her classes, the Spanish I classes were working on completing the first part of the book while the
Spanish II, III, and IV classes were in the process of completing the book. In addition she used other resources provided with the textbook: the computer test bank (Pearson Prentice Hall, 2006), the assessment program (Pearson Prentice Hall, 2004a), the practice workbook (Pearson Prentice Hall, 2003a), and the writing, audio, and video workbook (WAVA) (Pearson Prentice Hall, 2003b). There were CD’s and DVD’s accompanied with the WAVA workbook. The textbook and resources used in Kelly’s Spanish classes promotes CLT (Boyles, Met, Sayers, & Wargin, 2004). Again, through informal conversation as well as observation collected, it was apparent that her Spanish II, III, and IV students were all around the same level due to the instruction they received from their previous Spanish teacher.

Through the analysis of observation notes and interview responses Kelly’s four classes followed a common routine. Kelly described in her interview a typical day in her classes, “start off with some conversation either I’ll call on students individually or I’ll give them a topic that they have to talk to each other about for a certain amount of time. And then we usually go into some kind of worksheet” and at the end of the class she sometimes assigned students homework. Generally her Spanish I classes had a different lesson plan than the other Spanish level classes. The Spanish level II, III, and IV classes completed the same activities and received the same instruction however the Spanish IV class, which had an extra twenty minutes, spent more time conversing in the language, learning and practicing more complex grammar constructions, and extending on some of the activities. Kelly implemented activities from a range of sources. For instance, some were provided by the textbook, the other world language teacher at the school, and self-created by Kelly.

It is evident through the analysis of the observation notes I collected and the observation protocols I completed for each of Kelly’s Spanish classes that she is a hybrid teacher (see Fig. 1).
Kelly confirmed, “I consider myself a hybrid teacher. I do speak in English (more often than I should) in class and I do sometimes break the grammar down into charts and explanations, but I also try CLT activities” in her in her response to the question on the questionnaire, “Would you consider yourself a CLT teacher?” Furthermore, she expressed on the questionnaire and in her interview her desire to change her instruction to reflect that of a CLT teacher. In the interview she stated, “it’s an ongoing goal to become a more communicative type of teacher”. She explained that next year she plans to start off from day one speaking only in the world language in her level III, and IV classes and half and half with her level II classes, which she had already discussed with her current students who plan continue taking the world language.

According to Burke (2006) a hybrid teacher is a blend between a G-T teacher and a CLT teacher. These types of world language teachers generally fall closer to one side of the spectrum. Kelly is no exception and the side of the spectrum she falls on depended on the level of the class. She falls closer to the G-T profile when teaching her Spanish level I classes. In these classes English was used the majority of time, students completed more translation and grammar/drill activities than communicative activities. On the other hand, in her other Spanish level classes she used the world language slightly more and students completed more CA’s that promoted communication in the language. Therefore, when teaching these classes Kelly fell closer to the CLT teacher profile on the spectrum (Burke, 2006).

Maria. Maria was the other novice world language teacher who participated in this study. Unlike Kelly, Maria did not have prior teaching experience or a teaching license. She taught an Elementary II Spanish (SPAN 1020) course at Windy State University. Her class met four times a week for fifty minutes in a building located on campus and once a month the class met at a language-learning lab located in another building on campus. There were fifteen to
twenty students registered in her class varying from first year to fourth or fifth year students at the university. Maria noted through informal conversations that several of the students in this class, SPAN 1020, were also in her SPAN 1010 class. The desks were set up in rows facing the dry erase board. On the left hand side next to the dry erase board there was a projector Maria frequently used to display self-designed PowerPoint presentations. All of the Elementary I and II Spanish courses offered at the university used the same textbook and workbook, *Vistazos*, which promotes the communicative approach to language teaching and learning (VanPatten, Lee, Ballman, & Farley, 2010a, 2010b). There were no decorations on the walls in the classroom since this space was used by many other courses offered by the university.

Based on observation notes and interview responses, a typical day in Maria’s SPAN 1020 class consisted of a ten minute review, presentation of new material or brief review of previously learned material, and several activities. Maria conducted the review, or what she referred to as the “warm up”, in a few different ways; asking different students questions over a specific topic, having students converse with a partner following pre-structured questions that she provided, or using a self-designed power point presentation of pictures that relate to previously learned vocabulary words that students have to identify. Afterword, Maria either presented a new concept using a PowerPoint presentation with the students following along in the book or briefly reviewed material that had been taught in an earlier lesson. Next, students would complete at least three different activities that reinforced the new concepts taught. The students sometimes completed these activities independently. After they were finished, students shared and compared orally their answers with a partner. Maria indicated in the interview that some of the activities implemented were from the textbook as well as designed by her.
On the spectrum of the teacher profile as described by Burke (2006), Maria falls in between a hybrid and a CLT world language teacher (see Fig. 1). She meets characteristics of a hybrid teacher through her focus on the grammar and pronunciation of the language, the student-centered activities, and writing activities that mainly comprise of student developing sentences instead of paragraphs in the target language. Maria confirms by responding to the interview question “Would you consider yourself a CLT teacher, why or why not?” by stating, “for the most part except when explaining grammar”. However, Maria did use immersion when teaching and encourages students to speak only in the world language, incorporated culture into the majority of lessons, and created contextualized lessons that focused on meaningful communication in the language, which correlates with the characteristics of CLT teachers Burke (2006) identified.

Lisa. Lisa has been teaching French for twenty-six years and currently teaches French I, Honors French IV, and AP French V at Paramount High School. Her classes ranged from ten students in her AP French V class to twenty students. The desks in her classroom were in rows with two desks situated next to each other that faced the dry erase board located in the front of the classroom. There was a Smart Board next to the dry erase board. The classroom was decorated with posters of different French speaking countries, maps, pictures of past trips to France with students, and student work. In addition, there were French children books on a table in the back of the classroom and a couple different types’ magazines from France in a rack on the wall. The textbooks utilized in her classes were *Bien Dit: French I* (Demado, Champeny, & M. Ponterio, & R. Ponterio, 2008) for French I classes, *Bien Vu, Bien Dit: Intermediate French* (Williams, Grace, & Roche, 2008) for Honors French IV classes, and *Imaginez: Le français sans frontiers: cours de français intermédiaire* (Mitschke, 2008) for AP French V. In addition to the
textbook, the AP French V students read two French novels during the course of the year. During one observation the students were writing an essay on one of the novels they had just finished reading, *Le Petit Prince* (Saint-Exupéry, 2001). The publisher and textbook websites for these resources did not indicate whether or not they promoted the CLT method.

According to Lisa, a typical day in one of her classes varied depending on the level of the class. She stated, “It’s the same with the lower level on a simpler basis. The upper levels are able to think on a more profound level so we do some higher-level thinking” where as the “lower level’s a lot of repetition”. Nevertheless, all of her classes followed a similar routine with a brief review of what students learned the day before, homework check and review, presentation of new material, and activities. Lisa generally presented new material using the textbook or passing out a handout, photocopied from some kind of resource or self-designed, that she had students read out loud to the class. The activities students completed varied as well.

Overall, Lisa is a hybrid world language teacher. Her French I class focused more on grammar and translation through the completion of lower thinking level activities. Also, the teacher and students used English more frequently during classroom instruction. This type of instruction illustrates the common traits of a G-T teacher presented by Burke (2006), which would make her a G-T hybrid teacher in her lower level classes. In the two other classes, Honors French IV and AP French V the class typically started with some conversation in the language by Lisa asking various students questions, such as “What did you do over the weekend?” Lisa expressed that “with my upper levels, I let them do activities and do tasks in the language so that they are actually using it to communicate, but it doesn’t seem like work to them” when explaining activities the students complete. As opposed to the instruction of her French I classes,
Lisa’s teaching of the other two French levels reflects a hybrid teacher as expressed by Burke (2006) as a teacher who possess some characteristics of a G-T teacher and a CLT teacher.

**Instructional Approaches**

Next, four major aspects of world language instruction were categorized according to categories from the observation protocol (Appendix D) and the analysis of observation notes, observation protocols, questionnaires, and interviews of the participants. The important components of second language instruction were communication in the world language, grammar instruction, teaching culture, and types of activities.

**Communication in the world language.** Communication in the world language by both the teacher and the students is the key to students acquiring communicative competence and being able to utilize and function in the language (Burke, 2005, 2006; Canale & Swain, 1980; Savignon, 1987, 1997, 2007). It is evident from the analysis of observation notes, observation protocols, questionnaires, and interviews that the world language teachers that participated in this study used the world language in the classroom more than the students did.

**Teacher communication.** The amount and purpose of communication in the world language by the teacher varied from teacher to teacher and class to class. Two of the world language teachers, Beverly and Maria, used the world language almost one hundred percent of the time, seldom saying a word or phrase in English, “I rarely spoke English ever, it almost never happened” stated Beverly during her interview. Beverly used the target language as the medium of instruction for both her lower and upper level classes, as opposed to the two other world language teachers, Kelly and Lisa, whose use of the world language during instruction varied between the upper and lower level courses. Lisa actually communicated in the target language the majority of the time in her upper levels, but in her lower level class she utilized the target
language a fourth of the time. Out of the two world language teachers, who spoke in English more than they did in the world language, Lisa used the target language “mainly to reinforce what they do know and to practice” and to give simple instructions such as “open your book”, where as Kelly stated during her interview “If I am giving directions or clarifying a concept the students don’t understand, I do it in English. I try to have a portion of each day where I and the students solely speak in Spanish”. Burke (2011a) and Savignon (2007) express the importance of communicating in only the target language during instruction. A major characteristic of a CLT teacher is the utilization of the world language when teaching (Burke, 2006).

**Student communication.** Overall students tended to communicate in the world language, whether through writing, reading, or speaking, much less than their world language teacher. In general, students used the world language when responding to questions asked by the teacher, reading answers to homework or an activity, and completing oral activities with a partner or small group. Two of the teachers, Maria and Beverly, expressed in their interview that students ask questions using the world language. Beverly gave the following example of common questions her students asked in the target language “to go to the bathroom, get a drink, or go to their locker” and Maria stated her students asked “how to say things in Spanish” in the world language. The observation notes collected and analyzed of these two teachers illustrated that they encouraged students to use the world language anytime they heard them speaking English by simply stating “habla español” (Field Notes 1 & 3).

Students in the classes of all the world language teachers, with the expectation of Lisa’s upper level classes, always spoke among each other in English unless prompted otherwise. However, Lisa’s upper level students were required to speak in the world language and would lose five points every time they spoke English while in her class. Burke (2011a), Canale and
Swain (1988), Ellis (1997), and Savignon (2007) emphasize the importance of students communicating in the world language in order to develop communicative competence.

**Grammar instruction.** Explicit grammar instruction continues to be a focus in the world language classroom. All four world language teachers taught grammar explicitly by explaining the grammar aspects of the world language. This instruction was presented in a teacher-centered fashion using the textbook, a PowerPoint presentation, and/or notes written on the board. In one of Maria’s classes, she used a PowerPoint presentation to review with the class the grammar concept, the neutral *lo* (Field Notes 3), however Maria spoke in the world language. In Kelly’s Spanish classes she reviews grammar concepts explicitly mainly in English using the Smart Board. One day she reviewed the verb *ir* with her Spanish I students by writing on the Smart Board the conjugation of this verb in the present tense. Another time she reviewed with her upper level classes using the Smart Board the construction of *gustar* and similar verbs (Field Notes 2).

After, the students would complete an assortment of activities to practice and reinforce the grammar concept from filling the blank of sentences and conjugating verbs to creating authentic communication in the target language. For example, after Maria’s review of the neutral *lo* students completed a couple of activities from their textbook (Field Notes 3). Beverly and Maria taught and explained grammar topics in the world language, and Lisa teacher did this with her upper level classes only. The interview and questionnaire responses from all of the teachers indicated that they felt grammar features of the world language are necessary and important to learning the language. However, Burke (2011a) affirms that the majority of grammar instruction should be taught implicitly. Burke (2006), Savignon (1997), Ellis (1997), and Terrell (1991) indicate that at times explicit grammar instruction is appropriate and
beneficial to student language acquisition, especially when the teacher and students decide it is necessary to learn a particular grammar rule or form in order for students to communicate in the world language (Burke, 2006, p. 149).

**Teaching culture.** The aspect of culture being taught in world language classrooms appears to be a component that is either omitted from daily instruction or taught separate from language instruction, as Burke (2005, 2011a) has also found in her research. Out of the four world language teachers, Maria and Kelly were the only two that mentioned the use of culture components in their instruction in their interview and questionnaire. Maria mentioned, “other activities I would do, [were] cultural activities” through writing a minibiography on a famous Spanish person along with questions over the information, incorporating different genres of Spanish music to practice verb tenses, and teaching students about flamenco dancing. Everyday Kelly presents to all of her classes *La Noticia del Día* (the News of the Day). Each day is a different current news or event related to a Spanish speaking country. One day, Kelly showed all of her classes a news story on you tube about a lady in Acapulco who was helping young people turn their lives around (Field Notes 2). This video was in English, and most of these news stories are presented to the students in English or Spanish then English. In addition, these news stories are presented separate from the language and generally do not relate to the topics being discussed. Maria and Lisa were observed integrating cultural aspects into lessons, but most of time this was taught separate from the language and in English (Field Notes, 1).. Teaching culture as part of the language is a component of language instruction that only CLT teachers utilize (Burke, 2006, 2011a).

**Types of activities.** The completion of activities in the world language classroom is a vital part to learning and practicing a second language. World language teachers tend to use a
variety of activities that focus on the four skills as separate components: reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Each world language teacher was asked in the questionnaire, “What are the various components of world language that you address in your instruction on a weekly basis?"; all four teachers mentioned speaking and writing, Kelly and Beverly mentioned listening, and Kelly and Maria mentioned reading. In the interview Lisa and Beverly illustrated that reading was not an emphasis of daily language instruction. Because Beverly was student teaching, she was not always able to decide what components of the world language were addressed during instruction. Beverly expressed that she believed students needed more practice with reading since she says “it seems to be a topic that is neglected” because the textbook has a separate book with readings that the Spanish department at Paramount High School does not normally utilize.

Observation notes and protocols confirmed that speaking and writing were typical activities implemented that were generally separate activities. One day, Kelly’s Spanish II, III, and IV students wrote two movie critiques; one about a movie they liked and the other about a movie they disliked (Field Notes 2). Beverly’s Spanish III students completed an oral activity from their textbook where students asked and responded to a partner about different jobs they liked or disliked. This activity provided a model for students with possible questions and responses (Field Notes, 1). In contrast, in Lisa’s AP French V class she asked a question to the whole class and in pairs students took turn answering the question. This activity was to help prepare students for the speaking section on the French AP exam (Field Notes, 4).

Listening and reading activities were only observed in the world language classroom a few times, and again, were separate activities. Maria’s students read with a partner a Spanish passage from their textbook about the environment and answered orally questions about it (Field
Notes, 3). In Lisa’s French I classes students completed a similar reading activity. However, Lisa called on different students to read parts of a French passage in their textbook about a French speaking country in Africa, Senegal. Although students read in French, Lisa discussed and asked questions in English about what each student read incorporating the new French cultural vocabulary words (Field Notes, 4). To review Spanish future tense verb endings, Beverly’s Spanish III students listened to several parts of different songs where they had to fill in the blanks of the lyrics with the correct form of the verb they heard. Beverly’s Spanish I class also was observed completing a listening activity, but this was an activity provided by the textbook company. Students drew a picture of what each sentence was describing, this related to vocabulary words students had previously learned. Burke (2011a) indicates that many world language teachers continue to teach to the four skills, instead of focusing on communication through interpretation, negotiation, and expression of the world language.

Activities in the world language classroom borrowed from techniques of various methods and approaches to world language instruction. At some point during instruction or review of vocabulary words or verb endings all of the world language teachers instructed students to repeat these words or endings after them. This drill-like technique is utilized in the audiolingual method (Chastain, 1988; Hadley, 2001). In addition, three of the four participants taught vocabulary words of the target language with the correlation of a picture instead of the native language. Kelly confirmed this in her interview, “I think it’s been easiest for them when they see the words being used in an example and then they see that word attached to a picture that they are looking at”. One of the main goals of the direct method is to use visual aides to help create meaning of the world language (Glisan & Shrum, 2009; Hadley, 2001).
Each world language teacher who participated in this study implemented CA’s either provided by the textbook or self-designed. The number of CA’s the teacher used during each of her classes varied. Maria stated she used about three CA’s per class, while Kelly generally only used one per class, which she indicated on the questionnaire only occurred approximately fifty percent of the time a week. Lisa generally implemented CA’s in her upper level classes, with the occasion CA in the lower level classes. Lastly, the world language teachers expressed satisfaction and enjoyment of implementing CA’s into instruction. Since the goal of CLT is for students to develop CC and communicate in a meaningful authentic manner, CA’s are an essential component to world language classrooms (Burke, 2011a, Canale & Swain, 1980, Ellis, 1997, Savignon, 2007).

**World Language Teacher’s Beliefs**

Common beliefs of world language teaching and learning among the four world language teachers were illustrated in the questionnaires and interviews. These beliefs demonstrated what the teachers believed was the objective or goal to learning a world language. The observation notes and observation protocols were then analyzed to determine if the teachers’ beliefs reflected their daily instruction.

**Objective of Learning a World Language**

World language teachers in this study believed the objective to learning a second language is “to be able to communicate with the spoken language” and “to use it in every day life.” The world language teachers in the interview noted authentic communication through speaking and writing. Kelly explained, “the goal is that you should be able to speak with a native speaker and hold your own. That you could go to a foreign country and get by.” Maria
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further illustrated “It’s to use it in your jobs because especially if they want to stay in the United States I mean the Latino population is growing so it’s only evident that they should learn it.”

Some of the world language teachers’ actual classroom instruction told a different story. Lisa’s French 1 classes were not provided with many opportunities to communicate authentically in the target language, but rather spent the majority of class time drilling grammar rules and memorizing vocabulary words by completing lower level thinking activities. Beverley classes completed many textbook and workbook activities, which did not always allow students the chance to use the language in a meaningful manner. Many of these activities provided a model for students to follow when completing them. Kelly typically only implemented one CA per class, which only provided students with diminutive occasions to use the language in multiple ways since each CA focused mostly on one skill. In addition, Kelly did not use the world language all the time during instruction, and students need to hear the language in order to be able to use it. Not all of the world language teachers provided students with opportunities to use or function in the language in an authentic way. Richards, Gallo, and Renandya (2001) assert that the beliefs held by second language teachers affect their language instruction. In this case not all of the world language teacher’s beliefs are being reflected in their instruction, this could be explained by the various, unplanned factors, that occur in a classroom setting (Borg, 2003) or conventional wisdom and deep structure (Burke, 2011a).

Out of the four world language teachers, Maria and Beverly mentioned that one of their goals in teaching a world language was to promote a comfortable and safe learning environment for the students. “A big thing for me is making sure everyone feels comfortable enough to speak it because I think that fear often causes problems for students, because their concerned about making mistakes” stated Beverly in her interview. Maria described her role in the classroom as a
motivator who demonstrates to the students her passion for the language. This belief may be a result of the teachers’ prior language experience, teacher education, and/or classroom instruction (Borg, 2003). Students learning needs and interests were one of the main beliefs found in a study of teachers second language beliefs conducted by Richards, Gallo, and Renandya (2001).

**Barriers of CLT**

Barriers of implementing CLT were identified by the world language teachers from the analysis of the interviews, questionnaires, and observation notes. The barriers included, lack of materials and resources, student resistant, support of the language department, and teachers knowledge of the CLT method.

**Lack of Materials and Resources**

According to observations and interviews, teachers believed that the lack of specific materials and resources made the implementation of CLT difficult, especially for novice world language teachers. There are certain materials that aid in the implementation of CLT that teachers may utilize during instruction, which may include pre-created or self-designed CA. Kelly expressed, “I just don’t have the time to make everything this year.” In addition, she explained that there are only a couple communicative activities provided by the textbook for each chapter, therefore sometimes she utilized worksheets that the other language teacher created that promotes translation. Having the appropriate resources for students to utilize in class is essential to the implementation of CLT. One of the novice world language teachers only had several, old, falling part Spanish-English dictionaries. Not having the adequate material and resources to aid in language instruction inhibits some, especially beginning world language teachers, from the successful implementation of CLT.
Support

Beverly, Kelly, and Lisa revealed in their questionnaire and interviews that support from other language world language teachers is essential to the implementation of CLT. Maria noted in her questionnaire that she felt she had adequate support from Dr. Kohl through her supervising and observations of her classes. Lisa explained in her interview that if “the other teachers in your department are not on board with you that it’s virtually impossible to be successful [with the implementation of CLT]. You have to all have some what the same vision”. She further explains by giving providing an example of how if you teach a first year class and a fourth year class that if not all of the world language teachers in your department hold the same views of world language instruction then it makes it difficult to teach the students the way you would like, because then the students may not all end up on the same level and not be prepared when they have a different world language teacher or have you again a few years later. Beverly and Kelly agreed that the support of the world language teachers in your school is crucial. Having a support system of world language teachers provides teachers with opportunities to share and collaborate among each other. Richards, Gallo, and Renandya (2001) reported that teachers who are provided with opportunities to reflect and discuss with other teachers of the same content area, for example world language, assist in the process of change.

Student Resistance

Teachers noted in the interviews and questionnaires that the resistance of students against using the target language one hundred percent of the time, not wanting to complete particular CA, and requesting the teacher provide explanations or translations in English makes CLT difficult. Kelly and Beverly explained in their interview the struggle they faced with their students when attempting to use CLT. Beverly, noted that when she started student teaching, her
cooperating mentor teacher’s Spanish I and III students fought her making comments like “Why can’t we just say this in English?” or “Do we have to?”. The novice teacher, Kelly, dealt with a similar issue with her students, “They already think that learning the language is about memorizing all the words and so when you try to give them just the Spanish words…they want the English.” However the other two world language teachers, Maria and Lisa did not comment on this occurring in their classroom, but rather provided explanations to their success with CLT. Maria exclaimed in her interview, “I luckily have a class that participates like crazy”. Lisa expressed, “I disagree with teachers who say they are not able to do it, they are. You just have to be insistent that they do it and you have to have high expectations. They’ll work for it; they’ll do it.” Burke (2006, 2010) extends by stating the importance of world language teachers participating in strategy talks and debriefs about the actual process of learning a language, which can be in English.

Knowledge of CLT

The knowledge world language teachers have about communicative language teaching (CLT) and communicative activities contribute to the effective use of CLT. As mentioned in Chapter 3, three of the world language teachers received instruction on CLT. However, one of these teachers, Kelly, expressed her frustration with never experiencing CLT as a language learner or having the opportunity to observe what a CLT teacher does in the classroom “from day to day all period.” Maria, who also attended a course on CLT had a difficult time defining a communicative activity. In the questionnaire she wrote, “group work?” and when asked to clarify this response in the interview she still had difficulty explaining what a CA was, continuing to reiterate the idea of group work.
Lisa, who had never received formal instruction over CLT also provided misconceptions of the definition of CLT and CA. She responded in her questionnaire, “I would define CLT as exactly what it sounds like. To teach a student a language they can use to communicate”, which partially defines CLT. In contrast, Burke (2006) articulates that “communicative language teaching (CLT) represents an approach to instruction in language classrooms that promotes communicative competence” (p.148). In addition, Lisa believed CA’s were activities where students were communicating orally in the language as opposed to written communication, listening, and reading comprehension. A communication task or CA is a task or activity that involves students communicating and functioning in the world language, focusing on the message rather than grammatical forms (Burke, 2011a; Ellis, 1997). These activities can be oral or written, student to student, student to teacher.

Summary

This chapter discussed the analysis of the data collected of each world language teacher who participated in this study through observation notes, observation protocols, questionnaires, and interviews. Each world language teacher’s classroom and instruction were described through the use of case studies. Next, common themes of world language instruction were identified and discussed. Then, the common beliefs of world language learning and teaching possessed by the teachers were examined. Lastly, barriers of the implementation of CLT were listed and explained as recognized by the four world language teachers.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This research study aimed to understand the methods and approaches to second language teaching and learning today’s world language teachers are utilizing in daily instruction, and how these teachers beliefs of world language education affect their instruction. Furthermore, there are barriers to the implementation of CLT that exist for world language teachers, which need to be fully understood in order for teachers to successfully utilize the CLT approach. Second language teaching and learning research confirms that CLT is the most effective approach to second language teaching that aides in students development of the world language or CC (Berns, 1984; Burke, 2005, 2006, 2010, 2011a, 2011b; Canale & Swain, 1980; Ellis, 1997; Savignon, 1987, 1997, 2007; Schwartz, 2002). Burke (2011b, p. 1) further illustrates this idea:

U.S. students may not learn world languages beyond the Novice or Intermediate levels [developed by ACTFL] because their teachers value certain rituals and beliefs that inhibit implementation of communicative approaches to instruction. Data show that grammar learning remains to be the focus of most courses and world language use is limited.

This chapter discusses the results of the study conducted in relation to the research questions posed. Then, the overall conclusions of the study are presented. Lastly, recommendations are provided for future research in world language instruction.

Discussion

The findings from this study will be discussed according to each research question posed. This is done as a way to better organize and discuss the results of this entire study.
Research Question One: What methods and/or approaches are world language teachers using and why?

The findings demonstrate that world language teachers are not utilizing one specific method or approach to second language teaching, but rather are using the combination of methods and approaches. The impact of the development of methods and approaches to language instruction over the decades are apparent in the four world language teachers who participated in this study through the analysis of classroom observations, questionnaires and interviews. It is important to recognize that each method or approach to second language teaching and learning was influenced and impacted by other methods or approaches to language instruction. These influences included the demand of society and education at the time a particular second language approach or method of instruction was developed and the effect of previous methods and approaches to second language instruction.

Throughout the years many methods and approaches to second language instruction were developed in reaction to a current method and/or approach. The direct method of language instruction arose as a result of the second language scholars who did not agree with the ideology of the G-T method. In addition, several second language methods and approaches share or borrow certain techniques to language instruction. For example, several of the methods and approaches, the direct method, ALM, the cognitive anti-method, the cognitive-code method, CLT, TPR, and the natural approach, to language instruction promote the use of the world language by the teacher and student through meaningful communication. Because of this diversity, it is almost impossible to pin point one specific method or approach used by one world language teacher rather world language teachers utilize many approaches and methods of instruction.
All four of the world language teachers in this study were identified as hybrid teachers according to the world language teacher profiles identified by Burke (2006). A hybrid teacher utilizes both G-T methods and CLT approach in language instruction and these teachers tend to fall closer to one side of the spectrum (Burke, 2006).

Beverly and Maria are considered hybrid CLT teachers, because they utilized more techniques from the CLT approach than the grammar-translation method in their daily instruction. Both world language teachers used immersion in the world language, implemented several CA’s per week, and encouraged all students to use the world language during class. Unlike Beverly, Maria also tried to incorporate cultural components into her lessons whenever possible. However, they taught grammar explicitly, encouraged correct pronunciation of the world language, and typically taught the four skills, reading, writing, speaking, and listening, separately.

Kelly and Lisa are also hybrid teachers, but where they fall on the teacher profile spectrum depended on the level of the class they were teaching. In their lower level classes, Spanish I and French I, they utilized more G-T techniques through the use of translation, grammar, and drill activities, than CLT. Also, English was the main language spoken during instruction by both the teacher and students, where as in their upper level classes Kelly and Lisa leaned more towards a hybrid CLT teacher by creating more opportunities for students to communicate in the language through the implementation of CA. Lisa used immersion in these classes, and students only spoke in the world language, however grammar was still taught explicitly and practiced by textbook and workbook activities. In her upper level classes Kelly still used some English during instruction and students completed translation and grammar activities provided by the textbook or workbook.
World language teachers continue to use a range of approaches and methods to world language instruction. These methods and approaches used in the classroom vary for numerous reasons depending on the level of the students and the material or concepts being taught. For instance, all four world language teachers used the G-T approach when teaching grammar concepts and skills. In addition, Kelly and Lisa used different approaches and methods to teach their classes depending on the level of the class. Their lower level classes consisted more of grammar explanations, drilling, translation activities, memorization of grammar rules and vocabulary words, and repetition. In contrast the upper level classes included more activities where students could communicate authentically in the language through a variety of means. These students were provided with more opportunities to use the language rather than learning about it.

**Research Question Two: How do world language teachers’ values and beliefs of language teaching and learning affect their instruction?**

The reasons as to why world language teachers utilize these approaches and methods to instruction can be answered by my second research question. Since these factors are deeply rooted in our own general beliefs and values as well as societies view of education, they are difficult to separate and put into their own category. Some explanations as to why world language teachers teach a second language in a certain manner include the teacher’s prior language experience, teacher education, personal values and beliefs of language instruction, conventional wisdom, deep structure, and unplanned influences in the classroom (Borg, 2003; Burke, 2011a, Richards, Gallo, and Renandya, 2001). Therefore, it is important that world language teachers as well as teacher preparation programs recognize these beliefs in order to improve and change world language pedagogy to better reflect the communicative approach.
The world language teachers who participated in this study shared common beliefs and perceptions on teaching and learning a world language. The teachers believed the objective or goal to learning a world language was to be able to communicate and use it in everyday life, the workplace, and traveling to other countries where that language is spoken. In addition they expressed the necessity for students to have opportunities in the classroom to hear, speak, write, and listen to the world language through authentic and meaningful activities. Speaking and hearing the world language were both emphasized by the teachers as the most important aspects for students to learn. Lastly, all of the world language teachers believed grammar of the world language was imperative for students to understand, but should not be the main focus of instruction.

Although all the world language teachers possessed similar values and beliefs of second language teaching and learning these were not apparent in their daily instruction. Beverly and Maria were the only world language teachers who used the world language the entire time during instruction and encouraged students to do the same. Lisa did this too, but only in her upper level classes. The teachers continued to focus their lessons around a specific grammar point and taught it explicitly. Lastly, students were not always provided with opportunities to communicate in the world language spontaneously and authentically, as the teachers mentioned were important when learning a second language.

**Research Question Three: What barriers are inhibiting world language teachers from implementing CLT?**

The barriers included lack of resources and materials, support from other world language teachers, student resistance, and the knowledge of CLT. These barriers may also be a reason some world language teachers beliefs and values of world language pedagogy does not match
their classroom instruction. By identifying these barriers, strategies can be developed to help world language teachers effectively implement CLT. The four world language teachers in this study even identified a few strategies to help future world language teachers when implementing CLT.

The first barrier discussed was the lack of resources and materials available to assist teachers in the implementation of CLT. In her interview and questionnaire Kelly provided a possible strategy to help overcome this barrier, which included creating online support groups such as blogs or a listserv where other world language teachers can share their ideas, lessons, and activities. An online community of world language teachers is an ideal way to help support teachers around the United States or even the globe in the use of the CLT method. The key to success in any career is collaboration among your professional peers.

The next barrier identified by the four world language teachers was support from other world language teachers. The degree of support a world language teacher may receive depends greatly on the school in which they are employed. For instance, Kelly works at a small rural high school where she teaches all, but one of the Spanish classes. There is one other world language teacher who teaches all the French classes and one Spanish class. On the other hand, Lisa is a French teacher at a relatively sized suburban high school where there are two other French teachers and several Spanish teachers. Therefore, the size of your world language department may impact the support you receive from other world language teachers. There are pros and cons to every world language department no matter the size. For this reason it is essential to provide support to all of these teachers. Beverly discussed this notion of teacher support, “An entire world language department dedicated to the same goal of communicative language teaching would be ideal” and “either a small department or at least one that is all on
board with CLT teaching would aid in the success of that type of instruction”. Of course it is not always possible to persuade every one of the benefits and effectiveness of using the CLT method. However, having department workshops where these teachers collaborate and share their ideas about CLT and receiving professional development on CLT are both two ways to gain support from other world language teachers in your department. Additionally, sharing and discussing research about CLT and observing each other’s classrooms will establish a strong and supportive world language department.

Another barrier that inhibits world language teachers from successful implementation of CLT is student resistance. Beverly explained in her interview that she struggled with her students adjusting to her teaching style, which varied from her CMT. One way she overcame this was by having talks with her classes in English about why she was teaching in the way she was as well as encouraging the students that they were capable of producing in the target language. Kelly also discussed in her interview a talk she had with her Spanish students of her expectations and plans for how the Spanish classes will be taught next year. Student resistance is inevitable in any subject, but should not be a barrier to employing CLT. Strategy talks such as the ones Beverly and Kelly had with their students is one way to help students to understand why you are teaching the way you are (Burke, 2006, 2010). During these talks students should be provided with research on CLT so that they can learn more about the method being used and why it is the most effective method. In addition, allowing students to express their opinions and concerns is important so that student feel more involved in the learning. Lastly, students need to understand learning a language is a process that takes time and mistakes are unavoidable and part of learning a new language, but that CLT is the most effective way for students to develop their CC.
Lastly, knowledge of CLT is a barrier to the implementation of CLT. It seems logical that it would be difficult to perform or complete a task if you do not understand it or even know how to do it. Therefore, not understanding completely what CLT is and how it looks in the classroom makes it difficult, if not impossible, to effectively use this method. Kelly suggested in her interview that pre-service world language teachers have multiple opportunities to observe CLT teachers in action and that these students be paired with a CMT who is more of a CLT teacher than a G-T teacher. It is important that pre-service students be provided with ample opportunities to observe CLT teachers and implement CLT lessons. Along with this, these teachers should keep a journal of their thoughts and reflections in order to help them grow as an educator and to identify their own values and beliefs that may impede them from becoming a CLT teacher. Since there are current world language teachers who face this barrier, they need to be provided with courses and information on the CLT method through workshops, professional development, and seminars. In addition, observing other CLT teachers in their own school or even district would provide them with opportunities to see CLT in action.

By providing world language teachers, future and current, with ways to overcome these barriers we can assure that these teachers are able to effectively and successfully implement CLT, and therefore students develop CC in the language.

**Conclusion**

World language instruction is a critical issue in schools across the United States. Student learning is affected by world language teachers’ beliefs and values and by the barriers to implementing CLT. The approaches and methods of world language instruction utilized by world language teachers are impacted and influenced by their own beliefs, values, and experiences of teaching and learning a second language and vice versa. The barriers of
implementing CLT that exist, likewise, impact world language teachers’ beliefs about world language education and the methods and approaches they utilize to teach the language. This further illustrates the importance of understanding separately each of these underlying issues in order to grasp what actually is occurring in the world language classroom. Therefore, future and current world language teachers, schools and universities, and world language researchers must address these issues so that students can receive effective instruction in their world language classrooms to ensure they fully develop their communicative competence in the world language.

Due to the nature and limitations of this study it is important that other studies related to world language are conducted in order to learn more about the impact of world language instruction throughout the United States. Currently there are limited amounts of studies published about the impact world language teachers’ beliefs have on their own language instruction. Burke (2006) conducted a study on pre-service secondary world language teachers and found that their values and beliefs did affect their daily instruction. The CLT approach to language instruction has been promoted for nearly forty years by researchers and teacher-educators in the U.S. (Savignon, 1972). Nonetheless, teachers are still not implementing CLT on a daily basis, which means that students are not developing communicative competence. The majority of students are studying a world language in grammar-translation or hybrid classrooms for four or more years, and consequently unable to communicate or write beyond the intermediate level, according to the ACTFL proficiency scale (B. M. Burke, personal communication, 2010-2011).

It is essential that world language researchers focus on identifying possible barriers to the implementation of CLT, and then work with teachers to improve their instruction and understanding of CLT. Only then, will it be possible for world language instruction to improve
and move in the right direction of students’ development of communicative competence. Burke (2005) conducted a study about the influence of experiential professional development (EPD) on CLT of four secondary world language teachers. Her study produced excellent results that demonstrated these four world language teachers understanding of CLT improved, and they were able to implement CLT in the classroom successfully after the participation in EPD (Burke, 2005). After six years of completing the EPD these four teachers were still implementing CLT methods. This is just one example of the success world language teachers can have with the implementation of CLT if provided the appropriate assistance and opportunities by other world language teachers, researchers, and/or universities.

Now, that I have completed this study on world language instruction, world language teachers’ beliefs, and the struggles of implementing CLT I feel better prepared to be a CLT teacher. I understand the methods and approaches to world language instruction that my past Spanish teachers used and why they used these methods and approaches. Additionally, I have experienced first hand the effects these methods and approaches had on the development of my CC of the language. Therefore, I plan to do everything in my power to be an effective CLT teacher that provides my students with copious opportunities to negotiate, interpret and express in the world language. However, I know this will not be an easy task, because of the barriers that do exist with the implementation of CLT and because my own values and beliefs that may inhibit my instruction. I plan to use what I have learned from this study to become a CLT teacher and to share my knowledge with others.

Wherever I end up teaching next year I plan to share my knowledge and passion of the CLT method to other world language teachers. As a first year teacher in a new school and environment, I know it is important for me to not impose my beliefs and values of world
language pedagogy on to others. Rather I plan to share with others my ideas and beliefs when other teachers feel comfortable approaching me. Nevertheless, I will support other world language teachers at my school by sharing with them my knowledge and providing them with examples of CLT lessons and CA’s. I know that these teachers will also teach me a great deal about their own world language philosophies. In addition to supporting the world language teachers at my school, I plan to assist other teachers by continuing to work with my advisor and participate in a LISTSERV with other world language teachers. I have been working this year with my advisor to set up a LISTSERV for world language education graduates at Windy State University. This LISTSERV is one way these graduates can stay connected by sharing and discussing new ideas, lessons, activities, and struggles.
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APPENDIX A

CONSENT LETTER
Informed Consent Form for Social Science Research
Bowling Green State University
World Language Teacher Participants

Title of Project: What type of world language teacher are you and why?
Principal Investigator: Natasha Gallagher
Contact Information: 529 Education Building, Bowling Green, OH 43403; ngallag@bgsu.edu

1. Purpose of the Study: I will be studying the common methods and approaches world language teachers utilize during instruction and their beliefs and values behind their instruction style. I will also be examining what kind of barriers novice world language teachers encounter when attempting to implement communicative language teaching. The research questions to be answered are: What methods and/or approaches are world language teachers using and why? What beliefs and values do teachers possess about effective world language pedagogy? What barriers are inhibiting novice world language teachers from implementing communicative language teaching?

2. Procedures to be followed: I would like permission from you to complete a questionnaire, to observe in your world language classes multiple times in order to record observation notes, and collect any handouts provided to your students. I would also like to interview you for my research. I will tape-record and transcribe this interview with your permission.

3. Discomforts and Risks: There are no risks in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life. Most teachers do not teach in identical ways and respect one another’s different approaches and/or methods to instruction. The results from this study will discuss my findings on the common methods and/or approaches to language instruction and the values and beliefs held by world language teachers. Participant responses will be confidential. The names of the participants will be removed from all documents and replaced with a pseudonym. Each participant will be given a copy of the thesis before submission to the university, and allowed to go through it editing out any comments they feel may violate their confidentiality.

4. Benefits: This study will inform world language teachers of barriers that inhibit novice world language teachers from implementing communicative language teaching. The study will also identify specific ways that novice world language teachers can successfully implement communicative language teaching to ensure that all students are learning to use the language instead of learning about it. Each participant will receive a copy of my thesis, after it has been submitted to the university and given the opportunity to discuss with me my findings.

5. Duration/Time: I estimate that your initial participation in this study will take approximately two months. Your participation will involve seven different classroom observations, the completion of a questionnaire, and a tape-recorded interview. Each observation will take place during the regular scheduled school day hours of that participant. The questionnaire will take each participant approximately twenty to thirty minutes to complete. The interview of each participant conducted by the investigator will take approximately thirty to forty minutes.

6. Statement of Confidentiality: Only I will know your identity. Information from this study will not be given to identify you or your school. The focus of my study is the common methods and/or approaches world language teachers use in general and their general values and beliefs about world language pedagogy, and not on what methods and/or approaches specific world language teachers use.
and those specific world language teachers values and beliefs about world language pedagogy. Data collected from this study will be stored in a locked file cabinet in my office. The audiotapes of the participant interviews and transcriptions will also be kept in a locked file cabinet in my office. Names will be removed from the data and replaced with pseudonyms.

7. **Right to Ask Questions:** You have the right to ask questions and have those questions answered. You can ask me questions about the research. You can contact me via email at ngallag@bgsu.edu or by phone at 614-395-1071 or contact my thesis advisor, Dr. Brigid Burke, via email at bburke@bgsu.edu or by phone at 419-372-7324. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, contact Bowling Green State University’s Human Subjects Review Board at (419) 372-7716 or hsr@bgsu.edu.

8. **Voluntary Participation:** Participation is voluntary. You can withdraw from the study at any time by notifying me. You can decline to answer specific questions.

You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to participate in this research study. If you consent to participate in this research study and to the terms above, please sign your name and indicate the date below.

You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep for your records if you would like one.

_____________________________  ______________________
Participant Signature          Date
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TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE
Teacher Questionnaire

Biographical Information
1. Name:
2. World language(s) you teach:
3. World language(s) you can speak:
4. How long have you been a world language teacher?
5. Levels of world languages you currently teach:
6. What degree(s) do you hold?
7. Have you studied abroad at a university? If so, where and how long?
8. What do you do to maintain your competence in the world language?
9. Have you taken any education courses that have addressed communicative language teaching (CLT)? If yes, briefly describe what you learned about it in the course. To what extent, if any, has the course impacted your current language instruction?

World Language Instruction Information
1. How often (total=100%) do you use the world language when teaching and for what purpose?
2. How often (total=100%) do your students use the world language and for what purpose?
3. What are the various components of world language that you address in your instruction on a weekly basis? How much time per week (total=100%) do you focus on each component?
4. How would you define the term communicative language teaching (CLT)?
5. Would you consider yourself a CLT teacher? Why or why not?
6. What aspects do you like about CLT?
7. What aspects do you dislike about CLT?

8. How would you define the term communicative activity?

9. What is the approximate percentage of time per week you implement communicative activities in your world language classroom lessons?

10. Do you believe you have support from others (teachers, administrators, parents, etc.) with the implementation of communicative language teaching?

11. What type of support would help you successfully implement communicative language teaching?
APPENDIX C

TEACHER INTERVIEW QUESTIONS
Teacher Interview Questions

1. Describe a typical day in your classroom. What are you doing? What are your students doing?

2. What do you believe is the goal of learning a world language?

3. What is your world language education philosophy?

4. How do you believe students learn a world language effectively?

5. What is the most important aspect for students to learn in a world language classroom?

6. What aspects do you like about CLT? (Follow-up question from questionnaire-#6 part2)

7. What aspects do you dislike about CLT? (Follow-up question from questionnaire-#7 part2)

8. Do you believe you have support from others (teachers, administrators, parents, etc.) with the implementation of communicative language teaching? (Follow-up question from questionnaire-#10 part2)

9. What type of support would help you successfully implement communicative language teaching? (Follow-up question from questionnaire-#11 part 2)

10. Have you taken any education courses that have addressed communicative language teaching (CLT)? If yes, briefly describe what you learned about it in the course. To what extent, if any, has the course impacted your current language instruction? (Follow-up question from questionnaire-#9 part 1)
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OBSERVATION PROTOCOL
## OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

Teacher: ___________________ Date: ___________ Class: ___________________
Time: __________ #of students________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication in the World Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(teacher, students, immersion)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar Instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(explicit, implicit, both, comparison of languages)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(separate from language instruction, combined with language instruction)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types of Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(student-centered, teacher-centered, CLT, drill, translation, grammar, etc.)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(teacher to class, class to teacher, student to class, students to students, etc.)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where does the teacher fall on the continuum according to this lesson?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audio/Listening</th>
<th>Visual Aides</th>
<th>Reading/Writing</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G-T               Hybrid               CLT