6-18-2011

Moving Beyond "Second" and "Foreign": An Examination of the Discursive Construction of Teaching English and Spanish

Nicole M. Houser
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

MOVING BEYOND "SECOND" AND "FOREIGN": AN EXAMINATION OF THE DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF TEACHING ENGLISH AND SPANISH

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Nicole M. Houser

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

May 2011

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
The School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of English

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Nicole M. Houser

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

_____ _____
Sharon K. Deckert, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of English, Advisor

_____ _____
David I. Hanauer, Ph.D.
Professor of English

_____ _____
Nancy Hayward, Ph.D.
Professor of English

_____ _____
Anne Pomerantz, Ph.D.
Senior Lecturer in Educational Practice
University of Pennsylvania

ACCEPTED

_____ _____
Timothy P. Mack, Ph.D.
Dean
The School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Moving Beyond "Second" and "Foreign": An Examination of the Discursive Construction of Teaching English and Spanish

Author: Nicole M. Houser

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Sharon Deckert

Dissertation Committee: Dr. David I. Hanauer
Dr. Nancy Hayward
Dr. Anne Pomerantz

This dissertation explores how teaching Spanish and English as second languages in the United States has been traditionally defined, the common assumptions that are held about each context, and the influence these assumptions have on instructional practices and student learning. In order to explore how teaching English and Spanish is constructed in a local context, I employ a Foucauldian discourse analytical approach in conjunction with ethnographic methods to provide detailed descriptions of an Intensive English Program (IEP) and a Spanish Program at one university. I then contextualize this particular site within the larger professional and societal discourses surrounding the instruction of both languages. My study revealed that by comparing the discourses and practices of both contexts participants make contradictory and limiting assumptions concerning student goals and motivations as well as curricular organization and instructional practices in both settings. My research illustrates how participant interpretations of each context are highly influenced by what has traditionally been considered "normal" for teaching Spanish and English as second languages. While some contextual factors contributed to these differences, these divisions are essentially arbitrary, and potentially limiting to how we conceptualize teaching and learning in both settings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I first would like to thank my dissertation committee, my director Dr. Sharon Deckert and my committee members Dr. David Hanauer, Dr. Nancy Hayward, and Dr. Anne Pomerantz. Your guidance and useful feedback throughout this process have been invaluable. I would also like to thank my first dissertation director, Dr. Nancy Bell, for all of her support and input in the initial stages of this process.

Next, I would like to thank my family for their unending encouragement and their belief in me. To my parents, Barbara and Thomas Houser, I am thankful for your support, both emotional and financial, your honesty, and, most of all, your sense of humor. To my brother, Douglas Houser, I am grateful that you came back into my life in time to be my toughest coach at the end of this process ("Don't bore us, get to the chorus!").

My friends are family too, and I am fortunate to have several "friend families" that without whom I would never have been able to complete this project. To my IUP family, Brian Fallon, Kim Thomas, Chris Garcia, and Marcy Trianosky. You made my graduate school experience an unforgettable one. Thank you for all of your friendship and helpful feedback during coursework and afterward. Kim, I will never forget "dissertation boot camp!" Brian, thanks for all of your support, especially at the end of this process.

To my Frostburg family, Kate Keely, María-Luisa Sánchez, Daniel Silver, Paul Charney, Judy Dieruf, Regina Alderton, Jennifer Ingle, Jackie Brown, Damon Newcomb, Miha Wood, Greg Wood, Abby Lewis, Kristin Morton, and Patricia McDonald. I really

can't thank you enough for your support throughout this process. Your patience and consistent encouragement mean more than I can express here. I feel extremely fortunate to have such positive people in my life every day.

I would also like to acknowledge my Penn State family, Becca Barczykowski, Dan Bonsignore, April Jacobs, and Silvia Álvarez-Olarra. You have known me the longest and amazingly, even after this, you are still around! Thank you for always being "here" for me even though you may be physically far away.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my late maternal grandmother, Mary Rimokaitis, who had always served as a role model and inspiration for perseverance and strength.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

> The IEP (Intensive English Program) is a second language setting as opposed to a foreign language setting. . . I just don't think you really can compare them . . . in an ESL setting, you know, they go outside and they're surrounded by the language. So I think, you can't really compare the two. I know that's what you're doing ((laughs)) but I think it's really comparing apples and oranges. (Dr. Gail Nelson, Associate Chair of Foreign Languages, Southeastern State University, 2007)

As an instructor of both English and Spanish, which, in the United States, are predominantly categorized as second language and foreign language contexts respectively, I have observed the ways in which these disciplines overlap yet at the same time appear to be disconnected[1]. Their disciplinary histories and traditions have resulted in distinct language teaching ideologies, curricular organizations, and classroom practices. Although calls have been made in the field of second language acquisition (SLA) to investigate and acknowledge the complexities of second language learning contexts (Block, 2003; Ortega, 2010; VanPatten & Lee, 1990), the traditional separation of these two fields still strongly influences the way in which language professionals conceptualize them, as evidenced by the opening quotation by Dr. Nelson, who I interviewed for the current study.

[1] There has been some debate as to the designation of Spanish as a "second" rather than a "foreign" language in the U.S. because of the high population of Spanish-speakers (see Gonzalez, 1996). However, Spanish is still most widely considered a "foreign" language, especially in the university context, where it is included within "foreign" language study. A more complete description of issues surrounding Spanish teaching in the U.S. is found in Chapter 4.

The objective of this dissertation is to explore how teaching Spanish and English as second languages in the United States has been traditionally defined, the common assumptions that are held about each context, and the influence these assumptions have on instructional practices and student learning. In order to explore how teaching English and Spanish is constructed in a local context, I employ a Foucauldian discourse analytical approach in conjunction with ethnographic methods to provide detailed descriptions of an Intensive English Program (IEP) and a Spanish Program at one university. I then contextualize this particular site within the larger professional and societal discourses surrounding the instruction of both languages. My study revealed that by comparing the discourses and practices of both contexts participants make contradictory and limiting assumptions concerning student goals and motivations as well as curricular organization and instructional practices in both settings. My research illustrates how participant interpretations of each context are highly influenced by what has traditionally been considered "normal" for teaching Spanish and English as second languages. While some contextual factors contributed to these differences, these divisions are essentially arbitrary, and potentially limiting to how we conceptualize teaching and learning in both settings.

Background and Context

Language learning takes place in a variety of contexts. Although the characteristics of individual language learning environments are unique and complex, second language acquisition (SLA) theorists have historically grouped second language (L2) learning into three contexts: foreign language learning, second language learning, and naturalistic learning (Block, 2003). The labels of foreign and second language

learning have traditionally designated L2 learning that occurs in a classroom setting. Foreign language (FL) learning refers to language instruction that takes place in primary and secondary classrooms as well as in universities, where students "rely on their time in a classroom to learn a language that is not the typical language of communication in their community" (Block, 2003, p. 48).

In the second language (SL) context, students also participate in formal classroom language instruction. However, second language learning differs from foreign language learning in that "the classroom is situated inside a community where the target language is spoken" (Block, 2003, p. 49). Although second and foreign language learning are both situated within the broader context of second language learning and teaching, their relationship with each other within SLA research is largely unclear and often contradictory SL and FL learning are included together under the umbrella of SLA theory, yet they are most often defined and presented within this research as separate and, at times, contrasting the fields (VanPatten & Lee, 1990; Nayar, 1997; Tedick & Walker, 1994).

Having completed all of my undergraduate and graduate training in the United States, I draw on my professional and academic backgrounds in Education and second language acquisition theory to inform my pedagogical practices in both contexts. At the same time, I make decisions regarding class organization and activity implementation that are consistently distinct for teaching each language. I have been educated to teach English in a certain way in Teacher of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) programs, learning the discourse of the field of second language acquisition for a second language context. Regarding Spanish, not only have I learned the professional discourse

of foreign language teaching and the ways in which the field overlaps and diverges from second language teaching, I am also a product of foreign language education in the United States, having studied Spanish as a second language in middle school and high school and later completing my Bachelor's of Arts degree in Spanish at a U.S. university.

Coming from an FL learning and teaching background and entering a TESOL program, I duly noted differences in professional literature and in the ways instructors in both contexts described curriculum organization and practices, even though presumably both fields are situated in second language studies. The contradictory relationship between the two contexts was something that I had been generally aware of, but I did not think about critically until one day after talking with one of my colleagues about what I perceived as a successful classroom interaction in an English writing course that I was teaching. I recounted an internet research assignment that led to an animated discussion with the students on the history of immigration in the United States. Afterward I said, "That never would have happened in a Spanish class."

That particular comment stayed with me long after the conversation with my colleague had ended. The evaluative nature of my observation led me to question why I had perceived that successful lesson and interaction as not possible in a similar classroom of students learning Spanish. I then began to wonder about the origins of these perceptions and to what extent these interpretations influenced my teaching practices in both contexts. I also could not help but feel that my evaluation was limiting my view of instructional possibilities in some way and, therefore, potentially limiting students' learning opportunities.

This initial reflection led me to more detailed evaluation of the ways in which I taught both Spanish and English at the university level. I began to compare aspects of my classroom organization and teaching practices, examining past lesson plans, syllabi, examinations, and assignments for the Spanish and English courses that I had taught. The more that I studied my own practices, the more differences I noted; activities and lessons that would occur in Spanish class, but never in an ESL class and vice versa. Furthermore, when I asked myself the pedagogical reasons and second language theory and research that informed these differences, I often found there were none, and that they were just common practices to which I had become accustomed to in both fields. These informal findings served as a catalyst to begin researching these differences more formally as part of graduate coursework. I wanted to explore the assumptions I held about teaching and learning in both contexts. What, specifically, were these assumptions? Why did I hold them? Did other professionals in both fields hold them as well? And finally, are these assumptions limiting teaching practices and student learning opportunities in some way?

In order to examine the above questions regarding the differences between Spanish and English L2 learning contexts, I conducted preliminary research on the discourses of these two fields. I chose to focus on how larger professional and societal discourses affected the perceptions and practices of the instructors, because of the normalizing effect of discourse (Fairclough, 1995). This preliminary research that I conducted yielded the findings that serve as the basis for the current study. I found patterns of differences in how instructors in both classroom contexts talked about

teaching and learning. Furthermore, the instructors who had taught both Spanish and ESL expressed that they, like me, had perceived differences in both contexts.

Statement of the Problem

The exploration of the complex and contradictory relationship between second and foreign language learning contexts served as the underlying motivation for the current study. Interpreting and reproducing generalized understandings about different language learning environments limits the ways in which we conceptualize teaching and learning in these settings. This problem has been recognized within the field of SLA, and SLA scholars have made several calls for redefining language-learning contexts and acknowledging the complexities of these settings. For example, Block (2003) questions the traditional categories of second, foreign, and naturalistic settings, stating "while it is right to distinguish between classroom and naturalistic contexts, and foreign and second contexts, it should also be recognized that none of these contexts provides learning opportunities in a predictable manner" (p. 5). He criticizes the cognitive model of SLA for focusing on "general" contexts, whereas a more social model would describe particular contexts in order to show the multiple factors within language learning environments. Block calls for a "broader, socially informed and more sociolinguistically oriented SLA that does not exclude the mainstream psycholinguistic one, but instead takes on board the *complexity of context*, the multi-layered nature of language and an expanded view of what acquisition entails" (p. 4, emphasis added). The current study aligns itself with these goals and seeks to provide a detailed depiction of Spanish and English teaching at one university.

Furthermore, these traditional disciplinary divisions have been cited as leading to a lack of communication between different areas of second language studies. In a call to address the limitations caused by these traditional disciplinary divisions, Tedick and Walker (1994) cite the "fragmentation and isolation of various language teaching contexts" as one of the fundamental problems of second language learning and teaching (p. 302). By providing a detailed description and comparison of Spanish and English second language teaching contexts in one university, both categorized as foreign and second languages, respectively, the current study seeks to explore this fundamental problem in the field of SLA.

Statement of Purpose and Research Questions

The current study responds to the call to address complexity of context in second language teaching by providing a detailed description and comparison of English and Spanish L2 teaching contexts at one university. In this study, I examine the historical, social, and political factors that contribute to the formation of the discourses teaching English and Spanish in the United States. I explore how these larger discourses are reflected and reproduced in the local discourses and practices at one university. I then explain how theses discourses create simplified conceptions of second and foreign languages contexts, and hypothesize how these assumptions affect teaching practices.

The following research questions guide this study:

1. What discourses are circulating within and through these English and Spanish second language teaching contexts?

2. How do the discourses found at the local level reflect and reproduce larger professional and societal discourses on teaching English and Spanish as second languages?

3. How do these discourses shape and get shaped by particular institutional practices?

Research Approach

In order to examine the English and Spanish programs at one university in depth, I employed ethnographic methods and a Foucauldian discourse analytical approach in my study. Discourse analysis is often combined with ethnographic methods in order to gain a more complete understanding of the ways in which learning is constructed through multiple texts and contexts (Gee and Green, 1998). Over a five month period (a semester and a summer session), I served as a participant observer in multiple class meetings in the English Language Program and Spanish Program at one university, and conducted interviews with administrators, instructors, and students. I chose to speak with representatives of each group within the program in an attempt to include a variety of perspectives and to also gain a sense of how the learning and program identities are collectively constructed. In addition to conducting interviews, I observed interactions in multiple social spaces within each program and at the university—i.e., student lounges, graduate assistant offices, and resource rooms.

Since I intended to focus on the ways in which the discourses of these two fields shape and are shaped through practices, I collected and analyzed multiple texts from each program, both spoken and written, including field notes and transcriptions of classroom observations, transcriptions of participant interviews, program descriptions, class handouts, syllabi and textbooks. Following Foucauldian discourse analytical methods (Foucault, 1987), I analyzed texts on the local level and contextualized them within larger historical and societal discourses surrounding the teaching of both languages as well as the speakers of both Spanish and English in the United States. In order to contextualize the findings at the institutional level within the larger social, historical, and professional context, I present a historical overview of the teaching of Spanish and English in the United States and the prominent discourses that have shaped our current understandings of these two fields.

Rationale and Significance

By exploring these two language-teaching situations in depth, this study will inform the fields of second language acquisition and second and foreign language teaching and learning by answering the aforementioned calls for addressing the complexity of language teaching contexts, along with calls for increasing communication between disciplines that are traditionally fragmented within second language studies. In spite of numerous calls to address complexity of context and studies that examine how societal discourses influence one particular context, traditional labels, categorizations, and assumptions about contexts persist. These disciplinary divisions exist in professional organizations, publications within the field, and at professional conferences. For example, at the 2010 American Association for Applied Linguistics conference, although

the plenary speaker Lourdes Ortega delivered a poignant plenary lecture on the "bilingual turn in SLA" and the need to reimagine and redefine traditional language learning contexts, the traditional labels and division of SL and FL were found throughout the conference program. This demonstrates that, although a change in how we view these contexts has begun, more concerted efforts need to be made in the way we conceptualize assumptions within the field. The program labels also serve as indicators of the strength of these traditional professional discourses.

Furthermore, since Spanish is the second most widely-spoken language in the U.S., with its number of speakers continuing to grow, Spanish holds a unique position among other "foreign" languages. In relationship with the aforementioned conventional definitions of "second" and "foreign" language contexts, demographically, Spanish is no longer a "foreign" language, further exemplifying the complexity of these labels. In this way, the current study also seeks to add to research that specifically addresses sociocultural factors that influence the relationship and perceptions of Spanish and English in the United States, which in turn affect Spanish teaching contexts. Recently, multiple studies have addressed how outside discourses on immigration, Hispanics, and Spanish-speaking populations impact learning Spanish as a second language (e.g. Leeman and Martínez, 2007; Pomerantz, 2002, 2010; Schwartz, 2008).

The proposed study also seeks to contribute to discourse studies and more socioculturally focused SLA research by examining and comparing the social, historical, and professional discourses of each field and investigating to what extent these discourses affect teaching practices. As Block (2003) indicates, research that addresses the complexity of context is part of socioculturally oriented SLA studies, which represent a

shift in focus in recent years from a more cognitive model. The current study also contributes to recent SLA research that focuses based on sociocultural and critical models that contextualize language learning contexts within their social, historical, and political environments, as well as redefine traditional definitions and assumptions within the field (e.g. Kramsch, 2009; Ortega, 2010). Furthermore, although the terminology of second and foreign language contexts has been discussed together in the literature, research that compares the two contexts is scarce.

Finally, this study has two interdisciplinary objectives: 1) To serve as an example of how these two fields may inform one another, and 2) To promote communication across fields, for instructors of Spanish, English, or both languages. Comparative studies are necessary in order to more fully understand the construction of these distinct language-learning contexts and to gain greater insight into the ways these divisions limit our practices as language educators. Furthermore, recent calls have been made for interdisciplinary collaboration with university Foreign Language Departments as a way to foster curricular reform (Byrnes, 2001; 2002; MLA, 2007). Analyzing the contexts together provides an opportunity to step outside of the discourse of only one field in interpreting each context. In this way, we are better able to determine the ways in which our assumptions about these contexts influence our teaching practices, and are more likely to gain a new perspective on our traditional interpretations.

Assumptions

Based on my preliminary research on prominent discourses surrounding English as a Second Language (ESL) and Spanish foreign language contexts, I made several assumptions at the outset of conducting the current study. First, I assumed that I would

find different discourses and practices in each setting that would reflect prevalent professional discourses as well as societal ones. Traditional professional divisions and how instructors themselves have been educated within foreign language or English linguistics or second language studies programs still greatly influence a division of perceptions and practices in each context.

I also assumed that the division between contexts would also be reflected in institutional organization, as many English as a Second Language programs at the university level are separated from "foreign" language programs in multiple ways—physically, financially, and administratively. Although some language departments in universities are integrated, the traditional division within the field and also physically has led to the separation of English and Spanish second language programs at many universities.

Finally, I expected to find that assumptions that participants made about what was possible in each context locally would reflect larger societal discourses and these perceptions would affect practices. Also, these practices would in turn reproduce the discourse that influenced participants' perceptions. I anticipated these findings based on personal experience, preliminary research on the topic, and my understanding of discourse theory and how discourses and practices at a local (micro) level have a dialectical relationship with surrounding societal discourses at the macro level.

Definitions of Key Terminology Used in This Study

Throughout this study, I will frequently employ multiple terms and acronyms that identify different language learning settings. Although one of the main objectives of the current study is to reimagine and redefine traditional categorizations of language learning

contexts, I employ traditional terminology, such as "foreign language (FL)" and "second language (SL)" for two principal reasons that correspond to two separate contexts in the current study. 1. To maintain accuracy and consistency in describing the history of how these labels were produced and 2. To accurately reflect the way in which the English and Spanish language programs are categorized at the research site. At this particular site, English is labeled as a second language (SL) context and Spanish as a foreign language (FL). Although I use SL and FL to refer to the programs at the research site, I most frequently refer to the two contexts by their program names and acronyms: the Spanish Program (SP) and the English Language Program (ELP). I chose these particular names for the programs and to predominantly use these labels in an effort to not repeatedly tie English with the term second language and Spanish with foreign language. In this way, I am not constantly reproducing and calling attention to the labels and assumptions traditionally associated with both contexts. Finally, I will use the acronym "SSU" to replace the full name (pseudonym) of the research site, Southeastern State University.

Organization of Study

In chapter 2, I describe the theoretical framework that informed the current study. I outline my rationale for employing a Foucauldian discourse analytical approach in relationship to the goals of my research, and explain the definition and related concepts of discourse that influenced my methodological approach.

In chapter 3, I outline the methods and procedures that guided the current study. I explain the selection of the research site and participants and describe them. I then outline the rationale and procedure for employing ethnographic methods with a

Foucaldian discourse analysis and explain my methods for both data collection and data analysis.

In chapter 4, I provide a historical overview of teaching English and Spanish as second languages in the United States. I begin with detailing the professional histories of the primary disciplines with which each language is associated: second language and foreign language studies, respectively. I also review literature that defines and problematizes these definitions and the corresponding disciplinary divisions. Next, I detail the histories of teaching of English and Spanish as second languages in the United States, reviewing the prevalent discourses that shape understandings of both teaching contexts.

In chapters 5 and 6, I discuss the prevalent discourses circulating within and through both programs and the ways in which these discourses affect participants' interpretations of behaviors and practices within the Spanish Program and the English Language Program. In chapter 5, I address discourses related to student goals and motivation and in chapter 6, I examine discourses related to the place of culture in the curricula of both programs. In both chapters, I describe how local discourses reflect prevalent societal and historical discourses which are reflected and reiterated through institutional practices. Finally, I identify how participants interpret similar behaviors and practices differently, and how these differences in interpretation are based on assumptions related to each context. These differences indicate that the perceptions participants have in each context, which are filtered through local and societal discourses, limit our understanding and practices in each setting.

In chapter 7, I conclude my study and summarize my findings. I also discuss the implications that my research has for foreign language and second language teaching and the overarching field of second language acquisition.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The objective of the current study is to examine the discursive construction of English and Spanish second language instruction at both the societal and local levels. Performing discourse analysis implies there is an underlying theory of discourse that guides the approach (Pennycook, 2001). Although the term "discourse" has been widely understood to refer to language use in social context, the definition of the term has also been criticized for being vague; Widdowson describes discourse as "a diverse, not to say diffuse concept" (1995, p. 157). Therefore, I will first specify the theory of discourse and approach to discourse analysis that guide the current study, along with the rationale for these choices in light of the research questions.

In categorizing discourse analytical perspectives, Widdowson (1995) describes a continuum of approaches regarding the scope of the phenomena being analyzed. At one end of the continuum, discourse is described in terms of linguistic data, and at the other end, the social context receives the focus. Widdowson explains (detailing the former approach first), "In one case, you will look at social data as evidence of language processes, and in the other case, you will look at linguistic data as evidence of social processes" (p. 159). Widdowson notes that there are multiple variations along this continuum, and that the appropriate approach and theory are determined by what corresponds best with the goals of the study.

The goals of the current study are to examine the discursive construction of two traditionally separate fields within second language studies, Spanish and English teaching, and how these discursive constructions manifest themselves at the local level,

affecting interpretations of phenomena within each setting. Based on these objectives, I determined the most appropriate discourse analytical approach to be one modeled closely on Foucault's (1987) examination of mental illness and the field of psychology. Foucault's comparison is applicable to the current study in that he addresses how privileging the abstract correlations between related fields can be problematic for interpreting the phenomena and experiences occurring within them. Foucault (1987) argues that experiences within each field cannot be interpreted through decontextualized "shared" or "common" concepts, but rather, must be read within historical and power relationships unique to each context. In relationship to the continuum described by Widdowson (1995), this approach aligns more closely with socially, rather than linguistically focused discourse analysis. I will now describe the underlying theory of this Foucauldian discourse analysis in relationship to the goals of the proposed study.

Scrutinizing an Abstract Parallelism

In his analysis of the discursive construction of the field of psychology, Foucault states that he intends to show that "the root of mental pathology is not found in some kind of 'metapathology,' but in a certain relation, historically situated, of the man to the madman and to the true man" (1987, p. 2). Foucault argues that the framework for understanding organic illness has been erroneously mapped onto our understanding of mental illness when, in reality, they are two completely different phenomena. He attributes this correlation to a larger "abstract pathology" that dominates both fields "imposing on them, like so many prejudices, the same concepts and laying down for them, like so many postulates, the same methods" (1987, p. 2). According to Foucault, because these "shared" concepts were created based on the understanding of an "abstract

parallelism" between the two fields, and do not take into account the historical influences that have uniquely shaped each context, they are problematic for interpreting experiences in each one.

A similar relationship exists regarding teaching English and Spanish as second languages in the United States. In an abstract sense, teaching English and Spanish are analogous phenomena grouped together as types of second language instruction and are included within the larger field of "second language studies." Because of this correlation, several common concepts about language teaching are understood to apply to each context. These are concepts cited within the field as issues concerning second language (L2) studies in general, examples of which include teaching the grammar or structure of language, teaching culture, and understanding students' motivations for learning a second language. In relating Foucault's analysis to the current study, in order to understand participants' interpretations of both fields and the phenomena within them, I need to examine the historical and power relationships, which will therefore reveal why these fields are understood to be the way they "are" today.

Examining History and Power Relationships

Foucault asserts that it is more useful to examine history and power relationships unique to each context in order to interpret the phenomena within them, rather than interpreting them through decontextualized concepts based on a larger, abstract connections. He contends that, as a result of understanding mental illness within this "metapathology" and not as situated within its particular history, the same meanings have been erroneously been attributed to what are understood as "shared" concepts between

organic and mental pathologies, such as the notions of "illness" and "symptoms." Foucault summarizes his objectives in this work as follows:

> My aim, on the contrary, is to show that mental pathology requires methods of analysis different from those of organic pathology and that it is only by an artifice of language that the same meaning can be attributed to 'illnesses of the body' and 'illnesses of the mind.' A unitary pathology using the same methods and concepts in the psychological and physiological domains is now purely mythical, even if the unity of body and mind is in the unity of reality" (1987, p. 10).

The "artifice of language" Foucault mentions refers to the way in which certain truths or norms about social contexts are constructed through language, a central concept to understanding Foucault's definition of discourse.

Discourse

In order to explain the understanding of how the field of psychology has come to be understood in a particular way, as well as widespread interpretations of mental illness, Foucault looks to the historical framework and cultural environment in order to uncover several discursive principles that shape our understanding of this context. These discursive principles serve to explain *why* mental pathology "is" what it "is" and how certain widely-accepted concepts or "truths" about this context came to be. In the following section, I unpack this concept and describe Foucault's theory of discourse.

While some understandings of discourse based on Foucault's theory separate text (language itself) from discourse (language in use) (see Fairclough, 1995; Gee, 2005), Foucault himself did not make this distinction, and instead focused on the creation of truth, subjects, and object through language. Mills (1997) states, "Foucault's notion of

discourse is not a text or some grouping of signs but rather 'something which produces something else (an utterance, a concept, an effect) rather than something which exists in and of itself and which can be analysed in isolation'" (p. 17, as cited in Pennycook, p. 83). As Pennycook (2001) points out, Foucault does not see texts and language use as separate entities, with a social ideology reflected in discourse, but instead "reflects the term ideology in favor of discourse" (p. 83). This connection is reflected in other definitions of discourse, especially with theorists who stress the inextricability of language from social context. For example, Blommaert (2005) states "Discourse to me comprises all forms of meaningful semiotic human activity seen in connection with social, cultural, and historical patterns and developments of use" (p.3). Discourse refers to how language in use calls upon shared interpretations based in these historical, social, and cultural contexts, and create interpretation that in turn make sense as to normal perceptions to speakers. Blommaert (2005) also asserts, "There is no such thing as 'non-social' use of discourse, just as there is no such thing as a 'non-cultural' or 'non' historical' use of it" (p. 4). Thus, discourse is always reflecting and constructing the social world. This viewpoint falls in line with Foucault's usage of the term.

Knowledge, Power, and Truth

In order to understand how discourse works according to Foucault, it is necessary to review how the concepts of knowledge, power, and truth interact in relationship to discourse. According to Foucault, discourses produce knowledge and truth, or as Foucault termed them, "truth-effects." Power and knowledge are linked through discourse, with power moving through people and not in some stable location, held by certain people coming from the top-down (Pennycook, 2001). Pennycook stresses that

Foucault's concept of power and the analysis of power are not made separately from understanding discourse. He states, "Rather than relying on a prior sociological analysis of power on which we can base an analysis of language and ideology, Foucault's view demands that power remains *that which is to be explained*, specifically, the analysis of power does not exist prior to the analysis of language" (2001, pp. 92-93, emphasis in original). Pennycook details this distinction in order to contrast some views of critical discourse analysis that treat ideology as separate and preexisting. Therefore, it is important to point out this distinction when employing Foucauldian discourse analytical methods.

In the same way that there is no position outside of power in analyzing discourse, one cannot understand the concept of "truth" outside of power, that is, how things come to be how they "are." According to Foucault, power produces "reality" and power and knowledge are linked through discourse (Pennycook, p. 92). Foucault (1980) explains:

> Truth isn't outside power, or lacking in power. . . Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint. And it induces regular effects of power. Each society has its own regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true (p. 131 as cited in Pennycook, 2001, p. 91).

To summarize the relationship of all three concepts (knowledge, power, and truth) in regard to discourse, knowledge and power enact through discourse, and limit, or constrain possibilities for understanding and defining contexts and phenomena. These limitations then create truth (sometimes called "truth-effects"). These "truth-effects" in turn limit the widespread interpretation of phenomena in a given context, as well as what

defines a given context. This is also why it is essential to understand a subject within its historical context, as I outlined earlier. These concepts are central to the questions that I pose in the current study: How did the contexts of Spanish and English teaching become what they are? How are the truths of each context discursively constructed? What effects do these truths have on participants' interpretations of them?

Discourses are Normalizing

Building on Foucault's observations of the ways in which texts and discourse construct reality, discourses are associated with the construction of "common sense" and as contributing to peoples' understanding of what is "normal." This happens through the repetition of the patterns of shared meanings within particular social contexts. Blommaert (2005) points out importance of this "shared" aspect, and that the meaning-construction of discourse does not develop "*in vacuo*" but rather in "strict conditions that are both linguistic (never call a mountain a 'bird' or a 'car') and sociocultural (there are criteria for calling something 'beautiful' or 'problematic'), and this set of conditions cannot be exploited by everyone in the same way" (p. 4). These dominant discourses are repeated and naturalized, leading them to become "common sense" interpretations of certain phenomena.

Concepts of discourse based on Foucault's theories stress that it is important to point out that although discourses are comprised of patterns of agreed-upon meanings for certain groups and in certain contexts, discourses are in no way finite entities. Discourses are always defined in relationship to other discourses, and interact with each other and change throughout history. In addition to having no clear boundaries, discourses can split into two or more discourses (Gee, 2005, pp. 30-31). For example, the discourse of

English teaching in the United States had historically included teaching English to both English-speaking and non-English speaking students, and later split into the discourses of English composition for "native speakers" and English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction. Furthermore, the discourse of teaching ESL did not enter the broader educational discourse until fairly recently—the late 1960s, early 1970s (Darian, 1972; Nayar, 1997). In addition to splitting, two or more discourses can meld together, creating hybrid discourses. Referring back to the previous section on second and foreign language contexts, it is clear from the sometimes interchangeable nature of the terms that these discourses have combined to a certain extent. This is also an example of how discourses interact with each other and change throughout history, since for a long time foreign language teaching was the only "additional" language teaching context.

Discourses are also shaped by history and discourses, in turn, represent and reflect history. Gee (2005) provides examples of long-running exchanges—creationists vs. evolutionists, the discourses of "being an Anglo" or "being an Indian" in the U.S.—as examples of how history affects and changes present- day discourses. An example that pertains to the proposed study, is the discussion of the fluctuating public interest in learning Spanish and the effects this has had on instructor and program quality, as well as on the profession as a whole. These discussions began shortly after Spanish teaching was professionalized in the early 1900s and have continued to the present day. Regarding teaching English as an additional language, the long-standing association of speaking English with being an American and related discourses of Americanization continue to affect how ESL teaching is perceived and discussed today.

The above examples serve to demonstrate an additional point Gee (2005) makes regarding history, and relate to the earlier example of Foucault's concept of constraints that produce truth-effects. Gee (2005) addresses the unconscious elements of acquiring cultural models and discourses adding, "Intriguingly, we humans are very often unaware of the history of these interchanges, and thus in a deep sense, not fully aware of what we mean when we act and talk" (p. 28). In other words, whether we realize it or not, we revive or relive past discourses and associations through current discourses by repeating what is considered the "appropriate" language, actions, and objects associated with a given discourse. In explaining this aspect of discourse, Gee (2005) states:

> It is sometimes helpful to think about social and political issues as if it is not just us humans who are talking and interacting with each other, but, rather, the discourses we represent and enact, and for which we are 'carriers.' The discourses we enact existed before each of us came on the scene and most of them will exist long after we have left the scene. Discourses, through our words and deeds, have talked to each other through history, and, in doing so, form human history (p. 27).

In order to understand how discourses found in this study are carriers of history, I needed to gain a comprehensive understanding of the prevalent discourses in both fields and how they developed over time. Therefore, I conducted an historical investigation of teaching English and Spanish in the United States in order to determine the discursive principles at work for defining each context. I present this information in chapter 4.

Discourse and Identity

The final topic that I will address concerning discourse theory is how discourse relates to the concept of identity and the categorization of individuals within a certain context. Foucault describes characteristics of the truth-effects of contexts as "truth objects" and relates this concept to identifying individuals within these contexts as well. Foucault refers to the creation recognizable identities through discourse by using the term "object of discourse" (Graham, 2005). The ways in which power and knowledge combine to constrain definitions of contexts, resulting in the shared interpretations of certain truths about these contexts, are also applicable to the understanding of certain truths pertaining to individuals. These truths manifest themselves in the form of recognizable identities.

Earlier I cited Gee's example of how history affects interpretations of what it is to be "Anglo" or "Indian." This example also reflects the way in which repeated social discourses combine to construct recognizable identities in social situations. Blommaert (2005) explains that identities are constructed through practices, through discourse, through enacting them, performing them. Therefore, identity is not something that people "have." Furthermore, identities are also given or assigned to people by calling on social categories, giving group identities (p. 205). This aspect of discourse informs the current study for the interpretation of different identities or aspects of identities given to participants in either language learning context.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

The purpose of the current study is to examine the ways in which dominant discourses surrounding teaching Spanish and English affect perceptions and practices in both contexts. In order to explore these relationships, the following research questions guide this study:

1. What discourses are circulating within and through these English and Spanish second language teaching contexts?
2. How do the discourses found at the local level reflect and reproduce larger professional and societal discourses on teaching English and Spanish as second languages?
3. How do these discourses shape and get shaped by particular institutional practices?

Methodological Considerations with Post-Structuralist Theory

In choosing a methodological approach that aligns with Foucault's theory of discourse, I needed to consider the problematic aspects of employing post-structuralist theory as a research framework. Graham (2005) addresses common problems that arise in specifying methods using Foucauldian discourse analysis. She mentions that Foucault himself disliked prescription, and also discusses the general tension that arises between doing a post-structuralist study, which seeks to problematize "truth" within fields, and satisfying the expectations and conventions of academic writing (p. 2). Pennycook (2001) contrasts Foucault's concept of discourse with regard to academic and scientific fields with that of other, mainly "critical" discourse analysts. He stresses that other forms

of critical discourse analysis claim to be "scientific," whereas "Foucault's notion of discourse, by contrast, sees such a claim to science as exactly the sort of combination of power and knowledge that is part of the problem. Foucault was fundamentally not interested in truth but in *truth claims*, in the effect of making claims to knowledge" (p. 85, emphasis in original). Therefore, although I must specify the methods I use in conducting my investigation, I must also be careful not to categorize either methods or findings as representative of "knowledge" or a "truth" that is observable and static.

In an effort to avoid these contradictions, I followed Graham's (2005) guidelines concerning my approach and analysis. Graham (2005) outlines what she terms as a "discursive analytic," in which she uses the work of Foucault to outline a methodological plan (p. 2). In doing so, however, Graham does not seek to prescribe a set of rules, which would oppose post-structuralist theory. Instead, she seeks to begin a conversation about methodological approaches informed by Foucault, seeking "academic freedom whilst remaining within and respecting the expectations of a community of scholarship" (2005, p. 6). She elaborates:

> This requires, not that I dogmatically follow someone else's model for doing discourse analysis but that I ground my work in careful scholarship and engage in a respectful conversation with Foucault; whilst looking to and building on the insights of others, all the while making what I am doing *clear* without prescribing a model that serves to discipline others (2005, p.6, emphasis in original).

Following Graham's (2005) suggestion, my intent is to engage in conversation with Foucault, in particular regarding the discursive construction of two related professional fields, closely following his research on mental illness and psychology

(1987). In this work, Foucault contextualizes the field of psychology and mental pathology within its historical context. He provides a detailed review of the discursive principles that helped shape the field and common understandings of the field over time. Foucault also examines how present-day interpretations and truths of the field itself have come to be. He explores in particular the relationship of mental pathology to organic pathology, and demonstrates the tendency to interpret mental illness through the framework of organic illness based on an abstract parallelism that exists between the fields. However, this interpretation leads to misinterpretation of concepts and properties that really are unique to each field, yet are widely thought to be analogous concepts (the understanding of terms such as "illness" and "symptoms").

It is my intent in the current study to scrutinize the fields of teaching Spanish and English as second languages in this way. I seek to engage in the conversation that Foucault began regarding mental and organic pathology and apply it to two related fields commonly combined under the umbrella of "second language studies." Although both are considered to be within the same overarching fields and are widely understood to reflect shared concepts (teaching grammar, culture, conversation, composition, etc.), interpreting phenomena within the unique histories of the teaching of both languages reveals a similar "abstract parallelism" at work, similar to the one Foucault details.

The methods that I chose inform my intent to join this conversation. First, I conducted a historical investigation of the fields in order to trace discursive principles that have shaped and continue to shape interpretations of each context. The result of this investigation is presented in the following chapter. In determining how discourses work in a particular context using Foucauldian discourse analysis, Graham (2005) stresses the

examination of statements that contribute to the construction of discourses (p. 7). With this in mind, I sought to collect and observe multiple contexts of language in use in each program at the research site. I determined that the most appropriate approach to data collection follow an ethnographic perspective what Gee and Green term, and "ethnographic perspective" (1998).

Gee and Green (1998) explain that in order to gain a more complete picture of the discursive construction of a particular setting, it is useful to incorporate the cultural perspective of ethnography to guide research methods, what they term an "ethnographic perspective" (p. 126). They suggest combining this ethnographic perspective with discourse analysis since they are conceptually related. One way in which they combine to inform methods is through the understanding that cultural construction is found in multiple sites, places and people within a given setting. An ethnographic approach calls for collecting data beyond written and oral texts and analyzing transcripts; the researcher must interact with multiple members within the group and in various spaces, observe and participate. This concept corresponds with discourse theory which explains that discursive construction occurs through signs, symbols, and places in addition to written and spoken language. In this way, both perspectives can lead to a more complete understanding of the ways in which learning is constructed in both language programs in the current study.

Understanding the construction of cultural knowledge is important for interpreting the discursive principles that manifest themselves in both contexts. These interpretations reflect the patterns and dominant discourses that guide participants' actions. They represent the "normal" and "taken-for-granted" assumptions about each teaching setting

that I sought to investigate in the present study. Gee and Green (1998) state, "The task of the discourse analyst is to construct representations of cultural models by studying people's actions across time and events" (125). They suggest taking an ethnographic perspective in order to study cultural models, given the similarity of cultural perspective of ethnography that I had mentioned, as well as the ways in which concepts in discourse theory correspond with "two key tasks" of ethnography: exploration of part-whole, whole-part relationships and the use of contrastive relevance (p. 126). Exploring part-whole, whole-part relationships corresponds with the dialectal relationship between local practices and larger discourses, contextualizing participants' perspectives and actions within the social historical context. Also, collecting multiple sources of data in conjunction with participant observation allows of the exploration and analysis of intertextuality and interdiscursivity. This exploration is further informed by employing contrastive analysis, which "involves analyzing choices of words and actions that members of a group use to engage each other within and across time, actions, and activity" (pp.126-127). I will explain my analytic procedures in greater detail in the final section of this chapter. I first will provide an overview of the study design, followed by descriptions of site selection and demographics and data collection and procedures.

Design

The conceptual similarities and the ways in which ethnography strengthen a Foucauldian discourse analytical approach informed the design of the current study. Over the course of 18 weeks (a semester and a summer session), I collected documents, conducted interviews and served as a participant observer in the English and Spanish programs at one university. In order to obtain a more thorough understanding of the

prevalent discourses at work in these programs, I collected multiple documents from multiple sources, conducted and transcribed interviews with each type of representative from each program (students, instructors, administrators), and served as a participant-observer in multiple class sessions. I also spent time as a participant observer in multiple spaces related to both programs: student and faculty lounges, resource rooms, and shared campus spaces.

Research Site

Southeastern State University (SSU) is a public institution located in a small city in the southeast region of the United States. SSU is a large research university that offers bachelors, masters, and doctoral degrees, and has an overall student population of approximately 30,000. 57% of the student population is listed as a resident of the state in which SSU is located. Southeastern State is the largest provider of higher education in the state, and students from all counties attend the university. One unique characteristic of SSU that I observed while collecting my data was that there was a strong discourse of "state pride" that existed at SSU that I had not experienced at other state institutions. I asked several faculty members and students, and they attributed this to both a history of encouraging education about the state history at the university, and the fact that many students are from that state, and many of those who are not, are from neighboring states. Related to the state affiliations of SSU students is a low number of ethnic and racial minorities in relation to the large student population. In the 2006-2007 statistics, a little over 90% of the student population was considered to be "White non-Hispanic," 3.5% categorized as "Black non-Hispanic," approximately 2% as "Asian-Pacific Islander" and 1.5% "Hispanic." The low percentage of "minority" or "non-white" students is another

characteristic of the school that is frequently referenced by both students and faculty. I mention these statistics, along with the discourse and history of state pride to provide background information that shapes the local university context in which the English and Spanish second language programs are housed, as these two university characteristics in particular are mentioned frequently by administrators, faculty and students in both programs.

Site Selection

I chose the research site, Southeastern State University (SSU), for two reasons. First, SSU fit the most important criteria for providing enough information for my study and sufficient opportunities for observation: It offered both Spanish and English second language programs, both with full course curriculums and comprehensive departments. These research parameters were especially important with regard to English second language programs, which are not as commonly found as Spanish programs, especially at smaller institutions. Another reason that I chose SSU as my research site was because of its proximity to the university at which I worked at the time of data collection. SSU was located within driving distance from my workplace, which allowed me to collect data throughout a full semester and summer rather than just during summer courses to more closely correspond with an ethnographic approach.

Obtaining Access to Site and Participant Permission

I initially gained access to the research site through a colleague's connection to an SSU faculty member in the Spanish department. This faculty member then provided me with contact information for the administrators of both the English and Spanish second language programs. Since I had no prior personal or professional relationships at SSU, I

contacted the administrators by e-mail in order to meet with each one individually. At each meeting, I explained what my research entailed, and I provided each administrator with a one-page overview of my study, as well as with copies of the interview questions that I planned to ask all participants (See Appendices A-D).

Once the administrators of each program agreed to allow me to conduct my research, they provided me with contact information and/or opportunities to meet with instructors. I recruited instructors to participate in two ways: 1. By e-mail and 2. By meeting with them personally. In both instances, I explained my research project, and gave or sent potential participant instructors the following documents: A one-page overview describing the study—the same one that I had given to administrators, copies of the interview questions, participant-instructor informed consent form (Appendix E).

After instructors gave me permission to observe their classes, I met with the students, explained my study and asked for their consent before I began participant observation. I introduced myself and told students that I was a Doctoral Candidate at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, and that I was comparing the English Language Program and the Spanish program at SSU. I also explained that my focus was on class organization, topics and themes, and interaction, basically what was being talked about and how, and that I was not analyzing, measuring or grading their proficiency or abilities in the language. I also stressed that their choice to participate or not had no effect on their grade in the course. I explained that signing the consent form meant that what they say in class may appear in my dissertation. I stressed that I would use pseudonyms or "student 1" "student 2" to identify them, and that all identifying information, including the name of the university, would be changed. I also explained that I would like to

interview students who were available and interested, and called their attention to the copy of the interview questions. I asked that all students who were interested in participating in the interview check the interview option, include contact information, and days and times that they were available. I stressed again I would change the names of students participating in the interview, and that participating or not participating did not affect their grade in any way. I also clarified that all participation in my study was voluntary. I then asked if anyone had any questions, and distributed consent forms.

I requested permission from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the research site as well as the IRB at my degree granting institution. I did not collect any data until I had received written IRB approval from both institutions. As stated in the informed consent for all participants, all names of participants are pseudonyms. All other identifying information has also been changed including the name of the university and the name of English program[2], as well as potentially identifying parts of course names and numbers. For example, the names of the colors in the color groups which represent different levels in the English language program, since they are originally named for the university's colors. Also, identifying number sequences that may be particular to the institution are changed, but a similar sequence is maintained: Spanish 101, 102, 211, 212 to Spanish 100, 150, 200, 250.

Institutional Relationship Between Programs

The Spanish and English language programs at Southeastern State University are both officially seen as housed within the Foreign Language Department, which is part of

[2] The name of the English program was changed and not the Spanish program or Foreign Language Department for the following reasons: there are far less programs of these types in universities around the country, and these programs often have different names to distinguish them from the others and make them recognizable, since they often are financially independent "businesses" associated with the university.

the College of Arts and Sciences, one of 15 degree-offering colleges within the university. Although both programs are associated with the Foreign Language Department, the instruction of English as a second language takes place within the English Language Program, most often referred to as the ELP, and which is like many other Intensive English Programs (IEPs), a separate entity financially from the foreign language programs. Spanish instruction takes place within the Foreign Language Department, along with all other second languages other than English, such as French, German, and Russian. The English Language Program and the Spanish Program are separated in many ways institutionally, even though they are associated administratively. The two programs differ regarding physical space and location within the university, program administration, budget, and faculty make-up. I will now detail these differences.

Physical Space

The ELP and the SP are located in separate buildings on campus that are not in close proximity to one another. The Spanish Program is located in the same building with all other foreign languages, including French, German, Russian, and Chinese, with faculty offices and classrooms located on different floors of the same building. The ELP shares a building with two other programs at the university. In this building the two of four floors are utilized by the ELP: the first floor is designated for administration, student and teacher lounges, and classrooms and offices are located on the third floor of the same building. Although both departments hold classes in other buildings around campus, most of the ELP courses are taught in the ELP building, whereas many Spanish classes are taught at various locations on campus.

Administration

The English Language Program and the Spanish Program are also administered by distinct faculty members. The ELP has a director and an assistant director who oversee and make all decisions on curriculum and course scheduling, GTA supervision, student placement and recruitment. The administrators in charge of the Spanish Program are the chair and the associate chair of the Foreign Language Department. There is also a separate Graduate Teaching Assistant director in charge of the Spanish Program GTAs who does not supervise ELP GTAs. Since the ELP is housed in the Foreign Language Department, the chair of Foreign Languages must ultimately approve all proposals and changes made by the director and associate director of the ELP; however, the ELP administrators are the ones to make these decisions. Also, the administrators of the ELP and Foreign Language Department hold separate meetings, with the administrators of the ELP only attending Foreign Language Department meetings if they have something on the agenda. Both the chair and associate chair of the Foreign Language Department reported that in spite being "officially" under the Foreign Language Department's administration, the ELP director and assistant director makes all of the decisions regarding the ELP and Foreign Language administration has traditionally passed all ELP proposals.

Budget

The English and Spanish programs are also separate financially. Spanish is part of the Foreign Language Department, within the College of Liberal Arts, and therefore receives state funding through the university. The Spanish Program shares this budget with all other foreign language programs, and the Foreign Language Department shares

funding with other programs within the College of Liberal Arts. The ELP, on the other hand, is an autonomous financial entity affiliated with the university. Although it is associated with the university and the Foreign Language Department, it is financially separate, making its own revenue through student tuition and not through state and university funding. It is essentially a business affiliated with the university.

Faculty

The faculty make-up of both programs is also different. The ELP is comprised of the director, assistant director, a few contractual faculty members, with the majority of instructors being Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) who are students in the Master's of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (MATESOL) program. There are no permanent tenure-track or tenured faculty members within the ELP, not even the director and assistant director. The Spanish faculty is more varied regarding faculty experience and rank, including GTAs, contractual faculty, tenure-track, and tenured professors. However, GTAs only teach courses in the lower division of the program, which is comprised of the first four semesters of Spanish in the basic language program sequence (SPAN 100, 150, 200, 250). Although some contractual faculty members teach in the lower division, most teach in the bridge courses and upper division. Upper division courses are only taught by tenured or tenure-track faculty. I will now describe student population and curricular structure of each program individually.

English Language Program

The student population of the ELP varies from semester to semester in regard to the number of students enrolled as well as student background and experiences. All students are categorized as international students and are studying at SSU on a work or

student visa. Students have varying educational and work experiences and range in age from 18 to students in their 40s and 50s. However, most of the students who take courses at the ELP are prospective university students who intend to begin an undergraduate or graduate degree at SSU or another university in the United States. The majority of ELP students are not enrolled as full-time students in the university because most ELP courses are not credit courses university-wide. However, students have access to all university resources. The ELP also offers some courses that count for university credit. The students who take those courses are concurrently enrolled in university classes outside of the ELP.

Regarding the curricular structure, ELP courses are categorized on a four-level system indicated by a color and letter: White A, White B, Red A, Red B, with White A designating the entry or beginning level of courses and Red B designating the most advanced courses. Required courses for all levels include vocabulary, reading, writing, communication skills, and grammar. These are designated as the "core" courses of the program. Elective courses are also offered every semester, and are also designed by color level. For example, American Culture is a Red Elective, and TOEFL preparation is a White Elective. The topics for elective courses vary semester to semester, and also may reflect the instructors' personal interests or expertise. For example, one GTA who was an artist taught English through Art as an elective, a course which had previously not been taught, and may not necessarily be taught again after that GTA leaves the program. Other examples of elective courses include Pronunciation, English Through Drama, and Business English.

Courses at the ELP follow the same schedule as all university credit courses: two 16-week semesters and two six week summer sessions. As I mentioned before, students do not receive university credit for the majority of ELP courses, which includes any of the above required and elective courses. Students who complete the ELP's program receive a certificate of completion. There are four courses in the ELP's curriculum, however, for which students may earn university credit: ESL 100: Academic Reading and Writing, ESL 200: Research and Writing, ESL 250: Speaking and Listening, and ESL 300: ITA (International Teaching Assistant) Fluency. These courses appear on the schedule with the other non-credit courses and are taught by ELP instructors.

In addition to semester curriculum and courses open to all students, the ELP offers what they designate as "Special Programs." These programs include courses that are not in the regular ELP curriculum and are generally directed to a specific population of students and their experiences and goals. Special programs are usually offered for groups of professionals from one company. Examples of past special programs include a business English program for Chinese bankers on business English and another program designed for a group of professors from Mexico. One final aspect of the ELP is related to course placement, and that is student testing. All students must take the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) in order to determine the course level they will take (White/Red, A/B). At the end of the semester, students take the TOEFL once more, and those continuing study at the ELP will be placed in the designated group for their score in the following semester (See Appendix G for overview of ELP curriculum).

Spanish Program

The student population in the Spanish program consists of undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in the university. Most of the graduate students also serve as instructors for the undergraduate students during the beginning sequence of courses in the Spanish curriculum. I only observed undergraduate courses for the current study. The undergraduate students taking Spanish at SSU are primarily young adults ages 18-25 who have entered the university immediately after graduating high school. Many students at SSU were raised and educated in the surrounding area or in the same state. There are two distinct populations of students within the program: students taking Spanish to fulfill a requirement and students planning to earn a minor or a major in Spanish.

The Spanish curriculum is divided into lower and upper division coursework. The lower division consists of four courses that students must take in sequence. These courses are Spanish 100: Elementary Spanish 1, Spanish 150: Elementary Spanish 2, Spanish 200: Intermediate Spanish 1, and Spanish 250: Intermediate Spanish 2. Each of these courses is worth three university credits; however, these courses also have two intensive equivalents worth six credits each, Spanish 110: Intensive Elementary Spanish and Spanish 210: Intensive Intermediate Spanish. These courses are equivalent to taking both elementary and both intermediate courses in one course.

Undergraduate students who are completing a language requirement for their major, they must take all of the courses in the lower division or their equivalent. Students who have studied Spanish previously may take a placement examination in order to start their coursework at a level higher than Spanish 100 (but no higher than Spanish 302:

Advanced Grammar). To receive credit for the course that they tested into, they must receive a B or better; they can then buy credits for the courses they skipped.

The upper division courses begin with what the department refers to as "bridge courses," numbered in the early 300s. These courses are: Spanish 300: Spanish Conversation, Spanish 301: Reading and Composition, and Spanish 302: Advanced Grammar, and Spanish 303: Advanced Reading and Composition. Unlike the lower division courses which students are required to take in sequence, the first three out of the four bridge courses may be taken in any order if the student has completed SPAN 250: Intermediate Spanish 2. Then, after the student completes the last bridge course, SPAN 303: Advanced Reading and Composition, he or she may take advanced level courses at the 300-400 level. Almost all students who take the upper division courses intend to pursue a Spanish minor or major. Many advanced course topics focus on literature or culture, and include Latin American Culture, Spanish Culture, Early and Modern Literatures of Spain and Spanish America, Caribbean Literature. Other courses include Commercial Spanish and Grammar Review (See Appendix H for SP curriculum overview).

Participants

ELP Instructors[3]

A total of four ELP instructors agreed to be interviewed for the current study. Three out of four allowed me to serve as a participant observer in their classrooms. One instructor, Jennifer chose to only participate in the interview. Three out of four participants are Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) pursuing a Master's degree in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (MATESOL). The fourth participant was a contractual instructor who graduated from the university's graduate program (MATESOL) two years ago. She had taught at SSU as a GTA while completing her coursework.

At the beginning of each interview, I asked instructors questions about their backgrounds teaching and learning languages as well as where they had lived and where they were educated. All instructors completed all of their schooling in the United States, and had lived in the north or southeast region of United State for the majority of their lives. Participants' language teaching experience ranged from two years to seven years, with English the only language that they had taught, with the exception of Jessica who had more experience teaching Spanish and had recently begun teaching English. All instructors had studied languages other than English to varying degrees and reported varying proficiencies, but all reported speaking primarily English in their daily lives. Students who were currently taking Spanish courses reported speaking in class only.

[3] I designate instructors and students within the English Language Program as "ELP instructors/students" rather than "English instructors/students" as I do with "Spanish instructors/students," to distinguish this population from the instructors and students within the English department, which has a different mission and curriculum, as well as faculty and student populations.

At the time of data collection, two of the three participants, Rachel and Paula, were teaching core courses, Jessica was teaching two ESL credit courses, and Jennifer was teaching two elective courses, American Culture and Debate. Since all participants had taught at the ELP during the previous year, they had experience teaching other courses than the ones they were teaching that semester and summer. Therefore, all participants discussed course objectives and organization for courses other than the ones they were teaching. (See Appendix I for an overview of ELP participating instructors)

Spanish Instructors

Five Spanish Program instructors agreed to be interviewed and observed for the current study. Four out of five participants were GTAs who were completing Masters Degrees in the Foreign Language Department in Spanish Linguistics (Maite and Laura) Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (Jessica) and Spanish Literature (Silvia). The fifth participant, Ana, was a contractual instructor who had been teaching Spanish at SSU for twenty years, but began her career there as a GTA while completing her Masters Degree in Spanish Literature at the same institution.

Two of the participants, Maite and Silvia, completed all of their schooling in Spain, with the exception of semester-long study abroad programs in England and Ireland. Silvia's focus of study was Latin American literature, and Maites's was Applied Linguistics and TESOL. Laura completed most of her schooling in Panama, and also studied in Canada. Ana completed most of her schooling in the Dominican Republic. Jessica completed all of her schooling in the United States, with the exception of a study abroad trip to Costa Rica and a summer course in Spain. Jessica was the only participant who self-identified as a native speaker of English and a second language learner of

Spanish. At the time of the interview, Jessica was teaching in the ELP, but she had taught Spanish as a GTA at SSU the previous year.

At the time of the interview, Maite was teaching Spanish 250 (fourth semester Spanish), Silvia was teaching Spanish 150 (second semester), Laura was teaching Spanish 200 (third semester), and Jessica had taught Spanish 100 and 150 (first and second semester). All of these courses are lower division courses and part of the basic language program. Maite, Jessica, and Laura had experience teaching other lower division courses in the previous semester, but since they are GTAs are not permitted to teach bridge or upper division courses. Ana taught a composition-focused "bridge" course, Spanish 302 (See Appendix J for an overview of SP participating instructors).

ELP Students

All students in participating instructor courses agreed to be included in the study through participant-observation. Three students expressed interest in completing an interview. All three student interview participants completed the majority, if not all of their schooling in Japan. All students had studied English in Japan before coming to the U.S. to study. All students were currently enrolled full-time in the English Language Program, and were not taking university credit courses.

Mai was a recent high school graduate who completed all of her schooling in Japan with the exception of her last year, which she completed in the United States. She planned on entering an undergraduate program at SSU pursue a degree in nursing. She had been accepted for the fall, and intended to take an English Composition course for credit that summer. At the time of the interview, Mai was taking reading, grammar, writing, communication, American Culture, and TOEFL Preparation.

Haruna was a medical doctor who specialized in anesthesiology and intensive care. She had completed all of her schooling and her residency in Japan, and had come to the United States to study English with the goal of working in an international hospital in Japan. After completing her second semester at the ELP, she would begin a research internship at the university hospital. During this semester, Haruna was taking reading, writing, communication skills, and debate.

Atsushi completed an undergraduate degree in Policy Management in Japan, and had been working for a Japanese company for three years. The company sends employees to the United States, Canada, and England to take English courses, and Atsushi had been studying at the ELP as part of this program. After his second semester of coursework at the ELP, he planned to return to Japan to continue working for the same company, since the company pays for only one year of study. Atsushi was taking reading, writing, communication skills, and vocabulary (See Appendix K for an overview of ELP student participants).

Spanish Students

All Spanish Program students had signed the consent form to take part in classroom observation and of those students two agreed to participate in interviews. Both student participants were third-year undergraduate students who had completed all of their schooling in the United States and had both attended high schools in the same state of the university. Both students studied Spanish in High School and began studying Spanish at SSU in the first level course, Spanish 100. Sarah was a Broadcasting major with a Spanish minor and had completed Spanish 100, 150, and 200, and was taking Spanish 250 at the time of the interview. Sarah planned on studying in Santander, Spain

in the summer following the semester in which I conducted the current study. Crystal was a Sociology major with a minor in religious studies. She had taken Spanish 100 and 150 and was taking Spanish 200. Crystal planned on taking Spanish 250 because the basic program was required for her major, but doubted she would continue studying Spanish after completing that course.

Two other SP students who participated in interviews were also participant instructors at the ELP: Rachel and Paula. Rachel was currently taking Spanish linguistics, a graduate level course, as well as Spanish 250. She was permitted to take the graduate course because she had taught in Mexico for a year and had a higher level of Spanish than other 250 students. Paula took all four of the courses (100-250) in the basic language program. I did not conduct a complete "student interview" with Rachel and Paula, instead I asked them to discuss their experiences as Spanish students and make comparisons between the English Language and Spanish programs (See Appendix L for an overview of SP student participants).

Administrators

In addition to instructors and students, I interviewed three administrators: Dr. Charles Green, the department chair of Foreign Languages, Dr. Gail Nelson, the associate chair and graduate coordinator of the same department, and Ellen, the assistant director of English Language Program. At the time of data collection, Dr. Green was serving as an interim chair in the Foreign Language Department for that particular academic year only. He had previously held no other duties in foreign languages, teaching Literature and Gender Studies in the English department. As department chair, Dr. Green's duties

included being responsible for the department's budget, personnel evaluation and hiring, course scheduling and curriculum oversight.

Dr. Nelson held two administrative positions at the time of data collection: associate chair and graduate coordinator. As associate chair, she was in charge of undergraduate and graduate course scheduling, and undergraduate student placement in foreign language courses. Her graduate coordinator duties included graduate student advising, scheduling comprehensive exams, processing all graduate student paperwork, including applications of perspective students to the graduate school and graduation applications for current students. At the time of the interview, Dr. Nelson had held both administrative positions for less than a year; she had served as a faculty member within the Foreign Language Department, teaching undergraduate and graduate courses including Introduction to Linguistics, second language acquisition, ESL methods, Second Language Reading, and Syllabus Design and Materials Development.

Ellen had held the position of assistant director of the English Language Program (ELP) for ten months at the time of data collection. Prior to serving her administrative position, she had taught at the ELP for ten years, for the first three years as a GTA while completing her MATESOL coursework, and then as a full-time contractual instructor. Ellen continues to teach one course per semester within the program in addition to serving as the assistant director. As the assistant director, her duties included coordinating the teachers' (GTA's) schedules, conducting teacher meetings, organizing and evaluating teacher portfolios and files, and overseeing all testing. Ellen explained that her duties differed from those of the director's in two major aspects: student recruiting and managing the ELP's budget. The director of the ELP spends most of the

semester travelling and recruiting new students at universities in different locations worldwide. This responsibility is the main reason that I did not interview the director. During the six month data collection period, I had personal contact once with the director—when I met with him to ask permission to conduct my study at the ELP. I had only seen him once more after that during the next six months, as he spent most of the semester recruiting new students abroad (See Appendix M for an overview of participating administrators).

Data Collection

Data collection took place during a 15-week period, which included 12 weeks of a 15-week spring semester and three weeks of the summer session that followed. For both the ELP and SP, I collected multiple program documents, conducted classroom observations as a participant-observer, and conducted interviews and transcribed them. I detail each type of data collection below.

Documents

In line with discourse analytic and ethnographic methods, I collected a variety of texts from multiple sources. I printed out all available online material for each program. This included the information found on each program's university webpage, describing the programs and their mission statements, as well as all documents and information linked to the homepage providing additional description such as curricular structure and course descriptions. In the case of the Spanish program, all lower division course syllabi were available online. In addition to collecting online documents, I collected print documents that were available in both programs' main offices and student spaces, including billboards. This print information included informative brochures for each

program, course catalogues, and semester schedules. I also collected course documents from participating instructors which included class plans and syllabi. Instructors also provided me with the same activities and handouts that they gave to students during the classes that I observed. I also made photocopies of textbook tables of contents and some of the instructors photocopied the readings and activities from the textbook that students were going to complete in the class session that I was going to observe.

Classroom Observation

I conducted observation as a participant-observer in a total of thirteen class sessions in the Spanish Program and ten class sessions in the English Language Program. In the SP, I observed Silvia's Spanish 150 course four times, Laura's Spanish 200 class twice, Maite's Spanish 250 class four times, and Ana's Spanish 302 course three times. In the ELP, I observed Jessica's ESL academic writing course two times and her speaking and listening course twice, Rachel's grammar course three times, and Paula's vocabulary class twice.

In all class sessions, I sat at either the front or center of the room among students. Since I planned to have the role of participant-observer, I informed all instructors that I would assist in the classroom in any way they wanted me to. My role in the classrooms varied, especially between programs. In the SP, I worked with student groups in completing book activities. I participated in group and pair discussion in ELP classes. I took field notes and digitally recorded all class sessions. In my field notes, I supplemented recorded data by writing down observations on the physical space and layout of the room, objects, texts in the room, and positioning of students and instructors throughout class sessions. For each recorded class session, I wrote the activities, themes

and a summary of the interaction between instructors and students and students with each other, creating and documented outline of the sequence of activities, themes, and interactions for each session. I then coded these documents to find patterns and create conceptual categories (Gee, 2005) to examine prominent discourses and themes and to cross-check these themes with the conceptual categories I found in other documents. I then transcribed the interactions and practices that I found to reflect themes I found in other texts, so that I could analyze these interactions at a local, textual level and contextualize them within program and societal discourses.

Interviews

I interviewed a total of 16 participants: three administrators, eight instructors, and five students (as I mentioned previously, two ELP instructors were also SP students, but I did not conduct a separate, full student interview with them. All interviews lasted between 15-50 minutes and were conducted at the SSU campus. I conducted interviews for instructors in their offices or common area in the department, all administrator interviews took place in their offices, I conducted the two SP student interviews in the university student center, and I conducted the ELP student interviews in the ELP student lounge. Also, I conducted three interviews in Spanish based on the preference of the participant.

I followed a semi-structured interview framework, with all interview questions based on the preliminary research that I had conducted on comparing prominent discourses in Spanish and English programs. I asked all questions from interview framework as well as follow-up questions that were determined by each participant's answers. I also asked three of the instructor participants, Jessica, Rachel, and Paula, to

compare the Spanish and English programs since they all have had experience in the Spanish program as well as the ELP Since most instructors were graduate students and knew that I was a graduate student with a similar teaching background, many of the interviews were conversational in nature. Also, participants made several comments that acknowledged shared experiences such as, "You know how it is" or "I'm sure you've seen this happen." I paid particular attention to these instances since they are marking shared knowledge and are therefore indicative of the aspects that comprise the cultural models and dominant discourses in each program.

I digitally recorded all interviews and fully transcribed them. Following Oliver, Serovich, and Mason (2005), I employed "denaturalized transcription," which the authors suggest for conducting critical discourse analysis since it "concerns the substance of the interview , that is, the meanings and perceptions created and shared during a conversation" (p. 1277). When I completed all transcriptions, I mailed them to participants with a letter that asked them to review the transcript to see if they wanted to add, delete or modify and part of it, and send the corrected version back to me. Transcriptions in Spanish that appear in this study are followed by an English translation marked in italics. All translations are mine.

Data Analysis

I conducted my data analysis using Foucault's model (1987) as a guideline and followed Graham (2005), coding data based on the presence of "statements" and "discursive-objects" that I found in the texts in both programs. Following Foucault's concept of the construction of truth through the interaction of power relationships and knowledge that I outlined in chapter 2, "statements" refer to places where language

serves a function to constitute recognizable identities or characteristics about the phenomena being studied (Graham, 2005). Graham (2005) states that she interprets the statement as "an articulation that functions with constitutive effects" (p. 8). The recognizable characteristics and entities that are constructed are "objects of discourse." Objects of discourse are shaped through the limitations imposed on a context through language (power and knowledge), and describe the realities that are created through "the artifice of language," the term that Foucault (1987) employed when describing the understanding of the fields of psychology and mental illness. These discourse objects are not "found" in the context and do not describe a reality that's "out there" to be discovered. Instead, they are constituted through statements that essentially shape them into being. Graham (2005) cites Deleuze (1988) in order to explain this concept further, stating, "In discussing Foucault's interest in the statement, Deleuze (1988:8) points to the constitutive properties intrinsic to it by imparting that a 'statement has a 'discursive object' which does not derive in any sense from a particular state of things, but stems from the statement itself'" (p. 8). In analyzing my data, I located statements and discursive objects in historical texts and the texts that I collected at the local level. I then coded these statements to determine the most prevalent concepts and identities that shape what these contexts "are."

Coding

According to Merriam (1998), "Categories and subcategories (or properties) are most commonly constructed through the constant comparative method of data analysis" (179). The creation of thematic categories was the first step in determining the prevalent discourses in each program. Following discourse analytical method, I created conceptual

categories in order to find repeated themes in the data. The repetition of themes throughout the texts shows how certain identities, perceptions, interpretations, or "realities" are discursively constructed at the local context. This repetition constructs a reality, and idea of how things "are" what is "normal," which addresses the first research question guiding the current study.

I began to create thematic categories during the interview transcription process. As I organized and summarized participants' responses, I continued to constructed thematic categories based on patterns in these responses. The categories that I constructed moved beyond this basic description and on to the next level of analysis, related to, but independent of the imposed themes of the interview questions (Merriam, 1998). I also created categories based on patterns in classroom observations and documents that I collected for each language program, including syllabi, class handouts, program and course descriptions, program goals, and objectives. According to Merriam (1998), aside from developing them from the constant comparison of data, the researcher must also consider the following guidelines when creating categories.

Categories should:

Reflect the purpose of the research

Be exhaustive

Be mutually exclusive

Be sensitizing, or clearly and concisely named

Be conceptually congruent

I continued to find patterns within each larger category, and grouped pieces of text together reflecting sub-themes within larger themes. When I constructed multiple

groups of text from various sources, I then employed text analysis. It is important for me to point out here that, while I began with coding and moved to text analysis once I had grouped multiple text excerpts together my analysis within the phases after that second step was not a linear process. Text analysis led to further categorization, which in turn, lead to deeper text analysis. Throughout the process, I also noted connections to historical and social themes as well as comparisons within and between programs.

CHAPTER 4

CONTEXTUALIZING SPANISH AND ENGLISH INSTRUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES

Introduction

In this chapter, I examine the discursive construction of the teaching of English and Spanish in the United States. In order to gain insight into how these two fields have become what they are today, I examined historical documents within and about both fields. I followed Foucault (1987) and Graham (2005) in order to discern patterns in discourse and constructive statements. I surveyed professional journals related to the teaching of each language, from the recognized inception of each field to present day. These journals included The Modern Language Journal, Hispania, the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages, Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) Journal, and TESOL Quarterly. I also included texts that address the history of language use and language education in the United States.

The principal question guiding this stage of the investigation was: How did these fields come to "be" what they "are" today? Following Foucault (1987), I contextualized these two fields within their histories. As I indicated before, English is more commonly described as a "second language" teaching context (English as a second language being the name of the field of study), and Spanish is most commonly defined as a "foreign language" context. Based on my research on the discursive constructions of these fields I will now explore the answers to the questions: How did English become a second language and how did Spanish become a foreign language? I will also examine how

these categorizations affect interpretations of characteristics and practices of these fields today. Much in the way Foucault (1987) scrutinized the false parallel between the fields of organic and mental pathology, followed by contextualizing the fields historically, I will first scrutinize the conventional definitions of second and foreign language teaching. I will explain how these conventional definitions promote a false parallelism between the fields, since they are widely thought to describe observable language learning contexts, yet really reflect and reproduce dominant language ideologies in the United States. After analyzing the use of the terms second and foreign, I review the discursive patterns and principles throughout the history of teaching both languages that have made these fields what they are today.

Conventional Definitions

In examining how the terms "second" and "foreign" language teaching are defined in various sourcebooks and textbooks, I found a common set of characteristics of the conventional definitions found in the literature. Texts that classify second and foreign language teaching contexts separately focus on two defining characteristics: order of the language learned and the environment in which the language learning takes place. Definitions commonly list the order of learning as being the same for both SL and FL contexts: any language learned in addition to the learner's native language (Ellis, 1994; Gass & Selinker, 2001; Johnson & Johnson, 1998; Richards, Platt, & Weber, 1985).

The environment in which a language is learned is the most commonly cited difference that separates these two language learning and teaching contexts. Second language acquisition is commonly described as taking place in a "native language" environment (Ellis, 1994; Gass & Selinker, 2001; Johnson & Johnson, 1998; Richards,

Platt, & Weber, 1985). A native language environment has been further described as a place where the language learned, "plays an institutional and social role in the community" (Ellis, 1994, pp. 11-12), and where there is "considerable access to speakers of the language being learned" (Gass & Selinker, 2001, p. 5).

In contrast, learning a foreign language is commonly defined as learning a nonnative language of the environment in which it is taught (Ellis, 1994; Gass & Selinker, 2001; Johnson & Johnson, 1998; Richards, Platt, & Weber, 1985). More specifically, foreign language learning takes place in settings, "where the language plays no major role in the community" (Ellis, 1994, p.12), and where most, if not all of the learning occurs within a classroom (Ellis, 1994; Gass & Selinker, 2001).

Re-examining Conventional Definitions

Although the above characteristics are common to the conventional definitions of second and foreign language contexts, upon examining these definitions further I found them to be contradictory and vague in several ways. For example, in closely analyzing and comparing Gass & Selinker's definitions concerning both settings, it is unclear as to what exactly the defining difference is: order of language learned or environment. In a section entitled, "essential terminology of the field [of SLA]," Gass & Selinker (2001) list definitions of both contexts. Second language acquisition is described as referring to "learning of a nonnative language *after* learning the L1" (Gass & Selinker, 2001, p. 5). In this definition, it appears that order of language learned is the defining aspect of SLA. When defining foreign language learning, the authors focus on environment, stating that foreign language learning occurs predominantly in a classroom context. After focusing on context for defining foreign language, Gass & Selinker (2001) then seem to shift the

original defining factor between SL and FL learning from order of language learned, to environment: "The important point is that learning in a second language environment takes place with considerable access to speakers of the language being learned, whereas learning in a foreign language environment usually does not" (p. 5).

Another contradictory characteristic in definitions that separates SL and FL teaching concerns the nature of the relationship between the two. For example, in the listed definition of foreign language, the Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics states, "In North American applied linguistics usage, foreign language and second language are often used to mean the same in this sense" (Richards, Platt, & Weber, 1985, p. 108, bold in original). Here it appears as though SL and FL contexts are synonymous, or at least "often" synonymous. However, in the same source, a separation between the two contexts is maintained as "foreign" and "second" language learning are listed and defined separately. The terms are named separately within the entry for "second language acquisition, which is defined as "the processes by which people develop proficiency in a *second or foreign language*," and a term used by researchers interested studies of "*second and foreign language* learners" (p. 252, emphasis mine). Therefore, even though the Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics describes second and foreign contexts as often synonymous, the same text defines and lists them separately more often than interchangeably.

Another example of the confusion of the relationship between both contexts occurs in Ellis (1994). Ellis states, "The distinction between second and foreign language learning settings may be significant in that it is possible that there will be *radical differences* in both what is learnt and how it is learnt" (p. 12). On the same page, he

states, "A distinction between *second* and *foreign* language acquisition is *sometimes* made," implying that at times the two terms are interchangeable (p. 12, emphasis mine). Similar to the definitions given by the Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics, Ellis (1994) presents second and foreign language contexts as synonymous, yet at the same time distinctly different. These contradictions indicate that even within texts containing conventional definitions of second and foreign language teaching, the true complexities of these contexts as well as the difficulty in making clear distinctions between them, can be seen. These complexities and contradictions are the underlying motivation for the second type of literature that I found concerning the separation of second and foreign language teaching and learning.

Literature that problematizes the conventional definitions of and the division between second and foreign language teaching discusses two central issues: 1) the extent to which the labels of SL and FL are truly descriptive, and 2) the effects the theoretical separation has on the professional relationship between fields. Regarding the first issue, whereas conventional definitions of second and foreign language contexts are presented as labels that describe observable language teaching contexts, it has been argued that these descriptions do not accurately reflect real life language learning contexts (Berns, 1990; Block, 2003; VanPatten, 1990). Berns (1990) argues that a second to foreign language continuum would more be a more useful way of describing language learning contexts, reflecting the complexities of them while at the same time defining them in some way. VanPatten (1990) suggests a more extensive reexamination of the terms, as he feels that they are extremely unclear in not only defining language learning contexts, but also the situations to which SLA theory applies, which will be discussed in greater

detail in discussing the professional relationship between second language acquisition and Foreign Language Learning.

In addition to suggesting renaming or regrouping for second and foreign language contexts, others (Hill, 2003; Nayar, 1997; Phillipson, 1992) discuss the discourse and ideology associated with separating second and foreign language contexts. These works mainly focus on the ideologies and discourses unique to teaching English as a second language in the United States, which include the Americanization of immigrant populations, learning English for personal enrichment and economic opportunity, and the promotion of a monolingual society (Hill, 2003; Nayar, 1997; Phillipson, 1992). I outline these themes in detail later in the chapter.

In addition to an examination of what second and foreign language contexts truly describe, Nayar (1997) and VanPatten (1990), explore the ways in which the theoretical division of second and foreign language affects the professional fields. VanPatten (1990) argues that second language acquisition and foreign language learning do not describe two separate but equal language teaching contexts. Rather, foreign language learning is considered a subset of second language acquisition theory, and therefore is not perceived and researched as a separate field in linguistics. He criticizes the relationship between SLA and FLL as a unidirectional, producer-consumer one, in which FL may take and use theory from SLA, but not vice-versa. VanPatten states that, as a result of this relationship, language acquisition is not considered the domain of foreign language learning. Nayar (1997) adds to this argument by pointing out that the reverse of the terms "Second language acquisition" and "Foreign Language Learning" are "almost never used," that it is rare to see the terminology "Second Language Learning" and "Foreign

Language Acquisition," the second one in particular (p. 18). However, as I will illustrate in discussing the histories of teaching both languages, the ideological relationship between English and all other languages has most greatly influenced all professional distinctions within second language studies. I will now review contextualize the terms "second" and "foreign" within the history of language teaching in the United States in order to further explain the discursive construction of Spanish and English teaching.

Second and Foreign Language Teaching

Although both second language (SL) and foreign language (FL) learning and teaching refer to the instruction of additional languages, "[g]enerally in the discourse of language teaching, SL education is recognized and treated as different from FL education" (Nayar, 1997, p. 24). The fields of English and Spanish as additional languages in the United States are predominantly categorized as second language and foreign language, respectively. This division between second and foreign language has become a conventional way of categorizing the fields of teaching English and Spanish. To gain a more complete understanding of the discursive construction of teaching Spanish and English requires a review of the distinction between the labels second and foreign in language learning and teaching.

The labels of foreign and second language developed and became institutionalized at different points in the histories of language teaching. The field of foreign language teaching in the United States has been documented as having its origins in pre-colonial instruction in Spanish and French, and later, more formally, with instruction of classical languages of Latin and Greek (Watzke, 2003). However, instruction in languages other than English in pre-colonial and colonial times has been reconstructed as foreign

language teaching, since English was still one of many European languages widely spoken in North America. As English increasingly became the dominant language in the United States, it was treated as a separate subject from Latin, Greek, French, German, Spanish, and other languages. As Greek and Latin became increasingly replaced in the curriculum by "other modern languages," (mostly European languages other than English), the teaching of modern languages remained separate from the teaching of English (Watzke, 2003).

This separation occurred departmentally in universities and was reified through professional organizations such as the Modern Language Association, which formed in 1883, and maintained a division between English and other "modern languages" (Cook, 1884; Watzke, 2003). Also, in the early 1900s, the professional field of foreign language instruction began to develop through the formation of separate organizations and journals for individual languages; the ones most pertinent to this study being the foundation of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish (AATS) in 1916, and the beginning of the journal *Hispania* the following year by the AATS.

The term second language developed much later, originating in the field of structural linguistics in the 1940s, and strengthening and becoming established with the professionalization of TESOL as a field, and the increase in studies in second language acquisition (Matsuda, 2006; Nayar, 1994). In a text written when ESL was becoming established as a field and career, Darian (1972), describes the ways in which SL teaching was seen separate from FL, "…by virtue of its being a native language in the United States, English was subject to considerations somewhat different from those of foreign languages taught in schools and colleges" (p. 166). This professional division continues

today in the separation of SL and FL professional organizations, publications, and departmental divisions. For example, The Modern Language Association (MLA) continues to separate the teaching of English and foreign languages in both its organization description and in its subdivisions for their publications. On the MLA's website, the organization describes its programs as serving, "English and foreign language teachers" (Modern Language Association, 2006).

Two subdivisions of the MLA, the Associations of Departments of English (ADE) and the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages (ADFL), with their respective publications, ADE Bulletin and ADFL Bulletin, maintain the separation between teaching English and teaching other languages. Also, two separate associations oversee and publish standards for foreign language and English as a second language education, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and the association for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), respectively. Physical spaces and departmental divisions remain between English and Spanish language teaching contexts. In U.S. public schools and universities, foreign language courses and teacher training programs are still traditionally separated into foreign or modern language departments, and associated with the field of education, and ESL programs tend to be subsets of English and/or linguistics programs.

Although, as I reviewed earlier, "second" and "foreign" language teaching contexts are described as observable settings that reflect potential speakers in the community outside of the classroom, in the United States, "foreign" has always been designated as, and synonymous with, "all languages other than English," as evidenced when examining the terms' histories. This tradition, and the history and ideologies

implicated with it, is important to keep in mind when understanding the continued general designation of Spanish as a "foreign" language today, despite its prevalence in the United States. I will now examine these issues further and review the history of teaching Spanish and English in the United States.

Situating History/Situating Histories

In the March 2006 issue of TESOL Quarterly, Suresh Canagarajah begins his 40 year retrospective of the field of TESOL by discussing the problematic implications of writing a history. Canagarajah explains and acknowledges the contextualized and situated features of histories. He states that histories are "partial and partisan," written from a particular viewpoint, with the description dependent upon the narrator's intentions (p. 9). Canagarajah describes writing a state of the art, or history, as a "controversial and contested activity," with the awareness that for every subject, there are multiple stories from multiple locations and viewpoints, even from the same author (p. 10). The histories I represent are by no means definitive or exhaustive histories of the teaching of Spanish and the teaching of English in the United States. My intentions in presenting these histories relate to the objectives of the current study (the research questions) and to the theoretical framework I use. Being that the proposed study concerns discourse, my histories will address recurring themes that have directly influenced the teaching of these two languages throughout the history of the United States[4].

That being said, this is neither a history of method, nor of the professional organizations related to each field, being that professional organizations and methods comprise only *part* of the discourses and history of teaching for both of these languages.

[4] By the "history of the United States" I am referring to what is considered and generally defined as the "pre-colonial" U.S.- from the early 1500's, to the present day, 2006. These dates correspond with histories and accounts for both English and Spanish that I have found in the literature.

I include pre-professional/pre-field events and themes because the pre-field social events and discourses contributed to the formation of the fields, and are discussed frequently in the literature after professionalization occurred.

A final note on choice of organization: Although many histories are organized solely chronologically (for English see Cavanaugh, 1996; Crawford, 1992; for Spanish see Spell, 1925; Leavitt, 1961), I have chosen to organize the histories both chronologically and by common themes. I have decided to represent the histories this way because I believe that linear histories do not reveal the cyclical nature of occurrences and the discursive construction of each context. Histories that are solely linear can be misleading and incomplete in demonstrating patterns because they create a sense that events, attitudes, and debates are finished. Therefore, in addition to including a linear chronology in order to provide a background for each teaching context, I also discuss patterns of recurring themes that appear throughout each history.

English Teaching

Throughout the history of the United States, the English language has been associated with nationality and national unity. The teaching of English has traditionally been viewed as the primary assimilating means for non-English speaking populations. English instruction to speakers of other languages began in the early 1500s with the objectives of Christianizing and Anglicizing Native North American populations (Reyhner, 1992). As subsequent populations immigrated to the U.S., English continued to be taught to non-English speakers, and was also the primary language of instruction in U.S. schools. Although the founders of the United States did not specify an "official"

language, English has historically been enforced as the predominant language of school and government (Baron, 1990; Cavanaugh, 1996; Crawford, 1992; Dicker, 2003).

Laws were enacted to require the instruction of English only as early as 1642 and 1644, establishing the teaching of English reading and writing in all Massachusetts schools (Dicker, 2003). Subsequent laws were passed in other colonies and, later, states over the years. These laws ranged from designating English as the sole language of instruction in schools, to making the teaching of foreign languages before the eighth grade illegal (Crawford, 1992; Cavanaugh, 1996; Dicker, 2003, Baron, 1990). Similar legislation continues in the present day, as English continues to be named the "official" language of individual states, and much public debate continues over designating English the official language of the country. These "English-Only" laws are documented as resulting from the belief in the "melting pot" ideal of people from many backgrounds coming together to form a one nation (Castellanos, 1992). This ideal was the catalyst for the belief that one language would form a "unified whole" (Cavanaugh, 1996, p. 40). Although the melting pot ideal originated in colonial times, it has remained in the public discourse throughout the United States' history.

Although English had been taught to numerous non-English speaking populations throughout the history of the United States, the field of teaching "English as a second language" did not originate until the 1940s. Before this time, especially before the twentieth century, English language instruction was the same for native speakers as for non-native speakers. Both types of students were grouped together, and for the most part, non-English speaking students were not given additional or special instruction (popularly referred to as "sink or swim" methodology) (Baron, 1990; Cavanaugh, 1996; Crawford,

1992; Dicker, 2003; Graff, 2001). It is important to acknowledge that the field of English as a second language inherited this history and ideology in order to understand the defining characteristics of the field today. As many scholars in the field have recognized (see Pavlenko, 2002; 2003, Pennycook, 2001), there is also an unequal power relationship between English and other languages built in to this history.

Goals of English Instruction before the 20th Century

Although instruction in languages other than English did occur before the 20th century, the widespread goals and curriculum in U.S. during the 1700 and 1800s was to teach English as the common language to further national unity (Baron, 1990; Cavanaugh, 1996; Crawford, 1992; Darian, 1972; Dicker, 2003; Graff, 2001). In the 1700s, the American Revolution and formation of the United States as country is recorded as being the cause for the establishment of secular schools with instruction in English only (Cavanaugh, 1996; Crawford, 1992; Darian, 1972; Dicker, 2003). In 1787, an Ordinance was passed that mandated English instruction in all common schools (Cavanaugh, 1996).

English instruction in the late 1700s and throughout the 1800s is well-documented as contributing to assimilationist and monolingual ideals, with the explicit goals of teaching common moral bases and patriotism in addition to content knowledge (Baron, 1990; Cavanaugh, 1996; Crawford, 1992; Dicker, 2003; Graff, 2001)[5]. This instruction occurred in common schools as well as in the Native American boarding schools that

[5] It is important to point out that throughout the assimilationist movements, the literature also discusses groups that were resistant to assimilation. Graff (2001) cites Jewish, Slavic, Polish, and German groups, among others, as challenging the assimilationist hegemony of public schools, some even creating their own parochial, bilingual schools. However, the predominant objective for English education at the time is most often cited as assimilating students to dominant, middle-class, Anglo, Protestant culture, as well as the corresponding American English dialect.

were established from the 1870s to the early 1900s (Reyhner, 1992; Dicker, 2003; Graff, 2001). Graff (2001) describes the predominant curriculum and objectives for teaching English, "The curriculum and materials of the schools were permeated with pan-Protestant, American norms, values and attitudes. The message was "moral, civic, and social" (p. 215). Dialectal assimilation was an additional goal of English instruction. Students frequently completed pronunciation drills and were prohibited to and punished for speaking languages other than English (Baron, 1990; Crawford, 1992; Dicker, 2003; Graff, 2001). Graff (2001) adds, "One significant use of literacy training was to homogenize the speech of the pupils" (p.224). Once again, we see the reinforcement of English as holding more status than other languages.

English Teaching in the First Half of the 20th Century

Similar goals of assimilation remained associated with English instruction to non-English speakers in the first half of the twentieth century. However, many cite this time period as marking a dramatic increase in English instruction in locations other than common, or public schools. (Baron, 1990; Carlson, 1970; Cavanaugh, 1996; Crawford, 1992; Darian, 1972; Dicker, 2003; Graff, 2001; Korman, 1965). Examples of new contexts include, "steamer classes" (intensive, short term courses), and other adult curriculums such as the English program started by the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) in 1907, and English classes held in many tenement houses.

The Americanization movement of the early 1900s[6] is cited as the central cause for the creation of these new programs and types of instruction, particularly within adult

[6] The Americanization Movement took place in the early 1900's, and is said to have reached peak interest in 1915. It is attributed to being the result of extreme nationalism during Work War I, and as being a reaction to a large influx of immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe. "Americanization" continued to be defined as the process of assimilating populations toward Anglo-Protestant ideals and language (Baron,

education. As mentioned, the cultural and linguistic assimilation of recently-arrived groups of non-English speakers remained a central goal of instruction. However, teaching English for workplace training is cited as an additional objective. Also, scholars mention an increased emphasis on cleanliness and health habits as frequent topics of English lessons, particularly in the context of immigrant tenement houses. Carlson (1970) explains the philosophy of Francis Kellor, a strong promoter of the Americanization Movement, regarding English instruction: "She argued that a nation, a community, a factory would gain efficiency by requiring a single language for communication and by encouraging like-mindedness in thought" (p. 449). All of these programs had a common thread of practicality, with content including what the instructors felt was the "everyday" English the student would need, whether it be at work or at home. For example, the curriculum of the YMCA program " 'stressed the practical and necessary,' including common phrases used at home, words related to factory employment, words pertinent to buying, selling, traveling, and trading" (Korman, 1965).

Factory courses often took place on the premises of companies like the Ford Motor Company, International Harvester Company, and Kimberly-Clark, among many others. The lessons are reported as being closely tied to factory discipline and safety procedures (Carlson, 1970; Crawford, 1992; Dicker, 2003, Korman, 1965). Korman (1965) cites a spokesman from Weber Works of International Harvester as stating the goals of the classes as teaching the immigrant worker to "…learn to speak English correctly and also have impressed upon him the rules he should follow while in and

---

1990; Carlson, 1970; Cavanaugh, 1996; Crawford, 1992; Darian, 1972; Dicker, 2003; Graff, 2001; Korman, 1965).

around the works" (p. 401). Korman (1965) also includes an example of a lesson from the factory classes:

"Lesson 1 entitled, 'General' 'I hear the whistle, I must hurry.'

'I hear the five minute whistle.'

'It is time to go into the shop…' (p. 402).

Finally, tenement houses also provided English classes for non-English speakers. The most frequently cited example of a tenement house, with an almost mythical legacy, is Jane Addams' Hull House, which opened in the late 1800s and existed until the 1960s. Addams' curriculum is often described as diverging from mainstream Americanization, in that, in addition to the practical training emphasis of her curriculum, she stressed the incorporation of immigrants' talents and skills. Therefore, Addams is not seen as having the objective of total Americanization. Addams' position on Americanization has been debated however, as she opposed parochial schools with instruction in languages other than English, as well as her own practice of teaching, upper-middle class Anglo values (O'Rourke, 1998).

The Professionalization of Teaching English as a Second Language

Although the contexts in which English was taught as an additional language had grown at the beginning of the twentieth-century, professionalization of this instruction had not yet occurred. Instruction at this time is said to have been extremely varied, and teacher training was virtually non-existent (Baron, 1990; Crawford, 1992; Darian, 1972; Dicker, 2003). For example, instructors at the YMCA, which is recorded as being the largest organized English program, varied in backgrounds ranging from university and

seminary students, businessmen, public servants, and employees of industrial plants (Korman, 1965).

Events from the 1940s to the 1960s led to the professionalization of the field, establishing a marked change in the teaching of English as an additional language. The professionalization of the field of teaching English as a Second Language (ESL) developed during this time period as a result of the following: the increased scholarship in structural linguistics (Darian, 1972; Nayar, 1997), the renewal of ethnic and cultural sensitivities in the 1960s (Dicker, 2003), the creation of the Bilingual Education Act in 1968, and the foundation of the organization of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).

The early 1940s is recognized as the beginning of the creation of a field for teaching ESL, with the increase in scholarship in structural linguistics, specifically concerning the study of learning English as a second language (Darian, 1972; Matsuda, 2006; Nayar, 1997). At the same time new studies in second language learning were taking place, there was increase in the international student population at U.S. universities after World War II (Darian, 1972; Matsuda, 2006). The combination of the scholarship and the demographics led to the establishment of the first intensive English program at a university, the English Language Institute (ELI), by Charles Fries in 1941 (Darian, 1972; Nayar, 1997; Marckwardt, 1963; Matsuda, 2006). The curriculum at the ELI first focused primarily on speaking, and later incorporated writing instruction in the 1950s (Matsuda, 2006). The ELI marked a significant change in the way English as a second language was taught in the United States. Fries had not only created a full curriculum solely for second language learners of English, but he had also based his class

plan and content on current research in the field. This led to the creation of more intensive English programs, as well as contributing greatly to the professionalization of the field (Darian, 1972; Matsuda, 2006).

In addition to advances in structural linguistics and the increase in programs, the foundation of the professional organization of TESOL also greatly affected the way in which ESL students were taught in the U.S. The initial meetings of TESOL began in 1963, and the organization was officially recognized in 1966. TESOL was created "out of professional concern over the lack of a single, all-inclusive professional organization that might bring together teachers and administrators at all educational levels with an interest in teaching English to speakers of other languages (ESOL)" (TESOL website). The first organizational meetings and steering committee for TESOL were made up of representatives of these five institutions, which included The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), Modern Language Association (MLA), National Association of Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA), the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) and the Speech Association of America (SAA) (Allen, 1967, p. 3). The TESOL Journal was first published in 1967, and served as the first central forum for instructors of students of all ages, grades, and levels of English proficiency to discuss experiences, methods, and research. The journal built on the more scientific linguistic research of other journals such as Language Learning, and helped to bring the issues of teaching English as a second language and ESL learners to a wider academic audience, and to the general public.

Finally, the 1968 Bilingual Education Act greatly influenced ESL instruction, as well as the recognition of other languages, in the public schools. Even though bilingual

education is cited as occurring throughout the history of the U.S. (Crawford, 1992), specialized instruction, and even recognition of L2 learners of English is recorded as being absent from public schooling as late as the 1950s (Baron, 1990). The Bilingual Education Act of 1968 grew out of a growing concern for the educational neglect of teaching non-English speaking students, in particular, Mexican-American children (Jimenez, 1992).

The Bilingual Education Act provided funding for programs that maintained students' home languages, sought to group English language learners properly (e.g., not tracked in classes for mentally disabled students or students with learning disabilities), and provide information to parents in the home language (Crawford, 1992; Jimenez, 1992). This act, along with the other professional developments in the field, led to the end of the "sink or swim" approach of previous years, and resulted in a new way in which non-English speakers were treated and perceived in the U.S. schools and in society.

The professionalization of the field of teaching English as a second language has affected how English is taught to second language learners of English in many ways. Through professional journals, conferences, publications, among other forums, research, methodology, policy and other aspects of ESL teaching have been developed and discussed among ESL instructors of all levels of expertise. The growth of the field has also created a pluralist discourse that counters the traditional assimilationist, English monolingual discourse that had predominantly been associated with teaching English to speakers of other languages.

Professional discourse is currently associated with advocating multilingual and pluralist policies based on research and scholarship on language learning. The

professional associations in the field of linguistics and teaching English as a second language (TESOL, CAL, NCTE, etc.), openly state their opposition to perpetuating assimilationist instruction with the goal of English monolingualism, and, instead, promote pluralism, and the respect of and instruction of other languages in addition to the instruction of English. In addition to public statements and policy made by professional organizations regarding this issue, this stance is found upon examining professional literature and written histories addressing the teaching of English as an additional language.

This pluralist agenda is acknowledged in the texts I cite here (e.g. Baron, 1990; Crawford, 1992; Dicker, 2003; Nayar, 1997), and is explicitly addressed in some cases. For example, although he includes various examples of "advocacy on both sides of the official English question," Crawford (1992), states his bias, as well as the bias of those who contributed to the sourcebook. He states that his intent is not to give " 'equal time' to opposing views," and clearly states the position of those involved in the Conference on Language Rights and Public Policy on which the book is based as being in opposition to the adoption of English as the official language of the U.S. (p. 7). Dicker (2003), refers to a division between public and professional discourse regarding English language teaching in describing the goals of her book. She states that one of the major goals of the book is to bring the pluralist professional discourse of linguists to the public, whom Dicker sees as predominantly favoring monolingualism (xi).

The overarching pluralistic and multilingual agenda of the field has resulted in the presence of a concentrated, counter discourse to assimilationist movements. This counter argument to cultural and linguistic assimilation indicates a change in the overall public

discussion of teaching English as a second language. Professionals in the field have become able to join together to form a stronger, more unified voice for pluralism than any group or individual had achieved in the past. An example of this was the response that was mounted during the U.S. English movement of the early 1980s. The U.S. English movement (also called "official English" or "English Only") was started by Senator S.I. Hayakawa in 1981, who promoted of The English Language Amendment (S.J. Res. 72), an amendment with the objective of making English the official language of the U.S. Hayakawa later formed the group "US English," in 1983, along with Dr. John Tanton (an ophthalmologist, not a Doctor of Philosophy in any language-related field) (Crawford, 1992; Thomas, 1996). The goal of the group was to promote legislation that would initially make English the official language of each state, and then, eventually, the entire nation (Crawford, 1992; Thomas, 1996).

The English Plus Information Clearinghouse (EPIC) formed in 1987 as a response to the English Only movement. English Plus was established by a coalition of education, civil rights and advocacy organizations, whose founding members included TESOL and CAL. The core beliefs of English Plus include that "the national interest is best served when all members of our society have full access to effective opportunities to acquire strong English language proficiency plus mastery of a second or multiple languages" (English Plus website). English Plus sought to promote programs and legislation that include the instruction of languages other than English and the implementation of more two-way bilingual programs. Since then, other professional organizations including Linguistic Society of America, National Council of Teacher of English, and National

Education Association have publicly opposed subsequent English Only legislation that is still being proposed today.

Assimilationist and Pluralist Tensions

As indicated above, the professional field of teaching English as a second language has had the stated objective of creating a unified, pluralist discourse that opposes the traditional assimilationist discourse associated with teaching English to speakers of other languages, This has, in turn, for the most part, equated ESL professionals with pluralism and multilingualism. However, I have observed in the literature that a conflict exists between the pluralist politics and objectives of the field and the extensive history of assimilation associated with English teaching. In reviewing the history of teaching English to speakers of other languages from colonial times to the present day, it is clear that the contradiction and tension between the historical associations of teaching English and the intentions of its professionals may be attributed to a direct result of the short existence of the field.

This tension appears in professional literature that addresses various aspects of how the assimilationist history of teaching English affects the field. For example, concerning terminology, Nayar (1997) discusses the Anglocentricity in the widespread and taken-for-granted terms second language acquisition and second language learning, and ESL. He states, "The term second language typifies the Anglocentricity of the discourse of applied linguistics and language teaching in today's world" (p. 12). He further notes that the dominance of this discourse "makes monolingualism the norm (and English speakers are Euro-America's, if not the world's, most entrenched literate monolinguals), and because an additional language cannot be anything more than an SL

to an English speaker, so it is seen for the others" (Nayar, 1997, p. 12). Nayar indicates here that the monolingual oriented, assimilationist history leading up to the formation of the fields is not only visible in the terminology once the field were created, but is also perpetuated by the continued use of this terminology and what it implies. Pavlenko (2002) also has traced the history Americanization through language and the prevalent language ideology that to "be American" is to be monolingual and absorb Anglo-Saxon cultural traditions.

A second theme that has been addressed in the literature that points to this tension is the continued presence of assimilationist discourse within the ESL curriculum. Auerbach has criticized the assimilationist agenda of both "survival ESL" (1985) and "English Only" within the classroom (1993). Auerbach & Burgess (1985) critically examine the ways in which English instructors may be shaping their students' (traditional) subservient roles in society by teaching the "survival English." "Survival English" courses are meant to teach students "everyday English" they will use, especially in the workplace.

By examining the history of English teaching, it is evident that this type of instruction has its roots in the Americanization movement. Auerbach (1993) indicates that having students use only English in the classroom shares these origins as well. She states, "Much of the discourse from the Americanization period is mirrored in the discourse of present-day 'innovative' approaches which focus on survival English in an English-only classroom, with the notable difference that, at that time, the political agenda was more explicit" (p. 13). Nayar (1997) consents on the prevalence of this discourse as well, in spite of the politics and intentions of the field, "The enormous amount and the

nature of literature and material produced in the U.S. on teaching culture in the context of ESL underscore the fact that it is acculturation and not enculturation that is envisaged in [ESL in the U.S.]" (p. 17).

The continued examination of the tension between history and the intentions of the profession, and attempts to resolve this issue, continue to be addressed with the growing scholarship in critical and sociocultural studies in the field. As Canagarajah (2006) explains, "Since 1991, critical practice has made rapid progress in TESOL, exploring empowerment from diverse orientations…In all these projects, TESOL researchers adopt a constructivist orientation, perceiving how language is constituted, negotiated, and modified in discourse" (p. 16). Critical methods examine the questions of power, ethics, and subjectivity within the field, and how discourse and history reappear in current practices, and how we, as professionals, can go about changing the patterns of the past that go against our beliefs and objectives.

According to Nayar (1997), the origin of ESL teaching in the United States has two components: academic and demographic. The academic component refers to the professional growth of the field. The demographic element concerns the history of teaching English as an additional language that includes discourse from before the field's inception. The acknowledgement of this duality is important for examining and interpreting the discursive construction of teaching English as a second language in the United States. The professional field, and its academic and pluralistic political agendas is at once the response to, as well as the result of, a largely assimilationist agenda of teaching English in the past. While, within the profession, a pluralist discourse and agenda has developed, the legacy it has inherited of the unequal power relationship

between English and all other languages, along with associated discourses, continues to define the teaching of English and is also reified in professional divisions. The underlying principles that I have outlined above are also observable in the discourses on the teaching of Spanish in the United States. I will now review the history of teaching Spanish, as well as the relationship between Spanish and English in social and professional discourse.

Spanish Teaching

Spanish is the most widely-taught language other than English in the United States, with enrollments in universities higher than they have ever been (Kelm, 2000; Leeman, 2007; Roca & Colombi, 2003). Spanish is also the most widely-spoken language, with a far greater number of speakers than any other non-English language (U.S. Census Data, 2000). Within the conventional definitions of second and foreign languages, Spanish would be defined as a "second" language, since it is part of the speech community outside of the classroom setting in many areas of the United States. However, Spanish is still largely categorized as a "foreign" language, and although some discussion of this contradiction has surfaced in the field (see González, 1996), it appears that Spanish will retain this classification for the time being.

This contradiction between what the terms "second" and "foreign" are said to designate through professional dictionaries and sourcebooks, and what the terms actually designate in widespread usage, reveals the "abstract parallelism" between these fields and the decontextualized aspect of the conventional understanding of these terms. In fact, no other language in the United States has ever been designated as a "second" language other than English, and, given the history and ideology behind the term, no other

language probably ever will be. The case of Spanish in the United States is the leading example to support this theory. As Spanish language study and Spanish language usage have grown over the years, the terminology within the field has changed, and additional terms have been added, such as "heritage" language education. However, the division between Spanish and English, both professionally and socially, remains marked and is reified in many ways. I will now review the history of this division and the patterns of discourses that have shaped the field of teaching Spanish in the United States.

In reflecting on the teaching of Spanish in the United States, Fernandez (2000) lists two characteristics that have always conditioned Hispanism's self-definition and the place of Hispanic studies and the field of Spanish teaching: 1) the status of Spanish as both a European and an American language and 2) what Fernandez calls the "worldliness attached to the study of Spanish," which he defines as "The links between the practices and perceptions of Hispanic studies and the commercial, political, and demographic processes of the American hemisphere" (pp. 1962-1963).

In reviewing the literature on the history of Spanish teaching in the U.S., as well as noticing patterns in the discourse surrounding Spanish teaching over the years, I have observed similar prominent issues to Fernandez (2000). These two characteristics serve as a frame for discussing themes related to the teaching of Spanish in the U.S. What Fernandez observes as "the inextricable link to the geopolitical and demographic processes of the American hemisphere," corresponds with the booms and recesses that are recorded in the history of Spanish teaching since the early 1900s. The first defining characteristic of Spanish's status as both a European and an American language not only translates to the discourses of which dialect(s) and literatures of Spanish to teach, but is

also linked to the discourse of learning Spanish for cultural and practical reasons. Spain has predominantly been associated with cultural reasons for learning Spanish, and Latin America, with practical ones. I found that discussions related to sociopolitical influences on the profession of Spanish teaching and the distinction between Spain and Latin America/learning Spanish for cultural/practical purposes have been, historically, the most prominent themes in the field.

Booms and Recesses

Throughout the history of Spanish teaching in the United States there has been a continuous discussion of sharp increases in popularity followed by equally large decreases in popularity. These booms and recesses in the interest and demand for Spanish have been attributed to social and political events, much like Fernandez observed. The booms, recesses, and their consequences have been extensively documented in the literature (Espinosa, A., 1921; Espinosa, J., 1934; McKendree, 1942; Roberts, 1942; Leavitt, 1961; Long, 1999; Leeman, 2007). Social and political influence on teaching Spanish in the U.S. is observed in what is recorded as the beginning of Spanish teaching, due to a boom in interest, and the subsequent recesses and booms that followed. Although Spanish was the first European language taught in North America in varying contexts from the early 1500s to the present day, much of the recorded history and discourse on teaching Spanish in the U.S. does not begin until the early 1900s. There is a pattern in the literature citing this time period as being, if not a true beginning of Spanish teaching, a marked change in teaching Spanish in the United States. A commonly cited marker of this new beginning is the formation of The American

Association of Teachers of Spanish[7] in 1916, followed by the publication of the organization's journal, Hispania, in 1917.

In 1921, the founder of the AATS, Aurelio Espinosa, wrote "…Spanish is a new subject…We are just now writing our textbooks and training our teachers…" (p. 281). In the same article, he states that the rapid development and increasing interest in Spanish has created a fundamental problem: "How shall we make the teaching of Spanish an essential part of our educational system?" The question Espinosa poses indicates that, although, before that time, Spanish had been taught to varying degrees and in varying contexts, it was not yet included and generally accepted in the language teaching curriculum.

Authors of Spanish teaching histories published over the years (Leavitt, 1961; Long, 1999; McKendree, 1942; Spell, 1927; Wilkins, 1917), cite this new beginning as a direct result of outside social and political factors which led to an enormous increase in the interest in learning Spanish. According to Spell (1927), the Spanish-American War and the consequent acquisition of new territory seemed to serve as "an eye-opener to the magnates of commercial circles in the United States" (p.155). Spell says that, shortly thereafter, around 1914, advertisements appeared in the popular media, along with statements by the Commissioner of Education, urging everyone to study Spanish in order to invest in underdeveloped areas of South America as a market for goods. Spell states that instruction and interest in Spanish increased greatly, resulting in general introduction of Spanish in secondary schools.

[7] The AATS later included teachers of Portuguese in 1944, thus becoming the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP). I have used AATS here, since that was the original name under which the organization was founded, and the dates cited were before the name change occurred.

Aside from business interests after the Spanish American War, the event of World War I is frequently cited as the principal catalyst for the increased interest in learning Spanish, and the foundation of a professional teaching field (Espinosa, 1921; Leavitt, 1962; Long, 1999; McKendree, 1942; Roberts, 1942; Wilkins, 1917). In the literature, the popularity increase in Spanish is attributed to the removal of German from the foreign language curriculum, as a result of a popular negative sentiment towards the German language, due to the war. Leavitt (1961), cites the following statistics of that time: "Between 1915 and 1922 it is estimated that German dropped from an enrollment of approximately 325,000 to less than 14,000, and that in the same period…Spanish [increased] from approximately 36,000 to 252,000" (p. 621). Spell (1927) states that in 1918, The New York Times reported that the teaching of Spanish increased 1,000 percent and 400 out of 505 secondary schools substituted Spanish for German.

This dramatic increase in the interest in Spanish and the new beginning for the profession has been recognized repeatedly as the first of many Spanish "booms." As previously indicated, not only are social and political factors seen as contributing to booms, but recesses in the interest in Spanish are also attributed to these factors. In an article entitled, "Reflections on the prospects of another Spanish boom," McKendree (1942) describes a cycle of booms and recesses in the popularity of Spanish, and what this means for the profession of Spanish teaching in the U.S. (Effects of this fluctuation in demand will be discussed in greater detail in a following section):

Everyone knows the history of Spanish as a subject. Prior to 1914, it stood a poor third among the Modern Languages and was taught in only a few of our schools and colleges. By 1920, it had run far ahead of German and was even giving French a hard

battle for its hitherto undisputed position at the head of the list. About 1927, the recession began, the ebb continuing with ever increasing rapidity until, somewhere in the mid 1930s, the low watermark was reached. Now, it would seem that the pendulum has begun to swing in the other direction (p. 288).

McKendree's description of the cycle of booms and recesses in the popularity of Spanish applies to trends that occurred long after his article was written. In fact, the pattern of highs and lows of popularity of Spanish has continued to the 2000s. As McKendree observed, the initial boom during the early 1900s that is associated with the inception of Spanish teaching, was followed by a recess in the 1930s. Along with McKendree, Espinosa (1934) at that time observed "a decrease in enrollment in Spanish classes to a more alarming extent than is the case with other modern languages" (p. 139). However, as McKendree also references, the recess of the 1930s is reported to be followed by a new boom in the 1940s. This boom is attributed to social and political factors during World War II, including the continued disinterest in teaching German, and the implementation and promotion of the "Army Method" of language teaching (Leavitt, 1961; McKendree, 1942; Roberts, 1942). Nonetheless, as Roberts' 1942 editorial, "Will the current interest in Spanish last?" anticipates, a recess follows after the Army Teaching Method ends abruptly in 1944.

This recess is followed by another boom in the early 1960s that is attributed to another sociopolitical event, the signing of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) by Eisenhower in 1958. The NDEA was enacted to promote foreign language learning, because, as the name suggests, knowledge of languages other than English was viewed as necessary for the U.S.' defense at the time. The NDEA provided a considerable amount

of funding to foreign language programs in order to augment the resources of university language programs, and funded summer institutes with the goal of improving language skills of instructors (Long, 1999). At this time, the teaching of Spanish is described as reaching another "unprecedented height" (Honsa, 1960, p. 346).

The NDEA boom lasts throughout the 1960s, until, keeping with the pattern, another recess occurs in the 1970s. In a historical retrospective of Spanish teaching in the journal Hispania, the 1970s are described as a decade of declining enrollments in foreign languages, and of the elimination of many foreign language requirements in universities. Also, in 1981, Mead observes that the gains made during the time of NDEA funding had diminished greatly (p. 93).

The final boom is recognized as beginning in the mid to late 1990s and continuing to the present day. As previously noted, Spanish is the most widely-taught language in U.S. schools, and university Spanish programs have been growing and continue to grow (Gonzalez, 1996; Kelm, 2000; Long, 1999). The principal sociopolitical factors that are reported as contributing to the current boom include the growing number of Spanish speakers in the United States, leading to an increased demand for Spanish courses for the professions as well as Heritage Language courses for students whose home language is Spanish (Kelm, 2000). In a report on future challenges for Spanish departments, Kelm (2000) explains the reason for the current boom as "society's increased need for Spanish speakers," and cites the growing Spanish-speaking population for the need for an increased number of Spanish for instrumental purposes. In reflecting on today's social needs influencing Spanish in light of those in the past, Kelm adds, "Foreign language

curriculum has been shaped and modified ever since the end of the World War II, but at no time has the focus been on teaching Spanish for use within our own borders" (p. 83).

In the presentation of booms and recesses in the literature, Spanish educators, and even the profession as a whole, appear to lack agency in determining student interest and, therefore, enrollment. Based on the descriptions given in the professional literature, it seems like the teaching of Spanish is almost completely up to public interest and popularity based on outside social and political factors. Take, for example, the following observation on Spanish teaching before the "big boom" after the Spanish-American War, and during WWI: "In spite of its early roots in the United States, the teaching of Spanish was overshadowed by classical Greek and Latin, French, and German. After the Spanish-American War of 1898, however, interest in Spanish began to increase again" (Long, 1999, p. 38). Here there is no mention of Spanish teaching before the boom, even though "almost half" of the U.S. was owned by Spain in 1800 (Spell, 1927). In addition, the use of a passive voice portrays Spanish teaching as subject to the interest or disinterest of the American public, and, not only can nothing be done about it by Spanish teachers, but apparently, no one person or entity has actively discouraged the teaching of Spanish or has actively encouraged the teaching of another language (Spanish "was overshadowed…" and "…interest in Spanish began to increase again"). This indicates a viewpoint that is repeated and entrenched in the discourse of Spanish teaching, as the retelling of the history does not really vary from 1917 to 1999.

The Values of Learning Spanish

In addition to the booms and recesses in the interest and enrollment, another prominent theme in the history of Spanish teaching in an ongoing discussion of the ways

to promote the "value" or "worth" of learning Spanish to the general public. This discussion in introduced in the inaugural edition of Hispania, as Wilkins (1917) lists the second major goal of the AATS is to "Make known to all teachers of Spanish and educators the worth of studying Spanish" (p. 9). Oxford (1999) describes this objective of the professional organization as "in essence a public advocacy role" (p. 294). This role of Spanish teaching professionals in promoting the language appears often in subsequent texts. Over the years, Spanish has primarily been said to have two "values:" 1) cultural and 2) practical, and, interestingly, these values have traditionally been associated with Spain and Latin America, respectively.

In the early 1900s, more emphasis was placed on studying Spanish for the culture and language of Spain, as Spanish literature was becoming recognized academically in the U.S. (Spell, 1927). This affected the teaching of Spanish in the selection of texts as well of the dialect of Spanish that was taught. It is especially important to note that Latin American literature was recorded as widely being viewed as "of little value" (Spell, 1927; see also Umphrey, 1932). During this time period, business and trade opportunities in Latin America were also mentioned as reasons to learn Spanish (Espinosa, 1921; Hills, 1923; Wilkins, 1917). The establishment of U.S. banks in South America, along with the opening of the Panama Canal and trade opportunities with Latin America, are the most often "practical" reasons cited for studying Spanish. These associations of learning Spanish for practical purposes with Latin America and cultural purposes with Spain appeared to become commonplace by the early 1920s. Hills (1923) cites the two main reasons high school students learn Spanish as the increasing business and social relations

with the United States and Latin America and the importance of reading Spanish literature.

These themes continue in subsequent years. In 1940, McCuaig states, "It is an almost universally accepted theory that Spanish, as well as most of the modern languages, is taught for either of two reasons: first, for vocational reasons, and secondly, for cultural purposes" (p. 108). This indicates that the practical and cultural values named at the onset of the professionalization of the field have become entrenched in the discourse by this time. Leavitt concurs in 1960, as he attributes the high standing of Spanish to several factors including commercial relations with Latin America, and more general recognition and appreciation of literature of Spain and Latin America (it was at this time that Latin American studies begins and Latin America's literature is first said to be "recognized").

This established division between the cultural and practical "value" of learning Spanish has affected the teaching of the language in several ways. First, these discussions have often placed Spanish teachers in the role of "Spanish advocate" or "Spanish salesperson" to a certain extent (recall Wilkins' statement-to make the value of studying known to *Spanish teachers* and educators). The literature that addresses the value of Spanish often stresses, and re-stresses the same reasons for learning Spanish so that instructors will continue to advertise them to students and colleagues. It is interesting to note that this discourse is absent from the literature on teaching English as an additional language, indicating the assumed value of learning English. It is also interesting to make note of the language used here. Recognizing "value" or "worth" of a language presupposes that different languages and/or cultures have greater value or worth

than others. This implication was also absent from the ESL history and literature, as the "worth" of English is not frequently addressed (especially not the selling of its value).

In surveying themes related to Spanish teaching throughout the years, it is clear that, although currently the most studied language other than English in the United States changes in the field often occurred with changes in the sociopolitical climate. Although Spanish teaching currently appears to be in "boom" stage as in the past, this "boom" has outlasted others, therefore indicating a potential break in the "boom" recess pattern. However, remnants of this discourse remain today. The strong public sentiment against German was seen as such a determining factor for the "beginning" of the Spanish teaching profession, that it is still cited today as provoking the foundation of the AATSP. On the AATSP website, on the page entitled, "History of AATSP," the following description of the beginning of Spanish is given:

> American isolationism gave Spanish a boost when German was dropped from many schools during the First World War. Spanish became the language of choice, not through any love of the language, but for simple expediency. So Spanish developed a constituency and a foothold in American education, but for unattractive and unsatisfactory reasons (The American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese, 2003).

Jennifer Leeman (2007) addresses this relationship between Spanish's popularity and practicality, reflects on the sociocultural context related to Spanish's current high enrollment in relationship to its value. Leeman outlines the fluctuating popularity of Spanish throughout the history of the profession and concludes that Spanish's popularity is not as much related to prestige or students' personal inclination for learning (especially

for students taking Spanish as a requirement), but instead for the perceived "market value" of the language and the privileging of this type of value at the university. She states that high enrollments, "should be attributed less to an increase in the prestige value of Spanish than to the commodification of language and the contemporary fixation on the marketability of particular types of knowledge and education" (p. 38). This "marketability" aspect related to the utilitarian reasons for learning Spanish has always been present in the discourse, however the importance of this marketability has increased over the years, especially with discourses on globalization and the "global marketplace."

Relationship Between English and Spanish

Although, as discussed, the teaching of English and Spanish are predominantly associated with the separate fields of second language acquisition and Foreign Language Learning, other discourses exist that concern the relationship between the two languages. As indicated in the description of ESL discourse, the instruction of English as an additional language is often discussed in relation to the speaking, learning, and maintaining of "minority languages"(Crawford, 1992; Baron, 1992; Dicker, 2003). Although the term "minority languages" has been traditionally used to collectively refer to all languages other than English, regardless of number of speakers, in the past 35-40 years, Spanish has been singled out in academic and popular discourse, to have a unique relationship to English. This is due to the overwhelmingly large number of Spanish speakers in the U.S. as compared with other non-English languages.

The rapid and exponential rise of Spanish speakers in the U.S. has resulted in discourses that range from Spanish (and Hispanics) being portrayed as a "threat" to the maintenance of the English language (Crawford, 1992; Baron, 1990; Dicker, 2003), the

"struggle for the legitimacy" of Spanish in the U.S. (Torres, 1990), to the pressing need to promote and increase Spanish learning and teaching (Kelm, 2000; Roca & Colombi, 2003). An example of the discourse of "Spanish as a threat" to English is documented often as gaining momentum at the time of the "English Only" movement of the 1980s, due to increased immigration of Hispanics (Crawford, 1992; Baron, 1990). Since then, Spanish has been commonly seen as the "rival language" to English. This is evidenced by the occurrence of debates, some resulting in civil suits of the use of Spanish in public, especially the workplace. Also, in 1988, a study was commissioned by Hispanic Policy Development Project to investigate Hispanic's rate of learning English over generations. This study, completed by Calvin Veltman, was requested in order to dispel or verify the "Hispanic myth" that purports that, compared to other English language learners, Hispanics are more reluctant or unwilling to learn English (Nicolau & Valdivieso, 1988).

Although the current discourse of Spanish/Hispanics as a threat to English is attributed to the increase in immigration of Latin Americans in recent years, historically, the discourse of Spanish as a threat and subsequent efforts to get rid of the language appears much earlier, with the acquisition of Spanish and Mexican territories (now much of the southwestern U.S.). Spell (1927) documents these sentiments, indicating that, because of them, Spanish was not even taught in these areas: "The addition of large areas of Spanish territory to the United States has not had the tendency to increase the number of Spanish-speaking inhabitants; instead, the Spanish language has been supplanted by English as fast as possible. From the districts in which the interest in the Spanish language should naturally be greatest has come little of influence on the teaching of the language in general" (p. 158). The final sentence of Spell's quotation alludes to another

prominent discourse originating from the relationship between Spanish and English in the southwestern U.S.: Bilingual education. Although Spanish and English are not the only languages of concern with bilingual education, they are definitely the ones most strongly associated with the field. In fact, it is documented that the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 was formed out of a concern for teaching Spanish speaking students in the southwest (Crawford, 1992). Also, many studies and reports of bilingual education focus on Spanish and English programs (Crawford, 1992).

The discourse on bilingual education actually illustrates a point at which English and Spanish teaching meet. Nayar (1997) describes an essential association between ESL and bilingual education. Also, in examining professional journals, especially TESOL, bilingual education is discussed frequently, especially in earlier volumes at the inception of the journal, and the implementation of the Bilingual Education Act. Most of these articles address pedagogical issues for Spanish-speaking students.

In professional discourse in language teaching, bilingual education in the United States has often been criticized for not being truly "bilingual," where both languages are maintained and used throughout the student's educational career. Most programs, instead, are "transitional," in which the student's home language is used in the classroom at first, but is decreased year by year until only English is used. Thus, "bilingual" programs, which are predominantly "transitional," have been criticized for promoting assimilation and supporting the ideology of English monolingualism in the U.S. (Crawford, 1992; Dicker, 2003; Shannon, 1999; Torres, 1990).

The prominence of transitional bilingual programs is often attributed to the perception that true bilingual programs promote languages other than English, and not

place enough emphasis on learning English. For this reason, bilingual education is often described as "controversial." Torres (1990) comments, "Although some who struggle for bilingual education argue for bilingual programs which acknowledge the importance of languages other than English and which encourage cultural pluralism, the dominant group has, for the most part, successfully undermined this challenge" (p. 150). Shannon (1999) discusses the assimilationist and monolingual ideologies that affect the curriculum and practices of bilingual education, specifically Spanish/English programs in Denver Public Schools. She states, "The school behaves much the same as the larger society. In the United States, non-English-speaking residents are seen as a 'problem' and the speaking of English is associated with the process of becoming American" (p. 25). Shannon states that since Spanish does not share the same status as English, schools (both in Denver and elsewhere) are only concerned with transitional programs. She describes one bilingual classroom in which a teacher does not speak Spanish, and cites a Denver Public Schools board member as stating at a meeting, " 'we are not in the business of maintenance, we are in the business of transition'" (p. 23)

In the same article, however, Shannon (1999) describes the classroom environment of a teacher who promotes the status of Spanish in her classroom and maintains, what Shannon, teachers, and parents consider to be a truly bilingual environment: "Mrs. D insists that the culture of the society outside her classroom is not an acceptable model in her classroom. Spanish has the same status as English…and both are important languages of instruction" (p. 24). This example begins to illustrate the complexity of the relationship of English and Spanish, specifically regarding education. As mentioned in the introductory part of this section, along with discourses of Spanish as

a “threat” to English and Spanish’s struggle for legitimacy in the United States, a discourse also exists that acknowledges Spanish’s inevitable growing power and with it, the importance of learning Spanish in the U.S. This discourse was discussed briefly regarding the most recent issues in Spanish teaching which focus on the increased demand for Spanish classes because of the number of Spanish-speakers in the U.S. University Spanish programs continue to grow, and there is a increased demand for “Spanish for instrumental purposes” (Kelm, 2000). The widespread use of Spanish is often used to advertise the need to study Spanish. For example, the overview of the Spanish language program at the University of Pittsburgh emphasizes that Spanish is “no longer a foreign language to us,” that it has become “much like French in Canada-a de facto second language in the United States” (University of Pittsburgh Hispanic Languages and Literatures Overview). In addition to the increase in Spanish for instrumental purposes, university Spanish departments have added more “heritage language” courses to their curriculum, for students who come from Spanish-speaking homes (Roca & Colombi, 2003).

Valdés (2003) discusses how the discourse appears to be changing from what she anticipated to be “a growing anti-Latino, anti-Spanish hysteria fomented by a profound anti-immigrant sentiment,” to one in which learning Spanish is viewed as an asset (p. vi). She cites various newspaper articles and reports that especially highlight the increase in the interest in learning Spanish by non-Hispanics and Hispanic professionals (e.g. “Latino Lawmakers Study Their Spanish: Some Were Fluent as Kids but Stumble Today”). In addition, Valdés focuses on the changing view of Spanish, particularly in the southwest, where as discussed, throughout most of its history, Spanish was considered a

threat, and students were punished in schools for speaking Spanish. She cites an article in the San Antonio Press that begins, "Barely a generation ago, Spanish was a liability in San Antonio and much of South Texas. Today, it's often seen as a valuable asset, even in politics" (p. viii). Valdés predicts that these changes, in which Spanish is seen as beneficial and not as a threat, will "seriously impact the Spanish-teaching field" (p.ix).

Taking Valdés' prediction into consideration, and applying it to the current study, I would now like to examine how these discourses affect, or appear to affect the teaching of both Spanish and English as other languages. There are prominent themes that appear in the literature concerning how the aforementioned discourses affect practices in both fields, particularly when comparing FLL and SLA. The first example concerns the perceived importance (or unimportance) of foreign language learning, as a result of assimilationist and monolingual discourse and ideology, and the traditional association of the English language with national identity. The discourse of foreign language learning as "low priority" is found throughout professional literature (Hill, 2003; Tedick & Walker, 1994). This discourse has even translated into affecting practices, since, at times, English-Only amendments and legislation has caused a decrease in foreign language programs, at times resulting in making foreign language teaching illegal, as well as the use of a "foreign" language in public (Crawford, 1992; Spell, 1927). Pavlenko (2003) addresses how the term "foreign" in foreign language learning creates and recreates national and oppositional identities of "us" and "them" and of "English" and the "Language of the Enemy."

In examining the effects the discourse has had on the fields of Teaching English as a Second Language and second language acquisition, one can see noticeable

contradictions in practice and explicit ideologies among English language teaching professionals. Although the stated views within the profession are to promote multilingualism, cultural pluralism, and bilingual education, ESL instructors are subject to a history of assimilationist and monolingual discourse that the teaching of English carries. The terminology used to describe the fields "English as a Second Language" and "Second language acquisition" has been criticized as representative of the monolingual norm in the U.S., assuming all other languages learned must be "second" languages (Nayar, 1997). The prevalence of assimilationist discourse is documented in the field (Auerbach, 1993), and, more specifically, so has the conflict of interests that would occur between professionals and policy makers if English became the official language of the U.S. and English-Only legislation prevailed (Judd, 1987).

Another way in which these discourses have been described as affecting teaching regards the acquisition of Spanish as seen as beneficial to some members of the community and not others. This discourse has rapidly evolved over recent years due to the increasing number of Hispanic immigrants. Pomerantz (2002) describes an imbalance in the way the ability to speak Spanish is viewed in the U.S., which is in direct relationship with social class and immigrant status (pp. 276-277). She explains how the ability to speak Spanish can be considered as cultural capital and a "*resource*" for middle-and upper-middle class university students, and "gives them an 'edge'" in the global job market, whereas Spanish may be viewed as a "*problem*" for heritage language users, by both themselves and the English-monolingual, middle-class, American society (pp. 276-277 emphasis in original). I include this example because it provides insight into the relationship between bilingual education, Spanish as a heritage language and a

foreign language. In the public school system, students from Spanish-speaking homes most often go through transitional bilingual education programs that eventually become English-only environments. During this process, students may or may not take their home language as a foreign language at the high school level. At the university level, these students, who many time lose skills in Spanish because of transitional bilingual programs, learn (and re-learn) Spanish as a "heritage language" as part of the foreign language curriculum (Valdés 1995).

The division between these contexts widens the scope and provides further insight into the relationships between the various subfields with language teaching, and adds an additional dimension to the earlier discussion on the division between second and foreign language teaching contexts. Here we see the effects that these larger discourses have on the relationship of the larger field of SLA (ESL) and FLL. By maintaining a division between the two fields, second language acquisition limits its cross-linguistic research (VanPatten & Lee, 1990). These limitations concern both research projects and professional collaboration of instructors of both fields (Tedick & Walker, 1994).

The historical background and discourses of both Spanish and English teaching in the U.S. are multi-layered and complex, and, at times, contradictory. I have outlined what I have found to be the prominent themes within the histories of Spanish and English teaching, and discussed how quite different discourses have resulted from the historical relationship between Spanish and English in the United States. I will discuss the theoretical framework that guides the current study.

CHAPTER 5

DISCOURSES ON STUDENT GOALS AND MOTIVATION

Introduction

A common discourse of learning another language in relationship to student career goals circulates within and through both programs. However, within this shared discourse, interpretations of the feasibility of achieving these goals differ greatly in the two settings. ELP students, whether planning to enter the university or having already begun their careers, are categorized as having a greater possibility for using English in real-life career settings, while SP participants express that the likelihood is extremely low that SP students will use Spanish in future work environments. Participants correlate the probability of future language use most strongly with students' past and present interactions with speakers of the target language. Therefore, the ELP students, who are reported to have more extensive past and present experiences using English, in career-related contexts in particular, are likely to continue this pattern in the future. In contrast, SP students' limited past and present interactions in Spanish outside of the classroom context are cited as the principal determinant for the anticipated low use of the language in students' future careers.

Related to this difference in using language outside the classroom separate discourses related to student motivation circulate within both programs as well. Overall, students in the ELP are said to be highly motivated to learn the language, while SP students are described as having little motivation and as resistant to learning Spanish. These interpretations are related to a difference in perception of students' participation

and classroom behaviors. Participants often correlate ELP students' high level of motivation to their extensive target language experience and global worldview. For SP students, the lack of interaction with Spanish speakers coupled with the imposition of the university's language requirement act as the main factors that contribute to this group's perceived lack of motivation and resistance.

Upon further analyzing the interpretations of both student groups, I found that participants make contradictory and limiting assumptions concerning student goals and levels of motivation. The discourses circulating through both contexts reflect and reproduce larger professional and societal discourses on learning Spanish and English. Furthermore, institutional practices within both programs reflect and reify many of these assumptions. Comparing interpretations of the characteristics and actions of both groups of students exposes several contradictions that indicate the ways in which the discourses of both fields can be limiting in understanding students' backgrounds and objectives, which the influence how participants organize and practice teaching Spanish and English as second languages.

In this chapter, I first describe the shared discourse regarding career objectives, followed by detailed accounts of the construction of distinct sub-discourses related to students' experiences using the target language. I then contextualize these interpretations within larger discourses on learning Spanish and English, followed by an explanation of how these discourses are both reflected and reified by particular institutional practices at SSU. Finally, I argue the contradictions in interpretation and action that are exposed by comparing both contexts, addressing how assumptions we make about students in each

context can limit how we conceive of curricular and instructional possibilities, therefore limiting learning experiences.

Goals vs. the Everyday Context

The professional goals of both groups of students are reiterated in program documents as well as by individuals in each setting. Instructors and administrators relate students' motivation for language study to their current work experiences or future career goals. For example, the webpage entitled, "Foreign Languages-Our Mission" states, "The curricula and sponsored activities of the Department will enhance the students' career opportunities in a multicultural society by expanding their linguistic and cultural horizons." SP Instructor Maite reiterates these objectives when addressing her understanding of students' reasons for taking Spanish, "I think that the main focus is professional. If it's going to be useful for their career like a journalist or businessman, usually they take Spanish because I think they know that it can help them to get a better job with which they will make more money or with which it will be easier to get into a certain field." Throughout the SP, students, instructors, and administrators referenced these future career plans in relationship to language study. Participants in the ELP reported similar goals for that population of students. ELP instructor Jennifer articulated this perception while discussing student motivation and objectives, stating, "I think that learning the language is a means to an end for most of them. You know, it's not this joy of learning English, it's to go to the university or get a job or get a salary increase because now you are bilingual." She then extends this perception to other L2 learning. This understanding of students' goals in both programs prevailed at SSU.

However, both the "means" and the "ends" for the students in these contexts are understood to differ in significant ways. In comparing the career and requirement goals of the ELP and the SP, there is a notable difference in the ways in which participants discuss the plausibility for students to use the target language in professional contexts. These interpretations are often discussed in relationship to out-of-classroom experience and use of the target language, as well as how closely students' goals align with those of the program curriculum.

In general, ELP students are reported to have greater past and present experience using English outside the classroom contexts, with a higher likelihood of using English in a professional setting (currently and in the future) than the students who make up the SP population. Participants reference the direct connection of studying English with students' experiences. ELP assistant director, Ellen, describes the overarching objective of the ELP as "helping people learn English that they can use in their everyday lives, whether it be for academic use, or for business use." Here, Ellen demonstrates the perception that students already use English in university and professional contexts, aligning them with the "everyday." For those with the goal of beginning a university program of study, the program's location at SSU contributes to the everyday aspect for these students, since they interact with professors, students, and university employees, to varying degrees. For example, Mai entered the ELP with the objective of entering SSU's nursing program. During her interview, she explained why she chose to enter the ELP as follows, "The reason I study English is that I want to use English with my future job . . . working in America as a nurse . . . I want to get a bachelor degree in American university and hopefully I can get a master's degree in somewhere." She later told me that she

planned on applying for the undergraduate nursing program at SSU beginning the following fall semester.

The discourse of a career focus as an "everyday context" at the ELP is strengthened for the professionals because the companies for which these students work pay for their tuition at the ELP. The companies sponsor these students with the specific goal of building their English proficiency for use in their places of work. Ellen, the assistant director of the ELP explains, "They're going to go back and maybe get a better job in their company. Their company sent them here to improve their English." Because of the stated goals, contracts, and associations with their companies, these students are defined in relationship to their work experiences. Atsushi, another ELP student, self-identified with the professional group. He explained, "Yes, I finished [my undergraduate degree] and after graduation . . . I entered my company where I am now and I've been working for three years and now the company I work in in Japan sent me here to study English from this January, just one semester." Like almost all of the students in this group, Atsushi had already completed his schooling outside of the United States, having earned an undergraduate degree in Policy Management at a university in Japan.

Atsushi and Mai exemplify the types of students ELP participants cite when addressing the immediacy and practicality of learning English with relationship to career goals. Both students had experience using English in the past (Atsushi at work and Mai had attended high school in the United States for one year), and are currently taking classes at the ELP in order to achieve short and long-term career goals and expand their abilities and contexts for using English. These students are defined as using English in

"everyday life" contexts, as Ellen stated, and having tangible and immediate goals for using English as students and professionals.

In contrast, participants describe the majority of the SP students' career goals as centering on future and imagined contexts, with a small likelihood that the students will actually use the language in a professional environment. Jessica, an instructor who taught in both the ELP and the SP, addressed SP students' goals, stating, "For Spanish, I would say. . . that is also something they could put on their job application or (pause) they might use it really nominally." Here, Jessica defines the main career-related action for SP students as listing Spanish language study on a job application, rather than interacting in the language in the work environment. She also paused before she addressed use, and only qualified it as nominal, failing to provide specific examples. SP instructor Maite is more specific: "I don't really think they do anything with the language outside of class, not even listening to music or watching movies . . . I don't even think that they have Spanish friends or Mexican friends and if they had them, I am sure that they would speak English with them." This classification of the students further promotes the interpretation of having limited tangible uses for their stated professional goals. Thus, all participants within the SP share the view that students in the program have little to no past or present contexts for using Spanish outside of the SSU classroom. The small percentage of Spanish-speakers in the surrounding community is cited frequently by students, instructors and administrators in relationship to students' lack of contexts for using the language. Since a larger percentage of the undergraduate population comes from the surrounding area, this contributes to participants' general interpretation of the student populations' past, present, and potential experiences.

When discussing students' lack of experience and limited contexts for using Spanish, participants often contrast the region surrounding SSU with other states or regions in the United States that they perceive as Spanish-speaking. For example, SP instructor Maite states, "Some of [the students] take Spanish because they know it will be good for their future careers like some of them might travel to Texas or Florida, I mean, somewhere in the States where they know that they speak Spanish." Like Maite, other instructors and students named specific states including Texas, Florida, and Arizona, as well as the region of the Southwest as Spanish-speaking contexts. Sarah, a SP student, stated that she was studying Spanish because "it is becoming more prevalent in the United States . . . not so much around [this state], but going south or more west." In addition to naming the specific regions, she also generalized areas with warmer climates as Spanish-speaking, "I'd like to move some place warmer and I know that in warmer climates the Spanish language is really prevalent." Instead of naming specific contexts in which they have used Spanish or in which they intend to use the language, participants provide general contexts and uses: "to put on a job application," "somewhere they speak Spanish," "the southwest," and "warmer climates." Even when a state is specified, like Texas or California, it is just given as an example of a Spanish-speaking context, not in relationship to a student's specific past, present or planned experiences.

As I found with students in the ELP context, SP students reiterated participants' perceptions about themselves. Both SP students that I interviewed reported that they did not use Spanish outside of the classroom, aside from "joking around with friends." SP student Crystal indicated that she planned to possibly use Spanish in her future career in social work, but later in the interview stated, "I'll probably never use it (Spanish)."

Crystal's statements correspond with the common perception of SP students. Although she says that she plans to use Spanish in her field of study, when asked to predict a specific future use, states that it is highly unlikely.

Sarah was a Journalism major who was completing a minor in Spanish. She stated that she was studying Spanish to use "in the work environment," and thus privileging her career goals. She then explained, "Yeah, if I need to [use Spanish] in broadcasting, whether I'm working on a documentary or something and I want to focus on someone who speaks Spanish. . . . I think that it would be important to know." Here, Sarah demonstrates the characteristics of future and imagined uses among Spanish students by stating with uncertainty "if I need to [use Spanish]." She then provides a further imagined professional context of working on a documentary and qualifies this possible context with a hypothetical focus on Spanish-speakers. Like Crystal, Sarah reports plans to use Spanish in her future career, but she is unable to articulate specific contexts and goals related to these plans.

ELP Students are Motivated; SP Students are Resistant

In addition to discourses on the possibility of achieving career goals, two contrasting discourses about student motivation circulated throughout both programs, with ELP students described as highly motivated to learn English and SP students lacking motivation and at times displaying resistance toward learning Spanish. These discourses are related to discourses on student objectives, and the difference in students' use of the target language outside of the classroom. For the SP program, university language requirements are also identified as a factor in student resistance.

Participants in the ELP categorized the ELP students overall as highly motivated to learn English and to participate in the program. Jessica, an ELP instructor who had also taught in the Spanish Program, assessed that "out of a class of twenty students, fifteen are highly motivated." ELP instructor Jennifer states, "I would say that a good seventy percent of our students are really motivated and really happy to be here and really thrilled to learn, excited to learn." Like Jennifer, most other participants use positive modifiers when describing students' motivation, resulting in an overall characterization of the ELP student group as highly motivated and enthusiastic.

Students' goals and experiences also figure into the interpretation of their motivation. Participants cite students' objectives of entering the university, in particular as influencing their level of motivation. Many stated that students are highly motivated to gain admittance to the university, and so they are highly motivated within the program. ELP assistant director Ellen said, "many of them want to get into the university, so they take this seriously." Regarding short-term students who were sent to the ELP through their employer, many participants describe them as wanting to make the most of time at the program so that they can advance in their careers.

In contrast, SP instructors reported the low percentages or number of students that they felt were interested in learning the language. For example, SP instructor Laura stated, "A un cinco por ciento de los estudiantes les interesa la lengua. *About five percent of the students are interested in the language*." SP instructor Maite stated, "Maybe out of a class of twenty-five or twenty students, maybe three or four are interested," and Jessica, a Spanish and ELP instructor offered a similar assessment, "I would say that out of every class of like twenty-five people there were maybe two or three that you could

tell really loved it." Participants frequently and openly discussed the overall perceived lack of motivation of SP students.

Participants cited the university language requirement as the principal factor causing students' apathy toward learning. Many students in the lower division courses were completing this requirement as part of the plan for their major area of study, and although it pertained to only part of the SP student population, discourses surrounding the "requirement students" figured prominently in defining the SP program as a whole, especially concerning motivation. These students were not only described as having had little to no past or present experience using the language outside of the SP, but they also were perceived to have little to no interest in using the language in relationship to their field of study (or anywhere else, for that matter).

When discussing this aspect of the Spanish Program, participants emphasize negative attitudes that they perceive students have toward the requirement and stress that students are essentially taking the classes against their will, which contributes to their overall low motivation and perceived resistance in the classroom. Instructors and administrators repeat terms that reinforce this perception, stating that students are "forced" to take Spanish, are there because they "have to" be there, and that students just want to "get it (the requirement) over with" or "out of the way."

All SP participants cite the principal goal of these students as simply passing the course. SP instructor Laura commented:

> Vienen para pasar y ya. . . porque es una clase obligatoria, no es por su elección. Muchos de sus carreras les exigen los cuatro niveles de español y ellos no tienen mucho interés porque su especialidad es economía o su especialidad es

periodismo. *They come to pass and that's it . . . because it is a required course they are not taking it by choice. Many of their majors require the four levels of Spanish and they do not have much interest because their major is Economics or their major is Journalism*.

This comment shows a contradiction of the stated career goals for studying Spanish as related to their major area of study. As Laura indicates, their majors may be Economics or Journalism, but not Spanish. These students are seen as only taking the courses as part of earning their degree in their major area of study for which they are understood to have stated career goals.

The students' reluctance to use the language outside of a classroom setting is also reported as a contributing factor in students' apathy toward learning. For example, after Maite made the previously cited comment concerning students' lack of Spanish-speaking friends, she explained how this situation appears to affect students' attitudes toward language and language learning, "I think they see just the language as part of the class. They don't . . . get the idea that it's a tool to communicate with so many people. They just go to the class it doesn't matter if it is Spanish or History or Math it's the same." Maite's comment illustrates the perception that, since students have limited contexts for using Spanish in their own lives it is difficult for them to imagine any future real-life interaction, professionally or personally. Spanish, for many of these students, is a subject in a classroom, a "thing" to study, rather than a means of interacting with others.

In addition to lack of motivation, SP participants describe an atmosphere of student resistance. SP instructor Maite stated, "I fight with them every single day," regarding asking students to participate. Rachel, another ELP instructor who took

Spanish courses, expressed a similar observation, "The students in the university taking Spanish a lot of them. . . they don't care if they learn Spanish. . . . they're ANGRY that they're being taught in Spanish . . . they HATE it." Again, participants stated that they perceived these reactions as primarily associated with the language requirement in the lower division. However, the resistance of the requirement student is so prevalent within the discourse of the program in general, it became associated with the SP overall and becomes part of the program's identity.

Contextualizing Discourses and Related Practices

When participants describe student goals and motivations, they present their interpretations as observable qualities that indicate how students "are." Participants discursively construct student identities that generalize and categorize English and Spanish learners at SSU. Research that focuses on student labeling and group identities (e.g., McDermott, Goldman, and Varenne, 2006; Mehan, 1996; Wortham, 2006) asserts that rather than reflecting intrinsic characteristics of students, these labels are indicative of the social and historical contexts surrounding the students. Contextualizing local discourses within the larger ones enables us to gain some insight into the production of student identities relating to goals and motivation. I will now discuss the societal discourses that are reflected and reproduced in the discourses on student identities at SSU. I also describe the ways in which institutional practices mirror and, in turn, reify both levels of discourses.

Although participants frequently described ELP and SP students' contrasting motivations and likelihood of achieving their goals, these interpretations also reflected the overarching discourse on the importance and hegemony of English in the United

States and globally. Connections to this discourse are visible in participant comments, some more overtly than others. For example, in explaining ELP students' high level of motivation ELP instructor Paula stated, "They're very interested I mean *their livelihood requires it*, really. *Their future requires it*, so they're really motivated and they really want to learn (emphasis mine)." Here, Paula not only references the students "everyday" experiences with English that they wish to continue, but she also draws on a larger discourse of English as a requirement for survival by stating "their livelihood requires it." In comparison, although stated to be useful for their future, participants never described SP students' *necessity* for learning Spanish in this way.

Throughout both programs, the term "requirement" is used frequently in discussing student motivations in both programs. This term holds two distinct meanings in relationship to ELP and SP students. For ELP students, learning English as a requirement is different from other institutionally imposed "language requirements" such as that in the Spanish Program. Unlike a language requirement that can be completed after taking a set of courses or a placement test, the "requirement" of knowing English is much broader and long-range—needing to know the language to be able to function in the world, as Paula indicates by stating the students' "livelihood" and "future" require knowledge of English.

In addition, participants also cited the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) as a "requirement" that motivates ELP students. Although a university requirement, there is a crucial difference between the TOEFL and SP students' university requirement. Since a certain score on the TOEFL is needed to gain acceptance to the university, it is directly correlated with students' practical career goals, and to the overall

necessity for learning the language, unlike the SP students whose completion of the university language requirement leads to completion of their major at SSU, as opposed to gaining access to a Spanish-speaking context. ELP and SP instructor Jessica illustrated this perception when contrasting the "nominal" use of Spanish for SP students with that of the ELP students, "For the ESL. . . a lot of them feel that the demand in their country is for English speakers in business fields. . . so they see it as almost like a requirement for their job." This comment illustrates the connection of perceived ELP student motivation, with the practicality and likelihood of language use with the overarching discourse of the importance of English worldwide. It shows the different connotations of the term "requirement" for both contexts.

The related discourse on the necessity of learning English especially for career-related contexts is both reflected and reified in the curricular organization and practices of the ELP. Throughout the ELP, the repetition of stated university and career goals both reflects and reinforces the importance of learning English for these contexts. In the ELP program's mission statement, in addition to "providing English language instruction," the second program goal is listed as, "Familiarizing international students with the educational methods of higher education institutions in the United States." Both instructors and administrators specifically include activities that will acculturate students into what they define as a typical U.S. university classroom, which generally includes classroom debate and discussion, and themes related to curricular requirements for fulltime undergraduate students at SSU. For example, ELP instructor Jennifer explained the overall objective of her Debate class as "trying to…form a solid argument since that is something they are going to have to do a lot of at the university when they go." She

also explained the rationale for taking what she describes as a "historical approach" to her American Culture class as follows: "If they're going to the university they're going to have to take a history class at some point." These comments reflect participants' overall orientation and program philosophy for connecting ELP course themes to those at SSU.

Aside from selecting course topics for students entering the university, classroom activities were also chosen with the participatory and sometimes argumentative culture of a typical U.S. classroom. All ELP instructors indicated that a goal in their classroom was to get students to talk and participate more actively, to prepare them for the type of classroom environment they will encounter when they begin their undergraduate careers. Rachel stated that in class she tries different methods to "draw out [the students'] participation." She cited differences in classroom culture and why ELP students should be prepared for learning about and experiencing this difference before entering an undergraduate classroom. She explained,

> American schools . . . our classes are conducive to argument and attack and defending your ideas against someone else . . . and I think that can be really intimidating for students who might come from schools in other countries where it's more like you're encouraged to enlighten your classmates or share ideas or combine ideas.

In addition to showing direct connection to university use, Rachel's comment also reflects the larger discourse of acculturation and assimilation through English language teaching institutions that I had detailed in chapter 4. These discourses overlap and strengthen the overall importance of learning English, but also university-related culture in this particular context.

The importance of university acculturation in the ELP's curriculum is also represented in the ELP credit courses, which include ESL Academic Reading/Writing, ESL Research and Writing, Academic Speaking/Listening, and Graduate Teaching Assistant (GTA) Fluency. Students who take ESL credit courses have been accepted as degree-seeking students at SSU, and take these ELP courses at the same time as other credit courses toward their degrees. The description of ESL Academic Reading/Writing states, "Students will improve their speaking and listening skills so that they may successfully engage in classroom discourse, understand lectures, and gain confidence in their ability to communicate." This description demonstrates how these courses specifically address the academic culture and expectations of a U.S. institution of higher education.

Another credit course, Academic Research and Writing, focuses on the format and requirements of a typical university-level research paper, which is stated explicitly in the course description. Jessica, an ELP instructor who was teaching the ESL Research and Writing class which I observed, described its focus as follows, "[The students are] already in their university program . . . and these are a kind of academic support and so the writing class is, first they do a guided research paper where I collect the sources and then they do an independent research paper." In class, Jessica discussed organization of the "typical" university research paper, how to find and evaluate resources (students were guided through research at the university library during "library days"), as well as format and requirements, including practicing paraphrasing and citing sources in order to avoid plagiarism. These courses further reflect and shape surrounding discourses on the

necessity of learning English and strengthen discourses on immediacy and applicability of English in ELP students' present context and for future experiences.

Another instructional practice related to preparing students for entrance into the university is the inclusion of courses and instruction centered on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL). The TOEFL figured prominently into the students' goal of entering the university. One way in which the goal of university study specifically informs the ELP curriculum is in the administration of the exam, as well as the inclusion of classroom activities that address the TOEFL in the overall curriculum. Not only does the ELP serve as an official TOEFL testing center, distributing the exam several times per year, TOEFL practice is included in the curriculum.

According to the ELP assistant director and several instructors, all core curriculum courses (and some electives) address the TOEFL in some way and include practice exercises as part of course activities. In addition to these practice activities included in core courses, the ELP offers an elective course, TOEFL Preparation, with the main objective listed as improving students' TOEFL scores. The curriculum and instructional practices of this course center on the TOEFL, in which students complete, review, and discuss practice exam questions. During her interview, ELP instructor Rachel explained how the students' goal of improving on the TOEFL exam affected her classroom practice. In explaining her teaching methods she stated, "We also keep in mind that they are studying for the TOEFL . . . so for example, like, using conditionals, if I were, if I was, and if I was is accepted now, but originally the conditional form would be, If I were. If I were a good teacher ((laughs)) if I'm taking the TOEFL which one would I use?" In this example, Rachel explained how she makes a concerted effort to

distinguish between accepted colloquial usage in the language and "correct" usage as defined by the TOEFL exam. This inclusion of the TOEFL throughout the ELP curriculum strengthens its importance and connection to students' goals.

Finally, while prospective university students are defined as comprising the main population of ELP, the connection of business contexts for the professional student group is also reflected and reproduced in the ELP, though to a lesser degree. Within the core ELP coursework, students often make comparisons of business etiquette across cultures. ELP student Atsushi described sharing cultural customs and experiences, "For example when we are talking about a gesture or business manners . . . and I like to talk about my experience at work and explain the situation in Japan." In addition to course topics, electives in Business English are offered, and the curricula of ELP "special programs" are courses designed to meet specific goals for groups of professionals. Such past special programs included Business English for Chinese Bankers, English for Latin American Executives, and English for Teachers. The direct connection between the stated professional goals of students and curricular organization and practices strengthen the discourse of ELP students as having more tangible goals with a greater possibility of achieving them. This local discourse can be understood within the larger surrounding assimilationist and acculturation discourses of the importance of learning English in the United States and globally.

The interpretation of SP students as less likely to use Spanish in the future reflects a larger discourse of learning Spanish as important, but optional. In chapter 4, I detailed the history of the teaching Spanish, which boomed and receded in popularity and was subject to outside social and political influences. This discourse is related to the

hegemony of English worldwide, and the traditional monolingual ideal within the United States. When discussing her perception of students' low motivation and resistance, SP instructor Silvia cited this discourse directly, "La actitud de muchos norteamericanos es 'para qué aprender otro idioma si todo el mundo tiene que saber el inglés? *The attitude of many people from the United States is 'why learn another language when everyone else has to know English?*" This larger discourse which reflects the local discourse on students' goals and motivation is also reflected and reified in curricular practices.

Just as the curriculum and practices of the ELP reflected and reproduced the necessity and everyday use of English, the SP curriculum and practices perpetuate the perception that the learning Spanish is useful, but not necessary for students' future interactions due to a disconnect between the program's mission and curricular organization and instructional practices concerning career objectives. The mission statement and program description state that the program "will enable [students] to pursue additional studies at the graduate level or to enter the job market in positions that will demand the ability to communicate in more than one language and in a variety of cultural contexts." Although the program literature speaks to a career focus and application, these objectives are largely not reflected in the curriculum, and thereby reinforce the perception that students are less likely to use the target language in these contexts.

The disconnect between the SP students' stated overarching career focus and the perceived low possibility of them actually using the language in a professional context is directly reflected in the relationship between the FL mission statement and the curriculum objectives and practices. For example, lower division courses center around general

topics and personal themes such as family and friends, pastimes, holidays, food, shopping, health, and travel. In the courses that I observed in the lower division and bridge, professional contexts or topics were not discussed. Regarding the upper division courses, topics focus mainly on Spanish and Spanish American literature and historical themes, with two out of the eleven listed advanced courses focusing on business contexts (Commercial Spanish 1 and Commercial Spanish 2).

A reflection of the discourse surrounding requirement students is also found and reiterated in curriculum construction and program documents. All departmental documents addressing the program's mission and career goals for students address foreign language "majors" and "minors" only, and do not specifically mention students who complete the lower division courses as a requirement for their major. Documents addressing potential and current Spanish majors reveal this goal: "…a major in French, German, or Spanish can strengthen your résumé in any of the following areas: English, finance, history, journalism, law, marketing, political science, public administration, sociology, engineering, chemistry, medicine" (Foreign Language Website). Programmatic literature separates and essentially excludes the requirement student population in departmental documents, and further reifies the division between the two populations of students as well as the notion that using Spanish in a professional context is not likely for this student population. Furthermore, students completing the language requirement do not even reach the upper division courses that focus on professional contexts.

In addition to reflecting the discourses surrounding the likelihood and optional aspect of Spanish study in the SP, the discourses on students' limited experiences in the

target language appear in program documents. As evidenced earlier, the common perception of students' limited interaction and contexts for using Spanish is largely based on regional discourses on the lack of linguistic and cultural diversity in the area. These discourses proved to be particularly strong for the region surrounding SSU, as it is a region often stereotyped and characterized as provincial, uneducated and close-minded in comparison with other regions of the United States. SP and ELP instructor Jessica addressed this perception directly, "On the first day . . . I just try to tell them about certain things that could be beneficial for them. . . even if it was just for a job or I just tried to open their minds to different ways that it could be beneficial to them to know another language." This perception of SSU students' lack of experience with and interest in learning a language other than English is reflected in the advertising language of some of the program documents. There are several documents that detail the reasons for studying another language. For example, on the home page of the Foreign Language website, there is a link to the brochure "Why Learn Another Language?" published by the MLA Modern Language Association. This brochure focuses on reasons for learning languages other than English, addressing personal, intellectual, and professional goals. A link to this document is also provided on the home page of the Foreign Language Department's website.

Another document entitled, "What can you do with a Major in Foreign Languages?" is also linked to the department's webpage. This document lists careers for which a major in foreign language is useful, stating,

> Think of it…A degree in foreign languages provides one of higher education's broadest and most flexible preparations for a future career. In today's world,

> where information and communication are the primary engines of the new world economy, the language and cultural skills provided by your major or minor…can open the doors to a myriad of opportunities.

Although there is some overlap with career-focused language of all university programs, the focus of these documents assumes the audience is lacking knowledge and/or interest in learning a language other than English, as well as a student population unfamiliar with other languages and cultures. There is also a need to "sell" language study that is reflected in these documents.

The above types of texts do not appear in the program literature about the ELP, demonstrating a connection to the larger discourse on the importance of learning English, for there are no documents related to the ELP entitled, "Why study English?" or "How can studying English be helpful to your career?" A key way to understanding how discourses operate and normalize certain beliefs and values is to not only look at what is present in text but also consider what is absent. In this case, the prevalence of discourses on the hegemony and importance of learning English is evident by the absence of documents addressing the necessity and usefulness for learning the language.

Contextualizing the local discourses on career goals within the larger social historical context and taking into account how institutional practices serve to reflect and reproduce the interaction of both discourses at SSU provides insight as to not only what is viewed as "normal" within these contexts, but also, why. The constant reproduction of the discourses by the participants, the surrounding professional and sociohistorical contexts in which these interpretations make sense, and the institutionalization and repetition of the discourses in curricula and practices work together to create a more or

less static view of how these students and programs "are." As I stated before, these perceptions are more indicative of students' surrounding contexts rather than any intrinsic characteristic of the students themselves. This is evident for the discourse on the likelihood that students will use the target language in career contexts. While the student groups may or may not have contrasting experiences with the target language as well as varying motivations to achieving professional goals, the surrounding context and discourses create separate lenses through which student characteristics and behaviors are viewed, and therefore, interpreted. These lenses also affect how student behavior is interpreted in vastly different ways regarding motivation for both groups of students. Thus, the interaction of local and surrounding discourses and institutional practices that creates separate lenses that contribute to the perception of ELP students as highly motivated and SP students as unmotivated and resistant.

Resistance to Learning Spanish

Participants in the Spanish Program frequently discuss not only what they perceive as an overall low student motivation, but also a resistance to learning the language. Behaviors that instructors interpret as resistant include student comments or actions that instructors perceive are intended to disrupt or impede the class plans and objectives. SP participants most frequently cite a lack of participation in class activities, making off-topic comments, and making jokes or mocking themselves or each other as the most common forms of resistance in the classroom. SP participants interpret silence as resistance in relationship to what they describe as an overall low level of participation. SP instructor Maite, a lower-division instructor, discussed the lack of participation in her classroom, "I ask for volunteers and most time if it's like reading or something…usually

classes don't really want to volunteer you just have to ask for victims." Maite's use of the word "victims" here alludes to interpretations of students' attitudes toward the language requirement (being forced to take Spanish), and it also refers to a curricular Spanish-only classroom policy. From the first semester Spanish 100 course to the most advanced course, the Spanish Program implements a total immersion method of teaching which is strictly enforced. All GTAs reported that they are "not allowed" to speak English in the classroom.

Paula, an ELP instructor who took lower division Spanish courses, addressed perceived resistance in relationship to complying with the "Spanish-only" requirement, "I saw the teachers try really hard to maintain a Spanish-only atmosphere. I saw the American students totally resist that." I then asked her, "So what percentage of the students had that attitude?" She answered, "Eighty! Did NOT want to cooperate!" The interpretation of silence and lack of participation as resistant behavior is therefore filtered through the lens of programmatic curricular policy. These policies are further contextualized in larger societal discourses on predominantly monolingual white, Anglo student population resisting the imposition of a language other than English (which Paula alludes to by the qualifying them as *American* students). As I indicated earlier, a strong regional discourse on the majority of the population's lack of interaction with different cultures and languages strengthens this discourse and its influence in the SSU context.

Some participants directly refer to this larger sociohistorical discourse in relationship to the regional discourse when describing student resistance. SP instructor Silvia discussed at length how students ask her questions about topics that are unrelated to the textbook themes that they are scheduled to discuss in class that day. Some of the

topics include asking her if there are plasma televisions and Coca-Cola in Spain. Silvia interpreted the students' questions and topics as indicative of both their lack of intercultural experience and their lack of interest, and classified them as acts of resistance. She explained her understanding of why the students asked those types of questions,

> Es una actitud de Estados Unidos, que piensan que Estados Unidos es el mundo, ¿sabes? Que piensan que esto es la civilización que el resto del mundo no tiene nada. En serio. *It's an attitude that people in the United States have. They think that the United States is the entire world, you know? They think that this is civilization and the rest of the world has nothing. Seriously.*

Silvia's interpretation indexes the discourses of the ethnocentrism and superiority complex of people from the United States, a discourse related to and often found alongside discourses related to the hegemony of English (everyone speaks English; everyone should speak English).

Another type of reported student behavior that draws on overarching societal discourses on unequal power relationships between English and Spanish can be categorized as the use of what Hill (2008) terms "Mock Spanish." Hill (2008) defines Mock Spanish as "a set of tactics that speakers of American English use to appropriate symbolic resources from Spanish" (p. 128). She describes the predominant characteristics of Mock Spanish as speech that includes loan words from Spanish (such as "cerveza" or "macho"), expressions found in popular culture or popularized by the media (such as "hasta la vista, baby!"), as well as morphological changes, the most common one being the addition of the suffix "–o" to the end of a word in English. An additional

linguistic feature of Mock Spanish is employing an exaggerated pronunciation of these words and expressions in American English. I observed multiple instances of the use of Mock Spanish by students in the SP program, in particular in the lower level courses. For example, when giving presentations, students often spoke Spanish with an exaggerated American English accent—elongating vowels and pronouncing them using American English conventions. They also would often "invent" Spanish words, most frequently by adding an "o" to the end of a word in English. All of these instances of Mock Spanish were accompanied by laughter from the students who are performing them, along with laughter from other students in the class, and often disrupted the flow of the scheduled lesson.

In the following exchange, SPAN 250 instructor Maite asks students about the aspects of the sea that relax or bother them.

Maite: Los animales peligrosos? Son relajantes?

Dangerous animals? Are they relaxing?

Student 1: no=

Student 2: =molesto(.) *annoying(.)*

Maite: molestos sí. (.) quién me puede dar el nombre de un animal peligroso?

annoying yes (.) who can give me the name of a dangerous animal?

Student 2: tigre/ *tiger*

Maite: en el mar? ((laughter)) *In the sea?*

→ Student 2: yeah (.) a tiger shark (.) ((laughter)) tigre sharko

/ti.gɹei.ʃɔɹ.koʊ/((laughter))

Maite: tiburón (.) tiburón (.) okay? un tiburón vale?

In the line indicated with an arrow, student 2 demonstrates the use of Mock Spanish, adding an "o" to the ending of the English word "shark." I have also phonetically transcribed "*tigre sharko*" to indicate the way in which the student transferred American English pronunciation to the phrase. Aside from the morphological and phonetic features that make it possible to classify as Mock Spanish, the phrase is accompanied by laughter from the student speaking as well as others in the class.

In another example of the use of Mock Spanish, a Spanish 200 student drew from the popular media in order to disrupt a lesson. In this instance, students were writing the requests and commands that they were assigned for homework on the board. The teacher left the room to get something from her office, and while she was gone, one student wrote "*Yo quiero Taco Bell*" on the chalkboard instead of his assigned sentence after several students dared him to write it. When the teacher returned from her office and reviewed the answers written on the board, she paused when she called on that student and asked him which verb he was assigned and why he wrote that phrase. He replied, "I just wrote it." The instructor then said "Tú quieres volverme loca verdad? *You want to drive me crazy don't you*?" and many students in the class laughed.

In the above classroom events, "tigre sharko," had the phonological and morphological markings of Mock Spanish, and "Yo Quiero Taco Bell," exemplifies the use of a Spanish expression popularized by the media. I detailed these instances to further illustrate how outside discourses on Spanish and English shape and get reshaped at the local level. Hill (2008) describes Mock Spanish as a type of covert racist discourse that references and reproduces negative stereotypes about Spanish-speakers and marks and reinforces the "foreignness" of the Spanish language and those who speak it (p. 129).

She asserts that although, on the surface, Mock Spanish is often intended and viewed as lighthearted and humorous, it creates a particular "American" identity that indexes the unequal power relationship between English and Spanish and English and Spanish speakers within the United States (p.129).

This shared identity and understanding of Mock Spanish can be observed in many of the surrounding students' reactions to the acting student. These instances of Mock Spanish (as well as others that I observed) were always accompanied with laughter, revealing the intended humor of this type of talk as Hill describes. As Hill indicates, the use of Mock Spanish draws on the particular societal discourse on the relationship of Spanish and English that has influenced the interpretations that I have discussed thus far, not only the interpretations of resistance. Understanding the relationship between the use of Mock Spanish and larger societal discourses only partly reveals the context in which these student actions occur and are therefore, interpreted.

In the context of the SP program at SSU, institutional discourses and practices also contribute to the use of Mock Spanish in the classroom. Based on my observations and discussions with SP participants, SP students appear to use Mock Spanish as a way to break the classroom tension and/or their own nervousness and insecurities about their low language proficiency in relationship to the strict guidelines to maintain a Spanish-only atmosphere in the classroom. In most instances that I observed, students employed Mock Spanish when at a loss for words when called upon, or asked to speak publicly and clearly appeared insecure about their proficiency in the language. Therefore, I interpret the use Mock Spanish in those moments as a coping mechanism within the guidelines and

to relieve some of the stress of the situation as well as create solidarity with other students who were also following the class guidelines.

However, the way in which Mock Spanish works at the local level as a strategy for students demonstrates exactly what Hill indicates when she says that it is an example of covert racism. The fact that the students have this option as a way to diffuse their nervousness in these situations is indicative of the unequal power relationship between Spanish and English in the United States. Note that there is no equivalent option of "Mock-English" for the students in the ELP. Therefore, the use of Mock Spanish in this context can be interpreted as an overt way to bring levity and humor to a stressful situation, while covertly drawing on discourses related to the unequal relationship between English and Spanish and speakers of these languages, and in this way serves to create solidarity for the predominantly Anglo, monolingual English-speaking students to regain power in a situation in which they feel powerless.

Examining the ways in which societal discourses interact with local ones as well as with institutional practices provides a greater understanding as to why particular behaviors of students in the SP are described as "resistant." Analyzing these interactions in detail, however, reveals these interactions to be far more complex than a single label of "resistant" is capable of representing. While students draw on outside discourses on the inequality of Spanish and English (including racist discourses, as in the case of Mock Spanish) in certain actions and words, they do so within an institutional context that does not allow them much freedom of expression within the classroom, and that frames any question or comment outside of the rules as "resistant."

In addition to the Spanish-only policy, in the lower level, instructors as well as students must follow strict guidelines as to what topics they can address in class. All GTAs follow the same syllabus, have all exams and activities on the same days, and are not supposed to prepare lessons. In the lower level, the discourses related to the strict guidelines affects both students and instructors. For example, Maite explains that she does not make decisions regarding the course plans and activities, stating, "I am given the book and method that I have to use, the syllabus, everything." When I asked Silvia if she can choose themes outside of the textbook to teach in class she said, "Sí pero un poco limitado porque tienes dos días para un capítulo. *Yes, but I'm somewhat limited because you have two days to cover a chapter*." Maite reiterated this perspective when describing a lesson outside of the textbook that she created, "Well today it was [a cultural lesson], but it's an exception. I mean we're not supposed to do that." These programmatic guidelines and the discourses surrounding them overlap with and interact with larger societal discourses on Spanish and English in order to form the lens through which participants view and interpret SP student behavior.

The interaction of discourses and institutional practices at the ELP, in contrast, creates a context in which students' behaviors are interpreted as highly motivated. Jessica, an ELP and SP instructor contrasted the ELP students with those in the Spanish Program, stating, "For the ESL learners, I really feel like ANYTHING is motivating for them. They like to LEARN. You know all that is because they are more motivated." ELP instructor Paula's comment on students' "livelihood" depending on their proficiency in English, indicates the correlation between the necessity for learning the language with

intrinsic level of motivation of the students (they are more motivated, as Jessica states). This correlation does not exist for students learning Spanish in the SP program.

One of the places in which the normalizing power of discourses is exposed is found within a contradictory interpretation of the same action within separate contexts. In contrasting the ELP students' high level of motivation with that of the low level of SP students, participants often reference students' behaviors that indicate active participation: talking in class during discussions, responding when called upon, and not actively diverting class plans and activities. However, when ELP instructors reported students' lack of participation and silence, many stated that they did not view these behaviors as an indicator of low motivation, whereas the same behaviors were frequently listed as indicators of SP students' resistance. For example, ELP instructor Paula stated, "I've found [participation] to be really good. Even the quieter ones will, I get them to talk to participate." ELP and SP instructor Jessica offered a similar interpretation when I asked her about class participation, "even those quiet students, I feel like they're interested, but they maybe can't participate as fully when it's a whole group." One societal discourse that I found to influence this difference in interpretation is that of students from certain cultural backgrounds as being socialized to not speak up in class, something that all ELP instructors mentioned. For example, when discussing student participation, ELP instructor Jennifer reported, "The Japanese students . . . are rather quiet and don't really like to answer." For these students, a lack of participation is interpreted as reflecting a type of school socialization that differs from that of the United States (recall Rachel's earlier comment on students coming from school socialization cultures that emphasize cooperation rather than argument).

Contradictory interpretations such as this further illustrate that the participants' interpretations of students behaviors is more indicative of their surrounding social, historical and institutional contexts than intrinsic characteristics of the students themselves. Regarding institutional practices, much like the strict guidelines of the SP created a context in which student behavior is more likely interpreted as resistant, the guiding philosophy of creating community and related practices in the ELP create a space that makes it difficult for any behavior to be perceived as resistant. For example, Ellen, the assistant director of the ELP, stated that in addition to improving students' fluency in English, the secondary objective of the ELP is "building a sense of community for people who are displaced and are coming from all over the world , so we do, we have a community." In addressing the goal of community, ELP instructors often cite their objective of "creating a communicative environment" and how they feel that they achieve this goal through various classroom practices. Encouraging a cooperative environment among teachers and faculty, creating student-centered classrooms by promoting discussion, group work, personal sharing and a variety of activities in order to make students "feel more comfortable," figure prominently into the instructors' accounts of how they create a community in practice.

Making students "feel comfortable," is a guiding objective that all ELP instructors addressed when discussing their teaching goals. ELP instructor Paula stated that getting students to feel comfortable talking was her main goal, "One big goal I have is to get them to feel more comfortable talking. . . comfortable with each other and comfortable with me, comfortable talking. . . no matter what class I teach, that's my main goal." The objective of students feeling comfortable using the language is reiterated throughout the

ELP by all instructors, whereas not one instructor or administrator in the SP described any goal or practice within the program as relating to the comfort level of the students. As ELP assistant director Ellen stated, an overarching philosophy guiding the practices at the ELP is to "create a community."

Another institutional practice related to this goal relates to the guidelines that the ELP instructors follow. In contrast with the strict guidelines that SP instructors must follow, ELP instructors are encouraged to experiment with topics and methods, and choose their own materials. For example, when Ellen explained this approach, "Our teachers have carte blanche. [They] make their own assignments, they can supplement with what material they like . . . We want them to use a million different activities a million different methods. We want them to do anything they want and they can use whatever materials they want." All of the GTAs that I interviewed reiterated the directors' encouragement to try new things, as well as the sense of autonomy they feel in making choices for their classes, even though they are student teachers. Rachel, one of the GTAs stated, "We're encouraged to try different things . . . the directors as our mentors, as our bosses, will tell us try different stuff. If you think you might think exercise x is really juvenile but go ahead, see what happens." Just as the strict instructor guidelines affect the learning environment of the SP students, the rules of "no rules" affects that of the ELP. Creating a space in which all topics, methods, activities and types of interaction are encouraged greatly limits interpreting behaviors as resistant.

Examining and comparing the surrounding discourses and practices of the ELP and the SP reveals how the interpretation of ELP students' behavior as motivated and SP student behavior as unmotivated and resistant is reflective of each program and its

surrounding context. The findings show that the interpretation of student behavior and characteristics is highly context dependent, similar to the findings of Harklau (2000) who illustrated how the same group of ESL learners were perceived as good, hardworking students in their high school context and as bad and resistant when they entered the community college setting. A comparison of the structures, practices and objectives of both programs reveals greater potential for behaviors of SP students to be interpreted as unmotivated and/or resistant than the behaviors of ELP students. In the lower division of the SP, the strict guidelines that are imposed on instructors as well as students create a context for any action that deviates from the stated rules to be interpreted as resistant. It appears that both instructors and students perceive that they have little control over the class organization and classroom activities. Instructors report not being able to make personal choices regarding activities and lesson plans, and do not seem to have a sense of agency overall regarding decision-making and planning. Students both report and are reported by other participants to have a similar absence of personal choice, in particular concerning the choice to take the course, as well as the ways in which the class is conducted and the topics that are discussed. The numerous guidelines and limitations create a culture in which any action that does not correspond with the rules is considered resistant.

In contrast, the culture of community and the practice and encouragement of the instructors themselves to make all decisions regarding class organization, activities and evaluation lessens the potential for interpreting actions as resistant. Also, regarding classroom practices and activities, students in the ELP are encouraged to talk about personal experiences, and a wider range of topics and types of interactions is considered

legitimate classroom discourse. Instructors and students alike have more agency and personal choice, and experimentation is encouraged. This creates a culture that makes it difficult to interpret an action as "resistant" since everything, in a sense, is "permitted." These local discourses and practices are further contextualized within societal discourses surrounding Spanish and English. The necessity of learning English is conflated with student motivation, therefore characterizing ELP students as collectively, "highly motivated." SP students, on the other hand, are perceived as reflecting discourses on the unequal power relationship between English and Spanish, which overlap with a national discourse on Americans as ethnocentric and monolingual, a perception of the students that is further reified by regional demographics and stereotypes, demonstrating how the discursive construction of both fields that I outlined in chapter 4 manifests itself at the local level.

As I illustrated earlier in analyzing the perceptions surrounding student career goals, the interpretations of student behaviors are mediated through a lens created by the interaction of local and national discourses, and represented and reproduced by institutional practices. Understanding how student labels and group identities work to normalize certain perceptions about students allows us to critically examine the assumptions we hold about student populations we teach. Not only do these essentialized interpretations reflect more of the context surrounding the students rather than any intrinsic student characteristic, but they also fail to address the complexity and nuances of students' goals and behaviors. In order to illustrate this point, I will now share two detailed accounts of both an ELP and SP student's personal interpretations and

explanations of their participation in the classroom, based on the interviews I conducted with them.

Haruna's Self-reported Participation in the ELP

Haruna was a student in her second semester of coursework in the English Language Program. Aside from taking ELP coursework, she also held the position of a research assistant at the university hospital, since she had already completed a medical degree and worked as a doctor while in Japan, where she was born, raised and had completed all of her schooling before beginning her studies at SSU. When discussing her interest and participation in ELP classes, she emphasized her reluctance to talk in class and the discomfort that she feels when asked to speak. She stated that she perceived the main reason as being the difference between classroom cultures and practices between the Japan and the United States:

> In Japan the education system is so different than this country. We don't, we didn't speak in English or listening…we just do what is in the book and we can't communicate with each other, but in ELP we have to communicate with each other more than writing skill so it's difficult (pause) different.

She also expressed that, although speaking in class was uncomfortable and challenging for her, she was most interested in the Debate class, in which she was asked to speak most often, and reported that she participated more that semester than last semester. She explains, "I'm interested in the debate class because we have to speak English in the public . . . uh, but I, I like this debate class (pause) but I'm ashamed. I'm shy. So it's really (pause) I have a dilemma." I asked if she noticed a change in her

participation from past classes and she stated, "Yeah last semester I never say anything but now I can speak. I speak English in class."

Crystal's Self-reported Participation in the SP

Crystal was a student taking Spanish 200, the third semester course in the four-semester lower division sequence. She had taken Spanish 100 and 150 at SSU the previous two semesters, and planned to take Spanish 250 to finish the language requirement for her Sociology major. She was born, raised, and educated in a nearby town in the same state as SSU. I asked Crystal if she planned on taking Spanish courses at SSU beyond those required, and she said that she doubted it. I asked her why, and she explained:

> Because, it's SO hard (laughs) like everything else you can study for and get it you know, but Spanish is so different . . . I'm not very (pause) I'm dyslexic, too so it's hard for me to even just PLAIN READ. So it's harder to learn a new language.

I later asked Crystal to describe her interest and involvement in class activities and she answered, "I don't like them" and stated that she did not participate or talk much in class. When I asked her to explain why she felt that way about the activities as well as her lack of participation she said,

> I think I'm so (pause) I have SO much anxiety, like, I just freak out and then whenever it's like, my turn to speak I don't (pause) it seems like I don't speak Spanish very well because, like, I'm SO nervous. But when I'm at home or it's just like just messing around I can speak better . . . even with the oral interview this semester she'll ask me questions I know the answers to but it just CAN'T

come to me because I'm SO nervous. So I just hate (pause) and then she'll go like in the line and I know it's my turn and my heart's (pause) I just can't STAND it.

The above examples demonstrate that the labels most frequently used to describe student characteristics do not capture the complex interaction of various factors that influence student behavior in the classroom. Haruna's and Crystal's perspectives show the need for a critical examination of student labels group identities: 1. Student labels do not (and cannot) recognize the multiple factors affecting student behavior in the classroom. 2. Student labels are more reflective of cultural contexts than student behaviors, and therefore most likely poise instructors and administrators to interpret student behavior based on cultural expectations and the influence of dominant discourses rather than the behavior itself.

In the cases of Haruna and Crystal, both are students who are reluctant to participate in class for a variety of reasons. For Haruna, a combination of socialization and conditioning in the Japanese educational system, personality characteristics, and language proficiency concerns contribute to her reluctance to speak. For Crystal, her high anxiety level compounded by, and likely related to her dyslexia, as well as proficiency concerns prevent her from fully participating in class activities. Both students list multiple factors that interact in different ways, but with a similar result: low participation in class. However, the behaviors of these students are likely to be interpreted differently due to the differences in the cultures surrounding each program. As a student in the ELP, Haruna's behavior would most likely be interpreted as quiet, shy, but still interested and motivated to learn the language. In contrast, Crystal's

behavior would most likely be interpreted as demonstrating a lack of motivation to learn Spanish and, possibly, as an act of resistance.

The findings presented in this chapter illustrate a need for instructors and administrators in second language programs to critically reflect on the role we play in (re)constructing student goals and identities in our discursive practices and the consequences this (re)construction might have on language learning and teaching in both contexts. Critically analyzing the ways in which the students in both contexts are labeled gives us a better understanding of which larger sociohistorical models of identity are available and privileged in each context and how these models are enacted at a local level. Closely examining these connections can be a first step in critically analyzing which student identities we have a hand in reproducing and why, and the consequences these decisions might have for curriculum design and organization as well as classroom practices.

CHAPTER 6

DISCOURSES ON CULTURE'S PLACE IN THE CURRICULUM

Introduction

Assumptions about teaching culture in a second language context in comparison with a foreign language context are well established in professional and popular discourses. These assumptions center on the communities outside of both classroom environments, especially in the context of traditional definitions of the differences between second and foreign language learning settings. Since second language classrooms are defined as located within the speech community of the language being studied, they are generally perceived as providing students with greater opportunities for authentic cultural interaction both in and outside of the classroom. Foreign language classrooms, on the other hand, are seen as creating an artificial cultural context within the classroom, since the opportunity to experience perspectives and practices of the target language community cannot be directly observed outside of class. Interactions with speakers of the target language and therefore, experiencing the target culture, are viewed to be much more limited in FL contexts.

Claire Kramsch addresses these contrasting assumptions of both contexts when discussing factors affecting cultural teaching, ". . . ESL teachers can at least rely on a common language being spoken outside the classroom. In foreign language education, the language taught is not spoken in the environment, and the link between the foreign language and any specific speech community is an arbitrary one" (1993, p. 92). These assumptions are reflected in discourses on cultural teaching and culture's place in the

curriculum at the English Language Programs and Spanish Programs at SSU. Dr. Nelson, the associate chair of foreign languages, echoed the common understanding of the differences between the ELP and the SP at SSU as one of the main reasons that you "really can't compare" the programs, since the ELP is an ESL setting and "in an ESL setting, you know, they go outside and they're surrounded by the language." In describing how these differences relate to distinct curricular organization and instructional practices, she then stated that the goal of a foreign language setting is to "introduce" culture to the students and gradually increase cultural teaching as students move through advanced courses, and in comparison, the ELP is a "mixture of skills based and content based instruction" throughout all levels of the program[8]. These general assumptions about FL and SL contexts, as well as distinct curricular organizations contribute to an overarching discourse in which cultural instruction is pervasive and authentic in the ELP, whereas in the SP, cultural instruction is perceived to receive much less focus, and when students learn about culture, it is in a superficial manner.

Overall, participants perceived ELP students as "immersed" in culture. For example, when I asked ELP instructor Paula to give an example of a cultural lesson she answered, "There's culture all the time!" In comparison, Rachel, an ELP instructor who is also an SP student, viewed the teaching of culture as playing less of a role in the SP as compared with the ELP, and even questioned its presence in the SP curriculum. She stated, "I would say that we (SP students) don't get a ton of culture in the regular curriculum . . . I don't know if it's written into their curriculum . . .or if it's in there maybe I don't realize I'm getting it." These comments exemplify the contrasting

[8] In both programs, participants linked "content" with "culture." I address the conflation of these terms in greater detail later in the chapter.

discourses on culture's place in curricula of the ELP and SP that circulated throughout both programs.

Similar to the interpretations of student goals and motivation, I found discourses on the differences in cultural instruction to be heavily influenced by professional and societal discourses on teaching both languages. The definition of culture itself, what is considered cultural teaching, and evaluative comments made about culture instruction in both contexts reflect and reproduce separate disciplinary traditions as well as historically criticized aspects of cultural instruction that have focused mainly on foreign language settings and not on second language contexts, in particular ESL programs. As the participants reported, some practices in the SP did reflect aspects of FL teaching that have been scrutinized in professional discourse, namely culture playing an insignificant, additive role in the curriculum, with the majority of instruction privileging facts over meaning. Similar practices are conducted in the ELP, yet they are understood in a completely different way, and not evaluated negatively. The reasons for these discrepancies in the interpretations of cultural teaching practices can be understood when examining the distinct professional and societal histories and discourses surrounding both programs. These contradictions in the interpretations of the cultural teaching practices of both programs demonstrate the powerful, normalizing effects of discourse have on not only our understanding of critical component to language teaching, but also our evaluation of it.

In order to contextualize the findings of the current study, I will first review the professional discourse that focuses on problematic aspects of foreign language instruction. I will then review discourses and related practices in the SP that correspond

with these traditionally criticized aspects of culture in the FL curriculum, specifically culture as an insignificant, additive component, with culture instruction focusing primarily on facts rather than meaning. Next, I illustrate how, in spite of the institutional and professional discourses that assert second language teaching to be more authentic and to immerse students in culture, many practices found throughout the ELP can be interpreted as reflective of the problematic aspects of cultural teaching that is more widely attributed to FL contexts. I also describe some SP practices that, when interpreted using definition of culture teaching in the context of the ELP, would be perceived as authentic culture instruction, but instead are reported as "resistant." I discuss how interpreting ELP practices through the lens created by the discourses surrounding FL teaching and vice-versa reveal that some of the traditional criticisms and calls to improve cultural teaching in foreign languages should be made for second language contexts as well. To conclude this chapter, I address how these findings inform recent conversations on reconceptualizing the relationship between language and culture and reimagining cultural instruction in university language programs.

Professional Discussions on Teaching Culture

Although teaching culture is discussed in professional literature addressing both second and foreign language classrooms, the role that culture plays and the methods of culture instruction have historically been criticized much more frequently in foreign language contexts. Over the years there have been repeated calls for reforming culture in the foreign language curriculum (e.g. Byrnes, 2002; Kramsch, 1993), with the most recent being the 2007 Modern Languages Association's (MLA) report entitled, "Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World." The MLA's

report asserts that the traditional FL curricular organization of the two-tiered structure (such as that of the SP) is outdated and contributes to a conceptual separation of language and culture that recreates instructional patterns that inhibit students' understanding of the perspectives and worldviews of target language speakers, and instead only focus on cultural "trivia" or descriptive information (MLA, 2007).

Prior to the 2007 MLA Report, Heidi Byrnes (2002) also called for a critical examination of how culture is defined and the place it holds in the foreign language curriculum, with the hope that "substantial changes" would be made in curricular development and teaching practices. The title of Byrnes' 2002 article, "Language and Culture: Shall the Twain Ever Meet in Foreign Language Departments?" references the long history of conceptualizing language and culture as separate entities, one of the most criticized aspects of culture's place in the FL curriculum. In this model, which, as Byrnes explains, follows a formalist tradition, both language and culture hold separate places within the curricular structure, and this division is often reflected and reproduced in practice. In this tradition, not only are culture and language separated, but culture is primarily viewed as an additive component, one that is "considered only when the language component of our work has been completed" (Byrnes, 2002). This additive aspect of culture in FL programs is still one of concern today and is also reference in MLA's 2007 call for reform.

In addition to separation of language and culture as two distinct subjects, with "culture" being addressed in the classroom far less frequently than "language," the treatment of culture in FL teaching contexts has also been criticized for privileging facts over meaning rather than examining worldviews, values, and perspectives of target

language speakers in depth (Byrnes 2002, Kramsch, 1993 MLA, 2007). This traditional type of instruction focuses on the presentation and discussion of demographic and descriptive information on people and places, generalizing customs and/or artifacts associated with the speakers of the language. This approach is also referred to as "the four Fs" approach to cultural teaching: Food, Folklore, Festivals, and Factual information (Kramsch, 1991). Short, informative cultural readings often presented in textbooks are associated with this approach as well.

A final problematic tradition of cultural teaching in FL contexts concerns the perceived inauthenticity of cultural experiences and learning in the FL classroom. As I indicated earlier, professional and popular assumptions regard foreign language contexts as less authentic than second language contexts based on the differences in the speech communities found outside of each classroom. Foreign language contexts are defined as located within a community with little to no speakers of the target language. Therefore, the culture of the target language speakers must be artificially recreated, in turn contributing to the aforementioned criticisms of including culture in the curriculum in a superficial way. The traditional dependence on the use of commercial textbooks in the foreign language classrooms of universities is frequently cited as a main contributor to inauthentic cultural experiences (Byrnes, 2002). Since the textbooks have been defined as an inauthentic text, they have no function in a speech community outside of the classroom (Kramsch, 1993).

Although cultural teaching is addressed in professional literature for ESL contexts, the field of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) has not historically been criticized for the problematic approaches to teaching culture in the way

that foreign language teaching has, nor have multiple calls been made for the reform of cultural instruction within the discipline. This aspect of the professional discourse surrounding the teaching of culture in both contexts must be taken into account in order to contextualize and interpret the findings of the current study. These separate traditions appear to greatly influence the perceptions of cultural instruction at the ELP and SP, as all participants reference the traditionally criticized aspects of foreign language teaching when describing the SP. Though when talking about culture instruction in the ELP (in spite of the presence of practices similar to those criticized of the SP). Before addressing these contradictions, I will describe the discourses and related practices within the SP that do exemplify the problematic aspects of FL instruction cited in the literature.

Culture in the SP: Interpreting Practices within Professional Discourse

In the Spanish Program, there were many ways that participants described and practiced cultural teaching that reflected the traditional assumptions about foreign language context that I outlined above. When describing the curriculum and classroom practices, participants frequently referred to culture as a separate entity, usually in a dualistic relationship with the terms "language," "grammar," or "skills." Sometimes participants employed the word "content" as synonymous with "culture," although this was mainly when describing curricular organization. For example, Dr. Nelson described the lower division courses as "skills based with a little bit of content" as well as "skills based" and slowly introducing "culture."

This separation of language and culture is found in literature about the program curricular organization and objectives. A document entitled, "Why major in Foreign Languages?," states, "the demand for employees with *language* and *cultural* skills means

that there is a constant need for foreign language instructors" (emphasis added). Also, another document on career information on the Foreign Languages website, suggests majoring in foreign languages "if you enjoy studying language and culture." As illustrated in these examples, "language" and "culture" are usually placed in a dualistic relationship, often as two complimentary, integral components that guide second language learning and teaching. This dualism, which is acknowledged in a broad sense as defining the overarching goals of the program, is reiterated in the curricular organization of the SP, reflecting and reproducing the problematic aspects of FL teaching that have their origins in this division: culture as an additive component, instruction that privileges facts over meaning, and textbook-centered cultural lessons.

In the SP, the perception of culture as an additional component was repeated by instructors and administrators and reflected and reproduced in practices. As explained by Dr. Nelson, the overall curricular design of the SP is one in which culture is introduced gradually as course levels increase, with the goal of the bridge courses "to build up [students'] skills and at the same time include more content," with the upper division courses having "more of a content focus with lesser of a language focus." This separation of language ("grammar" or "skills") and culture (or "content") with language as the main focus and culture as an addition exemplifies Byrnes's (2002) comment on culture being taught only when the "language component" is finished.

The ways in which SP participants described and practiced culture teaching, especially in the lower division courses, reflect this concept of culture as an additive component. Lower division instructors indicate that overall, they perceive a greater focus on skills and grammar than on culture, with cultural lessons consisting mostly of textbook

readings. As detailed in the curricular plan for the program, "a little" culture is included in the lower division and then gradually added to the curriculum as the course levels increase. SP instructors Silvia, Maite and Jessica all reported presenting cultural lessons in class "if they have time" or during times when they anticipate lower student attendance, such as on Fridays, as stated by Silvia, or before a holiday break. For example, when describing a culturally-focused lesson on Spain that she had prepared for the students, Maite stressed that the lesson was "not typical" and "an exception." She explained to me that she decided to do a cultural lesson because she "knew that most of them (the students) wouldn't come to class" because it was the last day before spring break. Maite then contrasted this exceptional lesson with a typical one, stating, "A typical class would be one in which I present the input, either vocabulary or grammar and just give them the handout or some activities and practice the point at issue." In this explanation, Maite reiterates the "language" focus of the course (the grammar, practicing the [grammar] points at issue) with culture-focused lessons as not only separate, but less frequently.

Jessica, an SP and ELP instructor also perceived there to be a greater proportion of grammar instruction as compared with cultural discussion at the SP. She stated, "The textbook would bring in cultural topics too, like different festivals . . . but (pause) gosh, I don't know, a lot of it was SO MUCH grammar." In addition to her interpretation of the grammar focus, Jessica mentions the most common way in which culture is "added" to the curriculum: through textbook cultural readings. These readings strengthened the discourse of culture as a less important, additive component due to the fact that they appeared less frequently in the textbook and class discussions, and were also much

smaller and received less focus than grammar. Participants referenced these aspects of the cultural readings in the textbook, with Jessica calling them "little blurbs," and Silvia employing the diminutive in Spanish calling them "parrafitos/*little paragraphs.*" Also, in practice instructors mostly assigned the reading for homework, only occasionally reviewing the information during class time through a Power Point presentation.

The practice of presenting the readings through a Power Point reinforced the focus on the factual, "information" aspect of the cultural readings, as instructors described pictures related to a theme to present vocabulary associated with the reading as well as repeat the descriptions found in the textbook. During these lessons, the instructor would speak for the majority of the lessons, occasionally asking the class to repeat or provide words. However, if nobody responded, the instructor usually provided the answers herself. Crystal, a student in Laura's Spanish 200 course, described one of the lessons based on the reading from the textbook that describes a typical wedding ceremony in Mexico, "Like, there was one [cultural lesson] talking about marriage. I think the most recent is like, people in Mexico how their marriage is and like the rosary, or the beads that go around their shoulders and stuff." In this lesson, which I observed, Laura gave a Power Point presentation related to the textbook reading on marriage and family relationships. The presentation consisted of multiple images that corresponded with terms that were introduced in the textbook reading. Laura pointed to and named each image, writing the names on the board for many of them. For example, she pointed to a photo of a baby's baptismal ceremony and said, "Esto se llama bautizo. *This is called a baptism.*" She repeated this action for numerous terms, including naming all family members using the image of a family tree, and then instructed the students to complete a

listening exercise in which they filled family members' names in a family tree and labeled images related to the course theme. The questions that correspond to the exercise are located in the textbook after the cultural reading. These types of cultural lessons not only reinforce the idea of culture as less important, since less time is dedicated to them, they also focus almost entirely on information and rarely, if ever put students' views in conversation with those of members of the target language community, demonstrating the type of cultural teaching so widely criticized in professional literature.

The cultural readings to which participants referred are entitled, "El Mundo Hispano" (*The Hispanic World*) and "Nota Cultural" (*Cultural Note*) for the common textbook for Spanish 100, 150, and 200, and are located at the end of each chapter, reiterating the idea that culture is discussed as an afterthought or only after the more important, "language" component is learned. These readings also reflect another criticized aspect of FL instruction, that of privileging facts over meaning, since the articles focus primarily on topics related to patterns of customs, beliefs and practices in various Spanish-speaking countries and/or regions of the world. For example, when I asked SP instructor Jessica to describe cultural instruction in the SP, she responded, "That was mainly through, like little blurbs in the textbook, like this festival in Mexico, this celebration day or holiday." Jessica's description of the topics reflects the "four Fs" approach to cultural instruction associated with focusing on cultural facts of trivia on customs and practices of the target language community. A selection of reading topics that demonstrates this approach includes: "careers and professional life," "Costa Rican towns," "Hispanic system of education," "fashion," "health care," "leisure activities," "meals and food," " "religious life," and "sports."

An additional cultural teaching practice that participants described that focused primarily on factual information was representative of what Byram and Kramsch (2008) cite as the "Frankenstein approach," in which cultural instruction is comprised of "a taco from here, a Flamenco dancer from there" (p. 21). This method not only emphasizes factual description, it also presents a cultural survey of practices associated throughout various Spanish-speaking communities. For this type of cultural teaching participants report lessons that address multiple Spanish-speaking cultures, equating "country" or "nation-state" with "culture." The common understanding that students are learning about "multiple cultures" in the lower-division of the SP is evidenced in Paula's reaction to my question "What culture do you teach?" Paula, who was answering the question as an ELP instructor, but had completed the Spanish lower division coursework answered, "That's a Spanish question! ((laughs))" I then asked her, "Why do you say that?" and she answered, "Because there's so many cultures for the Spanish language." A selection of readings that exemplifies this approach include "Costa Rican towns" "Legends of Mexico City," and "the Indian Population of Panamá" "the climate of Guatemala," "Madrid," "artists in Mexico," and "politics in Colombia." In addition to the inclusion of a particular city or country in the topic description, a list of all Spanish-speaking countries is found on the back cover of the Spanish 100-200 textbook. The list is entitled, "El mundo hispano a su alcance" (*The Hispanic World at Your Fingertips*), and under each country name demographic information is listed including population, the capital city, type of currency, languages, literacy rate, principal export, and agricultural goods.

This focus on various cultures with varying geographic region is reiterated through the major cultural assignment of the course: the poster project. All students

taking Spanish 250 complete a "poster project" for which they are to research a historical landmark or location in a particular Spanish-speaking country or city to present to the class. When I asked Sarah to give an example of how she learned about culture in Spanish 250, she gave the poster project as an example, "at the end of the year, had us do a poster project where we got into groups and picked a city or country, that type of thing, and then we did a project on it and we presented it in front of the class." Examples of presentation themes include La Patagonia, Argentina, observatories in Chile, and demographic information on Montevideo, Uruguay.

Finally, the discourses and practices on cultural teaching in the SP support the overarching perception of FL cultural teaching as textbook-dependent, and therefore inauthentic. Kramsch (1993) explains this perspective, "The term 'authentic' has been used as a reaction against the prefabricated artificial language of textbooks and instructional dialogues; it refers to the way language is used in non-pedagogic, natural communication (p. 177). Participants at SSU make this distinction regarding textbooks versus other types of texts, and reference it in regard to the differences between instruction in the SP and the ELP. SP student and ELP instructor Rachel contrasted the "real texts" that she uses in teaching at the ELP with her Spanish textbook. She stated, "Sometimes the Spanish texts are more . . . I think they're more a little removed from reality." Regarding the "real texts" she used in her ELP courses, she explained, "I try to bring in things that are more interesting than invented stories about invented people for the purpose of teaching clothing vocabulary or something like that." Rachel's interpretation of the differences between the discourse of textbooks and "real texts" and their reflection of inauthentic versus authentic use of the target languages directly

corresponds to the criticism of textbook language in foreign language settings that Kramsch (1993) described.

Culture at the ELP: Contradictions in Interpretations and Practices

When participants talk about teaching culture in the ELP, the pervasive discourse is that which is reflected in instructor Paula's comment, "There's culture all the time!" Participants describe the ELP as providing authentic cultural experiences in a target-language community, using "real books" as Rachel indicated, and discussing "real-life" pragmatic topics (there is some overlap here with the professional discourse I discussed in the previous chapter). The professional and popular assumptions that perceive the potential cultural experiences and interactions with speakers of the target language community as indicators of authentic, cultural immersion inside of the classroom are repeated by instructors and administrators at SSU.

However, comparing both the practices with the interpretations of culture teaching at the ELP and with interpretations of practices at the SP reveals several contradictions that indicate that these overarching assumptions about teaching culture in an ESL context greatly influence how practices are perceived. In spite of the rhetoric of culture instruction at the ELP as primarily authentic and integrated into all aspects of the curriculum, the findings in this study indicate that many cultural teaching practices in the ELP actually reflect the problematic aspects of teaching culture that are more frequently attributed to foreign language contexts: the separation of language and culture, culture as an additive component, and the privileging of facts over meaning.

The separation of culture and language that I described in the SP context is also found in the ELP. As I indicated, it is this division that is cited as the root of cultural

teaching practices in need of reform in the FL context. In mission statements and descriptive documents of the ELP, culture and language learning are frequently listed as separate, but complementary goals for both programs, much as they are in the SP. For example, the mission statement of the ELP cites one of the program's main objectives as "serving the *language* and *cultural* needs of our international students" (emphasis added). Similar to the SP, participants frequently reference this dualism of "language" and "culture" as separate components of the curriculum, and also employ terms such as "skills" and "grammar" as parallels to "language," as well as "content" when talking about "culture." The curricular structure of the ELP is an integrated skills-content model of an Intensive English Program (IEP), in which all courses include cultural components as indicated by Dr. Nelson's description of the ELP as content-based.

This curricular configuration contributes to the overall perception that the ELP is "more content based" than the SP as instructor Jessica stated, but the conceptual division of language and culture are still reiterated frequently by instructors and pedagogical practices. For example, ELP instructor Jennifer drew upon this division contrasting her teaching approach in the American Culture course with those used in the "core" "skills-based" (language) courses. She explained, "It's not like teaching a grammar class or reading where you're teaching specific skills." Jennifer's comment exemplifies a contradiction in the discourses on cultural teaching in the ELP that frequently occurred when participants began to talk in detail about teaching practices: Although the program is "content-based" and the general perception is that "there's culture all the time" as instructor Paula stated, participants often referenced the division of language and culture

that correspond to the "core" courses named after "skills" (Reading Writing, Grammar, Speaking and Listening) and the elective course in American Culture that is offered.

The language in the curricular structure interacted with professional and popular discourses in order to influence how participants define the teaching of culture in both programs and create contradictions in the interpretations of cultural teaching practices in the ELP. Many times these contradictions are found in the same participant's descriptions of culture teaching. For example, even though Rachel stated that she incorporates multiple American and local cultural lessons in all of her courses, she later said "we have culture as a separate unit, curriculum." Later, when I asked her to give further examples of cultural lessons, she explained, "We have a course called American Culture for that purpose (cultural instruction)," and that she could not provide any further examples since she had not taught that course. The contradictory nature of Rachel's statements is indicative of how the larger discourse on the ELP as a site of cultural immersion by virtue of its status as a second language context conflicts with the institutional, curricular discourse on the division of "skills" and "culture" within the ELP's programmatic structure.

Rachel's comment also suggests that this conceptualization of culture being taught solely in the American Culture course while skills are the focus of the core courses also contributes to the perception of culture as an additive component, a characteristic that participants only attribute to the SP. Since American Culture is defined as an elective course, while the other courses comprise the "core" curriculum, it is generally viewed as an "addition." This separation is so pervasive that some students who are not taking this course state that they do not learn anything at all about American culture in

their classes, even though instructors detail (and I had observed) lessons on the United States, including a full instructional unit on state culture. When I asked ELP student Haruna to describe a memorable lesson on American Culture, she said, "No, I don't have, I don't take the American Culture class." In this respect, the labeling of the American Culture class greatly influenced how participants viewed cultural teaching, and created a parallel discourse of culture as an additional part of the core curriculum to the more generalized immersion discourse of an ESL context.

Another way in which culture is presented as an additional component to the skills or language core curriculum is through the "state culture" curriculum that I mentioned earlier. According to Ellen, the assistant director of the ELP, the state culture curriculum was a temporary "cultural unit" that the ELP "added on" as a result of receiving a grant. Lessons related to the state culture curriculum were added temporarily to core courses only, in that particular semester. Although these lessons differ from the additive aspect of SP cultural readings, the state culture curriculum is discussed as something "extra" in the core courses, and at least on some level are not viewed as "integrated" into the curriculum since Haruna did not classify the lessons as addressing American Culture.

Although participant reports and observations indicate a wider variety of culturally focused lessons (or lessons defined as culturally focused), upon further examination of these topics, I observed that, similar to the findings of the SP, many of the cultural lessons in the ELP privilege facts over meaning. ELP participants often contrasted cultural instruction there with that of the SP, indicating that cultural instruction at the ELP is more authentic and goes into greater depth. However, a comparison of the

content of the cultural lessons in both programs reveals that the majority of the ELP lessons could be categorized as reflecting the "four Fs" and/or "Frankenstein" approaches, which privilege facts over meaning.

This contradiction was revealed in the way participants talked about culture (although they did not recognize it and label it as such, like the SP participants) as well as through practices. ELP instructor Jennifer reflected the "facts over meaning" approach when she contrasted teaching the American Culture course with teaching the core "skills" courses. She stated, "In American Culture I teach information." Here, she equates culture instruction with presenting factual knowledge. A further examination of her teaching practices and the ways in which she describes them supports this interpretation. Jennifer explained her approach to teaching the American Culture course as "taking a historical perspective," presenting information on social movements and events in U.S. history. Examples of cultural themes she reported include, the Revolutionary, Civil, and Vietnam wars, slavery, the Civil Rights Movement, Woodstock, Martin Luther King, Jr., Watergate, President Reagan, and The Cold War.

In describing her approach to teaching the course, Jennifer interpreted her cultural instruction as "authentic," attributing this authenticity mainly to the fact that she does not employ a textbook. She says that her goal is to use a variety of media to create "real life, pragmatic" and interactive lessons for students rather than present a series of cultural readings, referring to those types of readings when she says, "That's why I hate textbooks." She listed a variety of media for presenting her information: internet articles, YouTube video clips, movies, and guest speakers who talk to the class about certain topics. Although Jennifer interpreted her cultural instruction as more authentic and

meaningful than cultural readings in the textbook, the list of themes and actual content of the lessons show a similar focus to the list of cultural readings in the SP textbook. Both included descriptive texts, and reporting "facts" about people, places, and events. The main difference here is the variety of media used, with the SP employing primarily the textbook (at times instructors use power point), while Jennifer employs the multiple sources mentioned. The use of a variety of media, however, is not an indicator of more meaningful, authentic, cultural experiences. Byram and Kramsch (2008) address this issue, in particular regarding interactions with native speakers, such as the guest speakers Jennifer mentioned. They observe, "While direct contact with native speakers is indeed a valuable experience . . . it leaves open the problem of how to help students interpret what the speakers say" (p. 24). In this respect, while the themes and media Jennifer employs might cover a wider range and yield a greater potential for "real world" connections with speakers from the target language community, the main focus of the cultural lessons remains on presentation of information and not interpretation.

An additional example of privileging facts over meaning by using "authentic" texts occurs within the state culture curriculum. Students read about and gave presentations on a series of topics, which fit directly into the "four Fs" description. In Paula's vocabulary class, students gave presentations which included descriptions on the most popular state foods, fairs, and activities, along with presenting demographic information on the state including census-type data on the residents' cultural backgrounds and types of professions they hold. Students completed similar presentations in other core courses, with much of their information acquired from reading "authentic texts": articles from the local paper, state internet sites, and state promotional and informative

brochures. Rachel described a reading on whitewater rafting that she adapted from a state tourism website and incorporated into her Reading course as part of the state cultural unit. She described the theme of the text as "why it's (whitewater rafting) exciting, why you want to do it in [this state]." She stated that the article also addressed "which rivers you white water raft on . . . the names for the different kinds of boats that you use when you raft . . . and what kind of clothes you wear when you raft." Much like the themes in Jennifer's culture course, from participants' descriptions and my observations, the state culture curriculum appeared to focus primarily on information, rather than address perspectives, viewpoints, and values of members of the target language community, which is the most criticized aspect of this approach. However, participants perceived these lessons as more authentic and meaningful than similar ones in SP courses.

The final ELP cultural teaching practice that I will discuss is "cultural background sharing," and reflects both the "four Fs" and "Frankenstein" approaches. I use the term "cultural background sharing" to describe this practice because instructors define this practice as conducting class discussions about various "cultural topics" where students describe and compare their own customs and experiences with each other. Although students describe perspectives, the topics generally reflect the "four Fs" approach, and range from discussing customs concerning social and personal relationships (family, friends, business interactions), food, holidays, common recreational activities, popular landmarks and their historical significance, and religious beliefs and associated practices.

In addition to an informative, factual focus, these lessons also can be interpreted as a type of "Frankenstein" approach, since they present a cultural fact from a variety of

different cultures. ELP instructor, Paula, described this dual focus of "cultural" instruction in the ELP curriculum, "They're not just learning about the United States they're learning about each other's cultures all the time." She later gave an example of this class practice in the Vocabulary course she was teaching, "In the Vocabulary class right now we've been having these food chapters so we've been talking a lot about food customs in their countries." I observed one of these food-related discussion activities that Paula described. At the beginning of the class, students were to review a list of vocabulary words and complete a chart on the verb, noun, adjective and adverb forms of different words and on the other side of the worksheet, students were to write answers to questions that addressed the topic of food. All of the questions incorporated one of the vocabulary words from the lesson. The instructions to this activity stated, "Think about food in your country and answer the following questions. Write an answer and then share with your group." After students wrote the answers to the questions, they shared their answers in pairs or small groups. Paula then asked some students to share information about food from their personal experience with the class, which included food customs from Colombia, India, Japan, Kuwait, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and Taiwan. Although the method of cultural presentation varies, these types of lessons focus on information from a variety of cultures, reflecting the "Frankenstein approach" similar to the SP readings that focus on popular foods from a variety of Spanish-speaking countries.

Another example of the "cultural sharing approach" is the "cultural presentation" that students completed as one of the major components of their final grade for the Communication Skills course. For this assignment, students were instructed to select a "cultural topic" to share with the class in an interactive Power Point presentation. All of

the "cultural topics" that students presented addressed an aspect of the culture with which each student identified. For example, one student from Japan presented a history of Japanese rice wine and how to make it, and other Japanese student presented the history of origami and teaches the class to fold an origami hat. Another student gave a presentation on historical landmarks in Pakistan, while another described the history and storylines of a popular cartoon character in Hong Kong. A comparison of these cultural presentations with the ones from the SP that I described earlier, in which students presented on the waterfalls in Argentina and observatories in Chile, reveals more similarities than differences between both contexts, including a similar content-focus for the presentation and a "cultural-survey" aspect.

In addition to reflecting the fact-over-meaning approach, which is more frequently attributed to FL than SL contexts, other aspects of the "cultural sharing approach" exposed the greatest contradiction between assumptions of culture teaching in an ESL context and cultural teaching practices, because participants report the "cultural sharing approach" as the primary means of cultural instruction at the ELP. I assert that this is the greatest contradiction because the focus on student culture in this approach directly contradicts the most general assumption about why culture teaching is more authentic in SL: direct access to target language/target culture communities outside of the classroom.

Although most instructors state that students are making comparisons with U.S. culture as well, students perceive the main focus of "cultural instruction" as learning about each others' cultural backgrounds. Atsushi, a student in Paula's Grammar course, describes a typical "cultural lesson" from that class, "Well, one day we were talking

about the differences in values or common senses or customs. . . in most cases when we're talking we feel like expressing our own nationality or our own situation in your home countries." Some students explicitly state that they do not learn about American culture in the core courses. I asked Haruna, another ELP student, who was taking core courses and not taking American Culture, to describe what she learned about American culture in her classes. She answered, "American culture? Hmmm, not much. We talk with other countries' culture not American culture." Another ELP student, Mai, described cultural lessons in her classes as follows, "in our vocabulary class we discuss about difference about our culture in each country all the time, um other class, vocabulary class and communication skills class we talk about the difference of the culture so that's the way of learning culture." She later shared a popular cultural topic from these courses and described what she has learned about other cultures, "The popular [topic] is food. Everybody's really interested in the food. Like, 'We don't eat that,' or especially, like raw fish in Japan, sushi, everybody gets excited about, like, 'What do you eat?' and that kind of stuff. . . Um, like I have never met the people from the Middle East I've never met people from Latin American and I just learn new things, like every day from them." These comments suggest that in the core courses, students primarily associate learning about "culture" with learning about each others' beliefs and practices, rather than about patterns in American beliefs and practices. Even though instructors report other United States-focused "cultural lessons" on state culture and conversational norms, all of the students that I interviewed described the cultural lessons of the core classes as learning about each others' cultural backgrounds, even after I explicitly asked about American culture. These findings illustrate a great disconnect between perceptions and practices

concerning the teaching of culture in the ELP, second language contexts are often considered to be "culture" intensive, essentially a cultural immersion setting, because the classroom is surrounded by the target language community. Furthermore, when discussing "culture" teaching in any language teaching setting, it is commonly understood that the instruction focuses on the culture or (cultures) associated with the language being taught. Clearly in this case, participants define "culture" teaching and learning to include learning about students' cultures related to their first languages, all languages other than English.

Contextualizing the Findings in Current Discussions on Culture

The findings indicate that perceptions and practices of teaching culture in the Spanish Program reflect the formalist tradition that Byrnes (2002) cites as an impediment to the much needed reform of cultural instruction in foreign languages, a call that was recently echoed by the MLA in 2007. At the SP, many of the cultural teaching practices reflect and reproduce the conceptual separation of language and culture, with culture as an additive component to the curriculum and the classroom. Lessons tend to focus primarily on factual information and "cultural trivia" about a variety of target language communities, equating "countries" with "cultures." Overall, the ideologies and approaches present language and culture as two separate entities, reducing language to a set of "skills" students can use to talk about "content" or "cultural themes."

Regarding the ELP, the findings show that although participants perceive language instruction to be more authentic and reflective of the students' immersion in the target language community, a comparison of ELP and SP cultural teaching practices reveals that cultural lessons in the ELP reflect and reproduce many of the problematic

aspects of cultural teaching traditionally associated with FL teaching contexts. In fact, the majority of the cultural teaching practices in the ELP replicate the SP characteristics of the separation of language and culture, the construction of culture as an additive component, and, most frequently, the privileging of facts over meaning. Furthermore, the most common practice of "cultural sharing" directly contradicts assumptions on the authentic and immersive qualities of cultural instruction in an SL context since students focus on aspects of each others' cultures rather than those of the target language community in which the classroom is located. These types of contradictions reveal the false parallelism created by conventional definitions of the contexts, and indicate the need to recontextualize these settings within their histories in order to more fully understand the phenomena within each one.

In contextualizing these findings within current discussions on culture teaching, the first issue that should be addressed is what the current study reveals about the ways in which the disciplinary divisions between different language teaching contexts have come to shape and somewhat solidify our views and interpretations of these settings. The findings that I review in this chapter indicate a need for critical examination and reform of teaching culture for all language-learning contexts, not just foreign language settings. Both Byrnes (2002) and the MLA (2007) suggest an interdisciplinary approach, including members of Cultural Studies and other departments as a way to reimagine and reconstruct the traditional two-tiered curricular structure that, according to the MLA report, "has outlived its usefulness and needs to evolve" (p.3). These suggestions for interdisciplinary change, however, do not specify the role that English language learning contexts (ESL settings and IEPs) should play in relation to FL programs. Furthermore, ESL settings are

not included in the call for reform. The findings in this study indicate that the same questions concerning the relationship between language and culture and how it informs culture instruction should be asked in an ESL context too, since many of the criticized FL practices were found at the ELP as well as the SP.

The central issue around which all current discussions on cultural teaching reform revolve has been how we define the relationship between language and culture. In her proposal, Byrnes (2002) asserts the need for " . . . a principled and coherent understanding of the relation among language, language use, and socioculturally and linguistically constructed knowledge, and particularly the role in that understanding of both the L1 and L2 for adult second language learners." The calls for proposed changes contrast the more structuralist, formalist view of language and culture as separate entities with a more inclusive view of the two as inseparable. The MLA report labels these views as "instrumentalist" or "constitutive," respectively (2007, p. 2). The report outlines these two "divergent" views, as they call them, explaining, "At one end, language is considered to be principally instrumental, for communicating thought and information. At the opposite end, language is understood as an essential element of a human being's thought process, perceptions, and self-expressions; and as such it is considered to be at the core of translingual and transcultural competence" (p. 2). In the MLA report, translingual and transcultural competence are the outcomes that the committee proposes for second language learners, thus suggesting a need to promote the more inclusive view of language and culture that moves away from the instrumentalist approach.

The instrumentalist approach separating language and culture is cited as largely contributing to curricular structures that have lead to the criticized practices of devaluing

culture in the curriculum, presenting it as an additive component and teaching it in a way that privileges facts over meaning. The MLA proposed the outcome of translingual and transcultural competence as progressing beyond the "four Fs" and "Frankenstein" approaches cited earlier. Under the proposed model, students "acquire a basic knowledge of the history, geography, culture and literature of the society or societies whose language they are learning," and are ". . . educated to function as informed and capable interlocutors with educated native speakers in the target language. They are also trained to reflect on the world and themselves through the lens of another language and culture" (p. 4). Considering these proposed outcomes in the context of the current study raises several questions about the goals we have for students in both contexts and also indicates a need to reexamine and reevaluate not only the way in which we imagine the relationship between language and culture, but also how we define culture itself.

Regarding student goals, the MLA's proposed outcomes have largely (if not entirely) been discussed and applied to are considered foreign language contexts—essentially, any second language classroom settings where students are learning any language but English. If the objectives of transcultural and translingual competence are intended for U.S. university students (mainly undergraduates) and the primary goal of students who study at an Intensive English Program (IEP) is to enter a program of study at a U.S. university, wouldn't the same outcomes to apply to them, too? The suggestions and curricular changes proposed, while ambitious in reconfiguring and reconceptualizing relationship of language and culture, still reflect and reproduce the larger discourse of "English and everything else" which has greatly influenced how teaching and learning

languages in the United States are understood and practiced, and further divide the disciplines of second and foreign language teaching.

Examining the MLA outcomes through a comparison of the second language context of an IEP and a foreign language context raises important questions on not only how we imagine the relationship between language and culture, but also how we define culture itself. In the context of the current study, this latter issue arises when interpreting the practice of "cultural background sharing" at the ELP, in comparison with what is considered cultural instruction at the SP. In the SP, activities in which students share personal information and background are not considered to be cultural lessons; however, in the ELP, they are. Furthermore, not only is the sharing of personal information considered learning about culture, it is one of the most, if not the most prevalent cultural teaching practices in the ELP.

This difference in the interpretation of cultural instruction is an indicator of how culture itself is being defined, and demonstrates the influence of larger, societal discourses, in particular discourses on diversity and multiculturalism in the United States, in shaping these interpretations and definitions in both programs. Kramsch (1993) addresses the general difference of students' cultural backgrounds in SL versus FL contexts, stating that FL students are often assumed to share a common culture, and in contrast, students in an ESL context generally have diverse cultural backgrounds (p. 43). Although Kramsch (1993) later asserts that this assumption about students in FL classrooms is incorrect, and that FL classrooms are becoming increasingly diverse, the SP students at the SSU are constructed as culturally homogenous, given the demographics of the region and the student population.

As I described in chapter 5, SP students are primarily white, Anglo, from the local area and are perceived to have little interaction with other cultures, races, and languages. They are often spoken of as one homogenous group. For example, SP instructor, Laura commented on the uniformity of the students' backgrounds stating, "La mayoría de ellos son americanos y de esta area. *The majority of them are American and from this area*." Another SP instructor, Silvia, stressed regional similarity:

> Casi todos son de [este estado], casi todos. Hay gente de [otras ciudades cercanas] pero casi todos son de aquí. *Almost all of them are from this state, almost all of them. There are people from other close-by cities but almost all of them are from here.*

Participants often discussed this aspect of the student population when addressing their perceived lack of motivation and lack of experiences with other languages and cultures. In this respect, the SP students were constructed as culturally-homogenous, and in the context of the United States, because of their race and background, "cultureless," especially within the larger societal discourse on multiculturalism and diversity.

The influence of the larger societal discourse on multiculturalism and diversity is more apparent when examining how the ELP students are categorized in comparison to the SP students. The "diversity" of the ELP student population is stressed in program literature as well as in participant descriptions. In the context of the ELP, "diversity" corresponds with an institutional definition that refers to a variety of cultural backgrounds in the student population, where culture is generally equated with nation-state or region of the world (e.g. Japan, the Middle East, Latin America), and frequently includes associated languages. This definition is referenced on the program web page, which

states, “Students from many *different countries* attend the ELP each semester, with approximately one third of the student coming from the *Middle East*, one third from *South America*, and one third from *Asia*. This *diversity* ensures that students in the ELP have adequate opportunities to speak English inside and outside class and learn about each others’ *cultures* (emphasis mine).” This description not only exemplifies the definition of diversity as associated with cultures, languages, and countries other than the United States or American English, but it also directly references the “cultural sharing” practices in the ELP. (i.e., students “learn about each others’ cultures”).

When ELP students share personal information about their backgrounds, the practice gets defined as a type of “culture” instruction. In comparison, since the SP students are not “diverse,” and therefore, since their “culture” is not reiterated as a significant or defining characteristic of the student population, their sharing is not constructed as a “cultural” learning activity. In fact, on some occasions that I observed, what would be considered “culture teaching” in the context of the ELP is interpreted as resistant in the SP. For example, in describing students’ resistant behavior of leading the class, “off topic” Maite states that students will ask about “partying” “young culture,” and “drinking.”

Another SP instructor, Silvia, describes a lesson in which students lead her “off-topic” and ask about women in Spain. She said that the theme came up because the students wanted to know how to say, “She is hot” in Spanish. She then explained that students ask her a lot of different questions in order to divert her attention from the assigned lesson. I asked her what other questions they asked her, and she answered,

¿Cómo es la urbanización? ¿Cómo son las casas en España? *What are cities like in Spain? What are houses like in Spain?*" She then explained that she perceived that the students asked these questions not only to "waste time" in class, but also as a consequence of their lack of cultural experience and knowledge of other parts of the world. She said:

> Pero estoy pensando que todos piensan que las casas de España son de adobe, pero no, tenemos ladrillo, tenemos cemento, y eso expliqué . . . que estamos aquí, es lo mismo, que no está muy diferente a Estados Unidos o sea los super Estados Unidos, que somos iguales. No hay una diferencia y tenemos teléfono televisión y coches y todo. *But I'm thinking that all of them think that the houses in Spain are made of adobe, but no, we have brick, we have cement, and I explained that . . . that we (Spanish TAs) are here and it's the same. That it is not that different from the United States, you know, the Super United States. We are all the same. There isn't any difference and we have telephones, television, cars, and everything*.

Silvia's comment illustrates how multiple local and societal discourses overlap and interact in affecting her interpretation of students' behaviors. In these examples, students are asking questions related to their lives: slang, city life, television (they asked her earlier if there were plasma televisions in Spain), and Silvia interprets these questions as demonstrating resistance, and also as indicative of their ignorance about other places and/or ways to assert their view of the superiority of the United States and as other countries as less civilized. This is evidenced by Silvia's use of the term the "Super United States" as well as her assertion of Spain having television, phones, and cars.

When Silvia recounted these interactions during our interview, she expressed frustration with the students and a certain level of disbelief about what she perceived as an extreme lack of knowledge and experiences about the world outside of the region surrounding the university. In these instances, the students' "lack" of culture, combined and associated with larger discourses on ethnocentric views about the superiority of the United States, contribute to the interpretation of the students' questions as "resistant." This interpretation was also heavily influenced by the programmatic discourse of the strict guidelines in the lower division of the SP, which lead to the negative perception of these questions as "off-topic." In addition, when the students asked these questions, they asked them in English, which is also "breaking the rules" of the Spanish-only requirement within the classroom. In contrast, when students in the ELP asked personal background and personal interest questions of the instructor and/or of each other, it was frequently defined as "cultural" learning and almost never perceived as displaying resistance. In addition to being influenced by the diversity discourse and emphasis on ELP students' culture, the objectives of building community and making students comfortable also contributed to how participants perceived student behavior in these particular activities.

Comparing these two divergent interpretations of the questions students asked related to personal experience not only reveals the way local and societal discourses interact with local practices to influence interpretations of both contexts, but it also reveals aspects of defining culture and cultural teaching that may not be as evident when examining only one of these teaching contexts. Considering the influence of how students' cultures are defined in defining what "culture teaching" is in the ELP within the

context of current calls to reform teaching culture in L2 settings, suggests the need for a critical examination of the practice of "cultural background sharing" at IEP settings. This type of examination could also lead to a greater understanding and analysis of how "culture" is defined as related to "culture teaching" in the ESL setting, as what the "cultural sharing approach" means within the context of the MLA's call for translingual and transcultural competence. Moreover, in light of the MLA's proposal for students to become more knowledgeable about the history, geography, and literature of the culture studied, the prevalence of the cultural sharing approach appears to limit these opportunities for students at the ELP. These findings indicate the need for these issues to be explored further.

In placing the findings about the Spanish Program in conversation with the recent calls for curricular reform, this study serves to exemplify the ways in which the separation of language and culture is reflected and reiterated in teaching practices within the two-tiered system, and how these practices construct culture as information, and as an additive, even optional component to learning language. However, based on the difference in how culture is defined between the SP with the ELP, this study also exposes how discourses related to student culture affect how culture teaching is perceived in an FL context, and in particular how students' motivation toward learning about culture is influenced by assumptions on student culture.

In addition to the view of students' intercultural ignorance and inexperience, as expressed by Silvia, all participants perceived SP students as uninterested in learning about culture. SP and ELP instructor Jessica contrasted her perception of SP students' interest in culture with that of the ELP students, stating that:

> They (SP students) didn't have as much knowledge or they weren't as interested, I don't know, but they didn't ask as many questions as far as like, what was it like in a Spanish speaking country, what's it like in Latin America, what's it like in Spain.

ELP instructor and SP student Rachel expressed a similar view, "For my Spanish classes I felt like they were maybe less interested to find out . . . some of them were less familiar with the culture, maybe didn't even plan on studying or living or even being in a foreign country . . .there was not as much interest, cultural interest for the people taking Spanish." Both of these comments attribute students' disinterest in culture to their lack of intercultural experience in a similar way that students' low expectations for using Spanish in a professional context was attributed to the same perceived lack of linguistic and cultural experiences.

However, I found discrepancies in the participants' perceptions of the SP students' lack of interest in cultural themes when I spoke with SP students. Both students that I interviewed stated that they were highly interested in learning about culture, and that not only were they interested, they felt that culture should play a more significant role in the overall curriculum and classroom activities at the SP. I asked SP student Crystal to describe her perceptions and attitudes about learning about culture and she stated:

> I think we should learn more. Because it's like we're just learning the language, like you don't even understand, how can you learn the language and not appreciate who they are, you know? . . . So I think they need to incorporate more into it, 'cause I know there's a lot more.

SP student Sarah also expressed that she thought it was important to learn culture, and said that she perceived her current class, Spanish 250, to be more interesting and informative because her instructor incorporated more cultural lessons in the class compared with her previous instructors. She stated:

> I know that what helps me is that my Spanish teacher incorporates culture into a lot of it which I think is important to really understand and learn a language for you to know their background and culture and stuff, I benefit from that . . . She dives into it deeper than most.

These student comments indicate that students are not only interested in learning about culture, but they perceive their learning experience to be incomplete without a strong cultural component in the curriculum. They also interpret the approach and practices in the lower level courses in the SP to provide incomplete cultural instruction, as evidenced by Crystal's evaluation of the need to include more culture, and her final comment of "I know there's a lot more."

These findings correspond with work by Kearney (2008), who examined students' perceptions of cultural teaching in the context of the MLA's proposed curricular reform. In her study of students in an FL French university classroom, Kearney (2008) found that although the curricular separation of language and culture contributed to attitudes that language can be learned separately from culture, students articulate the importance of including a high amount of cultural content in the classroom. She also found that, although students had difficulty articulating exactly what "culture" was, they did contrast what they thought to be superficial textbook exercises and more meaningful cultural activities that focused on students taking a variety of perspectives. Also, much like the

findings in the current study, students in Kearney's (2008) study recognize that cultural instruction based on the formalist separation of language and culture as insufficient. She stated that " . . . the students' comments tell us that attempting to artificially separate culture from language instruction, by simplifying it or by ignoring it entirely, does not satisfy the needs and interest of students" (p. 76). Kearney asserts that more research on students perspective must be conducted in order to determine how language educators will meet students' needs while reconstructing the foreign language curriculum. The findings in the current study also indicate the need to examine students' perceptions more extensively, especially in light of the contraction between instructors' perceptions of the students' interest in culture and what the students report.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine how teaching English and Spanish as second languages has traditionally been defined, the common assumptions that are held about each context and the influences these assumptions have on institutional practices. In order to explore these issues, I analyzed several pervasive discourses that were circulating within and through the English Language Program (ELP) and the Spanish Program (SP) at one university. I placed these local discourses within the context of the surrounding historical and societal discourses on English and Spanish in the United States. I also described the ways in which the local and larger discourses are reflected and reproduced in institutional practices. I demonstrated that the repetition of these practices and the discourse in which they are couched discursively constructed aspects of each program's identity that participants considered "normal" for each context. These aspects included perceptions on students' goals and level of motivation for learning the language, as well as the place of culture in the curricula of both programs.

I found that although participants viewed their interpretations as describing observable "normal" characteristics of each context, contradictions between perceptions and practices within and between both programs revealed that these local discourses instead reflected the history and cultures surrounding the ELP and the SP. I found that participants perceived similar student behaviors and classroom methods differently for each context because these interpretations were filtered through lenses created by local and societal discourses surrounding each program that were then reiterated through institutional practices. These findings implicate the need to explore our assumptions

about different language learning contexts further because these assumptions limit our understanding of what is positive, problematic, and possible within each context. These findings contribute to the fields of second language studies, foreign language education and the overarching field of second language acquisition. I will now review implications and recommendations based on the results of the current study for each of these professional areas.

Implications and Recommendations for Foreign Languages

In the introduction of a 2008 special issue of Hispania dedicated to the need for curricular reorganization in Spanish departments, Leslie Schrier writes "Within the majority of modern language departments, committees working on modifications in curricula are in crisis mode" (p. 1). Schrier echoes the call of the 2007 MLA report to restructure the traditional two-tier curriculum comprised of a "language-focused" lower division and a "content-focused" upper division, much like the structure of the SP at SSU. Many findings of the current study indicate the need to reorganize this traditional model which decontextualizes language from culture, divides students and faculty and in the case of the Spanish Program at SSU, reflects and reproduces discourses on student disinterest and resistance toward the language and unsuccessful learning experiences for many of the lower division students. For example regarding student learning, SP instructor Maite stated, "When they read . . . They don't really get the meaning. They aren't really paying attention. It's language but they don't get the meaning . . . They just really are not interested." Maite also stated her perception that students do not see language as "a tool for communicating with so many people," but rather a subject, just like math or science. Jessica an SP and ELP instructor stated that in comparison to

teaching in the ELP, teaching in the SP was not as "enjoyable." She said, "Well, it's kind of discouraging in the Spanish classes just because the interest was so low . . . and just for my own morale it made it hard to go in there every day." These comments reflect how the discourses surrounding the lower division and requirement portion of the two-tiered curriculum affect interpretation of the overall teaching and learning experiences within that context. Also, my research reveals that many practices related to the lower division (i.e. instructor and classroom guidelines, low importance of culture in the curriculum) affected interpretations about the students and the program in a predominantly negative way.

These findings indicate a need to not only reconfigure the traditional two-tiered curriculum but also to reevaluate and redefine the objectives and practices for students taking a language requirement. The overall dissatisfaction of students, faculty, and administrators with this component of the program was palpable within the department. In fact, both the chair and associate chair of foreign languages described the main goal of these students as "simply fulfilling a requirement," and did not mention any language-related goals or contexts for them. In the case of the SP at the SSU, a strong regional discourse influenced this perspective. The disconnect between the experiences and professional goals set forth by the department, along with proposed career contexts not being reflected in practices, suggests the need for the reassessment of this model. In the case of the SP, maybe the goals and methods should more closely address the reality of the students rather than speak to a larger discourse of using Spanish in their profession. Or maybe "career goals" should not be considered as a main objective for this group at all and the overall objectives should change to more closely align with student needs.

Similar consideration should be given to the place of culture in a restructured curriculum. The findings of the current study suggest that the model that includes a "little bit" or "gradual" addition of culture throughout the curriculum is not offering students enough in terms of experiences or opportunities for understanding culture beyond "facts" or "information," and the students recognize this as well. Students taking Spanish as a requirement do not have the opportunity to experience a culture-focused or content course since they complete their requirement before these courses begin. For students completing Spanish minors and majors, the decontextualized learning of language as separate from culture can result in the depersonalization of language from its speaker. For example, Ana, an SP reading instructor (a "bridge course" with a greater focus on culture) reported that for a writing assignment on the subject of immigration, three students wrote essays, "con una actitud absolutamente de odio hacia los inmigrantes. *with a tone of absolute hatred toward immigrants*." She stated that she did not understand why the students were in the class, and that she thought that either someone wrote the compositions for them, "o para ellos debe ser una tragedia estar en una clase de español donde se habla español siempre.*or it must be terrible for them to be in a Spanish class where Spanish is spoken all of the time*." I interpret this type of incident as at least partially influenced by the decontextualization and therefore, depersonalization of language which is caused by the formalist way language is separated from culture in the curriculum.

Based on these findings and in light of the current calls for curricular reform for foreign language programs, I recommend that future research further examine possibilities for reform of the traditional two-tier structure. These studies should

carefully assess the objectives and understandings of the students within the local context in relationship to the program objectives. Also, further research and assessment of reimagining culture's place in the curriculum as well as redefining the relationship between language and culture is necessary. Furthermore, given the disconnect between participants interpretations of students' characteristics and behaviors and the students' self-perceptions, future research should focus on students' expectations and understandings of their language learning experiences.

Implications and Recommendations for Second Languages

The findings of this study also have many implications for second language studies, in particular Intensive English Program (IEP) settings in universities. Comparing an IEP with a foreign language program revealed that both contexts had more in common than popular and professional assumptions reflect, although foreign languages are more frequently criticized and viewed as in need of reform. Aside from an overall tone of the SP as more unsuccessful and problematic than the ELP, participants also reported that the Foreign Language Department was planning to restructure the curriculum of the SP (and all other foreign languages) whereas there were no plans for reform for the ELP. In general, participants found no reason for reform. Ellen, the assistant director of the ELP, stated, "In the past eleven years the courses have remained about the same. There's not much you can do [beyond] grammar, vocabulary, reading, writing, and communication skills." This comment exemplifies what I found to be a general understanding that the integrated skills-content curriculum at the ELP was not in need of reform.

The perception that the organization and practices in general in the ELP did not need to be reconstructed in any way reflects popular and professional discourses on SL

and FL contexts similar to the one that I cited regarding culture instruction: SL contexts are more authentic learning environments, with students that are more interested and motivated and are therefore, more successful learning environments in comparison with FL programs. As an educator in both contexts, I am familiar with these views, which I outlined earlier in the history of teaching both English and Spanish in the United States. However, the contradictions between interpretations and practices in the ELP in the current study indicate a need for a more critical examination of the curricular organization and methods in IEP settings, especially concerning how culture and cultural instruction are defined.

Based on the findings of the current study, I recommend research be conducted with a more critical focus on the curricula and methods of ESL settings, in particular IEPs. More studies should be conducted that analyze and assess the practices of cultural teaching and the definition of culture in IEP with the goal of refining the objectives of teaching culture and redefining culture's place in the curriculum, similar to studies in foreign languages that have answered the calls for curricular reform. In fact, based on the insight I gained from my analysis using FL professional literature, I recommend future research employ proposals such as the 2007 MLA report as a guide for the investigations. Finally, I suggest further research on the relationship between societal discourses on culture, multiculturalism, and diversity, as well as the effect that diversity initiatives in higher education have on the conceptualization of culture in the IEP curriculum.

Implications and Recommendations for Second Language Acquisition

Finally, the findings of the current study implicate the need for more cross-disciplinary research is second language acquisition (SLA). This dissertation attempts to

answer a call for examining the complexities of language learning contexts that has largely been overlooked within the field. I found that by conducting a comparative analysis I gained a more complete understanding of the assumptions and discourses at work in both settings and that I was able to observe the contradictions between perceptions and practices that suggest ways in which these assumptions can be limiting. This comparison afforded me the opportunity to step outside of the discourse of each individual field and question practices from alternative perspectives, which I would not have been able to do so extensively by analyzing each program within the professional literature of its own field. For example, I would not have interpreted the practices related to teaching culture in the ELP within the context of the calls for curricular reform in foreign languages had I examined culture in this context individually.

The current study also has implications for continued research with a discourse analytical focus within the field of SLA. Investigations on the local and societal discourses that influence our perceptions of classroom contexts increase our understanding of how social factors shape language teaching and learning. The findings in this study point to the need to continue to conduct research that incorporates the social into SLA studies and does not focus solely on cognitive aspects, in order to gain a more complete understanding of the complex combination of factors that influence second language teaching and learning.

Based on the findings of this study, I recommend that further research be conducted to continue to explore the ways in not only language learning is constructed in both contexts, but also language learners. One of the findings of this research that has had the greatest impact on me was how the ways in which we construct and understand

student identity affect our understanding of language teaching as well as our practices. These findings support research such as that conducted by Wortham (2006) who asserts that the ways in which we label and identify students has a direct relationship curricular organization and teaching practices. He explains that the tendency to understand learning as occurring within the mind alone and as separate from social experiences such as that of identity formation limits our understanding of how learning is constructed within institutional settings. Following Wortham (2006) and studies like those conducted by Kearney (2008) in conjunction with the findings on discourses of student identity in this study, I suggest further research on the ways in which we construct student identities in institutional settings in SLA influence our teaching practices and students' learning experience.

To conclude, the findings of this study that demonstrate how assumptions about students' characteristics and behaviors greatly influenced my understanding of the direction future research should take, especially concerning students in both contexts. I found that the construction of generalized student identities and interpretations of their behaviors based on contextual assumptions failed to capture the complex dimensions of students motivations and experiences regarding the language they are studying.

In her recent examination of the complex relationships individuals have with the languages the speak, Claire Kramsch (2009) calls to make a more concerted effort to include subjective and socially contextualized experiences in applied linguistic research and language teaching contexts. She addresses the disconnect between the ways in which language instruction is presented as a formal construct that "strives to develop communicative competence as exchange of information and the fulfillment of

communicative tasks" (p. 3). She then states, "Yet, below the radar of tasks and exercises, the students discovers in and through the foreign language subjectivities that will shape their lives in unpredictable ways "(p. 3). Based on the findings of the current study, in conjunction with recent changes in technology that blur the physical boundaries of language-learning settings, I have begun to wonder if, in order to address the "complexities of context" the "contexts" themselves should not be the focus, but rather the complexities of the experiences of the learners within each context should be address. I say this for the following reasons. First, the findings in this study show that understandings of the traditional definition of the differences between second and foreign language settings influence perceptions of individual language learners and the contexts themselves. These preconceived notions limit interpretations of behaviors and practices and therefore limit understandings of what could be possible when considering curricular development or reform.

Take, for example, the contradiction between assumptions on cultural immersion in an SL setting and the practices of cultural sharing among ELP students. In the case of the ELP, the most prevalent form of cultural instruction did not include experiences within the target culture at all, contradicting the most widespread assumption about culture instruction in a second language context. This contradiction indicates that, at best, assumptions based on traditional definitions of SL/FL contexts can indicate *potential* experiences for students. However, the possibility of interactions based on *what* and *who* are located outside of the classroom does not determine that there is any connection with what is happening inside of the classroom. Furthermore, because of recent technological advances that make communication possible across geographical

boundaries, assumptions about potential types of interaction based on the traditional definitions of second and foreign language contexts do not reflect the current reality, since interaction with speakers of the target language within the classroom is now possible regardless of the community located outside of the classroom walls.

In addition to the limitations based on traditional understandings of context, teaching culture and language as separate entities also indicates the need to include personal experiences and focus on the subjectivities related to language learning that Kramsch (2009) discusses. The findings of the current study demonstrate the need to begin to reconceptualize the relationship between language and culture within the curriculum and critically examine how this change will inform practices in both English and Spanish language learning settings. Recognizing and incorporating students' and other language learners' experiences outside of the classroom can be one way to "re-personalize" and therefore recontextualize language as social interaction. For the ELP, instead of sharing their experiences of "their culture" and reflect on practices and interactions they had in "their country" that do not pertain to their current environments, discussions could focus more on students' current interactions and changing perspectives and identities rather on past and generalized experiences and customs. For SP students, incorporating more open discussions of how learning Spanish realistically with their lives and making connections with experiences they already have, as well as acknowledging their questions which, for the lower division students in particular, would mean changing the "Spanish only" classroom rules. Instructors could interpret "acts of resistance" as opportunities to open up these types of dialogues.

The generalizing and contradictory nature of the participants' interpretations of student goals and behaviors also suggests the need to recognize individual experiences with language in the classroom. The students that I interviewed for the current study all demonstrated that their goals, attitudes, and behaviors toward language learning as fluid and multi-dimensional, and influenced by a combination of contextual, emotional, and experiential factors. Also as Kramsch (2009) illustrates and as the current findings suggest, students are aware of the social complexities related to language learning. She states, "We are fooling ourselves if we believe that students learn only what they are taught" (2009, p. 4). By "what they are taught" Kramsch means language as subject, as a cognitive function through which messages and information are conveyed, a decontextualized, depersonalized entity that is separated from history, social relationships and interactions. These observations, in light of the findings of this study, suggest a pressing need to reform language teaching curricula and practices that present language as subject, the need to not only recontextualize language within social discourse and personal experiences, but also recognize students' understanding of these phenomena.

To conclude, the findings of my dissertation research have significantly influenced my interpretations and practices teaching English and Spanish at the university level. I now have a greater understanding of how professional histories and discourses interact with social discourses surrounding both languages in order to influence perceptions and assumptions of teaching and learning in both contexts. Comparing the two contexts has shifted my perspective and has allowed me to step outside of the discourses of each field. As a result, I have expanded my understanding of what is possible in both classroom contexts. I have also begun a more critical

examination of my teaching practices, paying particular attention to reforming the ways in which I present language in a decontextualized manner. I have made a concerted effort to include social discourses, history, and learners' experiences into the classroom, and I plan to conduct future research in this area in order to develop ways to reform curricular organization and teaching practices.

References

Allen, H. B. (1967). TESOL and the journal. *TESOL Quarterly, 1*(1), 3-6.

American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portugues (2003). *History of the AATSP*. from https://www.aatsp.org/scriptcontent/custom/members/01_about/history.cfm

Auerbach, E., (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*(1), 8-31.

Auerbach, E., & Burgess, D. (1985). The hidden curriculum of survival ESL. *TESOL Quarterly, 19* (3), 475-496.

Baron, D. (1990). *The English-only question: An official language for Americans?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Berns, M. (1990). 'Second' and 'foreign' in second language acquisition/foreign language learning: A sociolinguistic perspective. In B. VanPatten & J. F. Lee (Eds.), *Second language acquisition/foreign language learning*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Block, D. (2003). *The social turn in second language acquisition*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Byram, K., & Kramsch, C. (2008). Why is it so difficult to teach language as culture? *The German Quarterly, 81*(1), 20-34.

Byrnes, H. (2002). Language and culture: Shall the twain ever meet in foreign language departments? *ADFL Bulletin, 33*(2), 25-32.

Byrnes, H. (2001). Reconsiderting graduate students' education as teachers: "It takes a department!". *The Modern Language Journal*, *58*, 512-530.

Canagarajah, A. S. (2006). TESOL at forty: What are the issues? *TESOL Quarterly*, *40*(1), 9-34.

Carlson, R. A. (1970). Americanization as an early twentieth-century Adult education movement. *History of Education Quarterly, 10*, 440-464.

Castellanos, D. (1992). A polyglot nation. In J. Crawford (Ed.), *Language loyalties: A source book on the official English controversy* (pp. 13-17). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cavanaugh, M. P. (1996). History of teaching English as a second language. *English Journal, 85*, 40-44.

Cook, W. (1884). The selection, which every teacher of a modern language should make, of subjects to teach. *Modern Language Association of America Proceedings*, *1*, xv-xx.

Crawford, J. (1992). *Language loyalties: A source book on the official English controversy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Darian, S. G. (1972). *English as a foreign language: History, developments, and methods of teaching.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Dicker, S. J. (2003). *Languages in America: A pluralist view* (2nd ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

English Plus Information Clearinghouse. (1987). *English plus movement: Statement of purpose and core beliefs.* From http://www.massenglishplus.org/mep/engplus.html

Espinosa, A. M. (1921). On the teaching of Spanish. *Hispania, 4*(6), 269-284.

Espinosa, J. E. (1934). The teacher of Spanish in the present order. *Hispania, 17*(2), 139-144.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Essex, UK: Longman.

Fernandez, J. D. (2000). Fragments of the past, tasks for the future: Spanish in the United States. *PMLA, 115*(7), 1961-1964.

Foucault, M. (1987). *Mental illness and Psychology*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2001). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gee, J. P., & Green, J. L. (1998). Discourse analysis, learning, and social practice: A methodological study. *Review of Research in Education, 23*, 119-169.

Gonzalez, C. (1996). Spanish is not a foreign language. *PMLA, Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 111* (3), p. 475-476.

Graff, H. (2001). The nineteenth-century origins of our times. In E. Cushman, E. R. Kintgen, B. M. Kroll & M. Rose (Eds.), *Literacy: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 211-233). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Graham, L.J. (2005, November). *Discourse analysis and the critical use of Foucault*. Australian Association for Research in Education 2005 Annual Conference, Sydney, Australia

Harklau, L. (2000). From the "good kids" to the "worst": Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(1), 35-67.

Hill, J. (2008). *The everyday language of white racism*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hill, R. A. (2003). *The articulation of novice foreign language teacher needs in relation to teaching contexts and discourse about languages and language learners.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Utah.

Hills, E. C. (1923). Should Spanish be taught in the high schools? *Hispania, 6*(3), 131 147.

Honsa, V. (1960). Teaching of Spanish as a foreign language in the XVII century. *Hispania, 43*(3), 343-346.

Jiménez, M. (1992). The educational rights of language-minority children. In J. Crawford (Ed.), *Language loyalties: A sourcebook on the official English controversy* (pp. 243-250). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, K., & Johnson, H. (Eds.). (1998). *Encyclopedic dictionary of applied linguistics: A handbook for language teaching*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Judd, E. L. (1987). The English language amendment: A case study on language and politics. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*(1), 113-136.

Kearney, E. (2008). Culture learning in a changed world: Student perspectives. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education, 4*(1), 62-82.

Kelm, O. R. (2000). Report on the national forum on the future of Spanish departments on college and university campuses. *Hispania, 83*(3), 521-530.

Korman, G. (1965). Americanization at the factory gate. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 18,* 396-419.

Kramsch, C. (1991). Culture in language learning: A view from the United States. In R. B. G. Kees de Bot, Claire Kramsch (Ed.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 217-240). Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins.

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (2009). *The multilingual subject*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Leavitt, S. E. (1961). The teaching of Spanish in the United States. *Hispania, 44*(4), 591-625.

Leeman, J. (2007). The value of Spanish: Shifting ideologies in US language teaching. *ADFL Bulletin, 38*(1-2), 32-39.

Leeman, J. & Martinez, G. (2007). From identity to commodity: Discourses of Spanish in heritage language textbooks. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 4*(1), 35-65.

Long, D. R. (1999). Methodology and the teaching of Spanish in the twentieth century:

Retrospective and bibliography. *Hispania, 82*(3), 383-396.

Marckwardt, A. H. (1963). Training the Peace Corps for English training abroad. *The Modern Language Journal, 47*, 310-314.

Matsuda, P. K. (2006). Second-language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. In P. K. Matsuda, M. Cox, J. Jordan & C. Ortmeier-Hooper (Eds.), *Second-language writing in the composition classroom: A critical sourcebook* (pp. 14-30). Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

McCuaig, W. D. (1940). A reconsideration of the teaching of Spanish on the undergraduate level. *The Modern Language Journal, 25*(2), 108-112.

McDermott, R., Goldman, S., & Varenne, H. (2006). The cultural work of learning disabilities. *Educational Researcher, 35*(6), 12-17.

McKendree, P. (1942). Reflections on the prospects of another Spanish boom. *The Modern Language Journal, 26*(4), 288-291.

Mead, R. (1981). La imagen pública y profesional del español en Yanquilandia--Y como mejorarla. *Hispania 64*(1), 91-96.

Mehan, H. (1996). The construction of an LD student: A case study in the politics of representation. In M. Silverstein & G. Urban (Eds.), *Natural histories of discourse*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

MLA Ad Hoc Committee on Foreign Languages (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. *Modern Language Association*.

Modern Language Association. (2004). About the MLA. From http://www.mla.org/about

Nayar, P. B. (1997). ESL/EFL dichotomy today: Language politics or pragmatics? *TESOL Quarterly, 31*(1), 9-37.

Nicolau, S., & Valdivieso, R. (1988). Spanish Language Shift: Educational Implications. In J. Crawford (Ed.), *Language loyalties: A sourcebook on the official English controversy* (pp. 317-321). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Oliver, D., Serovich, J., & Mason, T. (2005). Constraints and opportunities with interview transcription: Towards reflection in qualitative research, *Social Forces*, 84 (2), 1273-1289.

O'Rourke, B. (1998). *Meanings and practices of literacy in urban settlement communities: Chicago's Hull House, 1890-1940*. (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Perdue University.

Ortega, L. (2010 March). *The bilingual turn in SLA*. Paper presented at the American Association for Applied Linguistics.

Oxford, R. (1999). Educating the educators: The standards and eighty-one years of Hispania. *Hispania, 82*(2), 293-297.

Oxford, R. (2008). Preparing language teachers in the midst of a perfect storm: Reflections on reform. *Hispania, 91*(1), 52-58.

Pavlenko, A. (2002). 'We have room for but one language here': Language and national identity in the US at the turn of the 20th century. *Multilingua, 21*, 163-196.

Pavlenko, A. (2003). 'Language of the enemy': Foreign language education and national identity. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 6*(5), 313-331.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic Iimperialism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Pomerantz, A. (2002). Language ideologies and the production of identities: Spanish as a resource for participation in a multilingual marketplace. *Multilingua, 21*, 275-302.

Pomerantz, A. (2010). Speaking Spanish outside of the foreign language classroom: An analysis of learner narratives. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 7*(1), 1-27.

Reyner, J. (1992). Policies toward American Indian languages: A historical sketch. In J. Crawford (Ed.), *Language loyalties: A sourcebook on the official English controversy* (pp. 41-46). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Richards, J., Platt, J., & Weber, H. (1985). *The Longman dictionary of applied linguistics*. Essex, UK: Longman Group.

Roberts, G. B. (1942). Will the current interest in Spanish last? *Hispania, 25*(4), 453-456.

Roca, A., & Colombi, M. C. (Eds.). (2003). *Mi lengua: Spanish as a heritage language in the United States, research and practice*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Schrier, L. L. (2008). Finding comfort with the complexities of change: Introduction to the issue--Meeting the challenges of the new century: Issues in policy, planning and practice. *Hispania, 91*(1), 1-3.

Schwartz, A. (2008). Their language, our Spanish: Introducing public discourses of 'Gringoism' as racializing linguistic and cultural reappropriation. *Spanish in Context, 5*(2), 224-245.

Shannon, S. M. (1999). Language rights or language privileges? *TESOL Journal, 8*, 23-28.

Spell, J. R. (1927). Spanish teaching in the United States. *Hispania, 10*, 141-159.

Tedick, D. J., & Walker, C. L. (1994). Second language teacher education: The problems that plague us. *The Modern Language Journal*, *78*(3), 300-312.

Thomas, L. (1996). Language as power: A linguistic critique of U.S. English. *The Modern Language Journal, 80*, 131-139.

Torres, L. (1990). Spanish in the United States: The struggle for legitimacy. In J. J. Bergen (Ed.), *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic issues* (pp. 142-151). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Umphrey, G. P. (1932). The place of Spanish America in the teaching of Spanish. *Hispania, 15*, 367-372.

U.S. Government (2003). Language use and English-speaking ability: 2000. From: http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/c2kbr-29.pdf

Valdés, G. (2003). Foreword. In A. Roca & M. C. Colombi (Eds.), *Mi lengua: Spanish as a heritage language in the United States, research and practice* (pp. vii-x). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Valdés, G. (1995). The teaching of minority languages as academic subjects: theoretical challenges. *The Modern Language Journal*, *79*(3), 299-328.

VanPatten, B. (1990). Theory and research in second language acquisition and foreign language learning: On producers and consumers. In B. VanPatten & J. F. Lee (Eds.), *Second language acquisition/foreign language learning* (pp. 17-26). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

VanPatten, B., & Lee, J. F. (Eds.). (1990). *Second language acquisition/foreign language learning*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Watzke, J. L. (2003). *Lasting change in foreign language education: A historical case for change in national policy*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Widdowson, H. G. (1995). Discourse analysis: A critical view. *Language and Literature, 4*(3), 157-172.

Wilkins, L. A. (1917). On the threshold. *Hispania, 1*(Organization Number), 1-10.

Wortham, S. (2006). *Learning identity: The joint emergence of social identification and academic learning*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Appendices

Appendix A: Overview of Dissertation Project

Nicole M Houser, Doctoral Candidate, English Composition & TESOL
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Project Title: A Comparison of University Spanish and English Second Language Programs

Purpose of study

In the United States, Spanish and English have traditionally been categorized as "foreign" and "second" languages, respectively, leading to a professional division in both teaching contexts. At the university level, Spanish is predominantly taught and located in foreign language and education departments and English as a second language as a subset of the linguistics, and/or English departments. In the overarching field of Second language acquisition studies, these two language teaching contexts are often researched and discussed separately. The purpose of this study is to examine and compare both Spanish and English teaching contexts in detail in an effort to bridge traditional disciplinary divides, and to put into question the theoretical division of "second" and "foreign" languages, by taking into account the social, historical, and political factors related to this terminology.

Research Questions

1. What discourses are circulating within and through English and Spanish L2 teaching contexts?
2. How do these discourses shape and get shaped by particular institutional practices?
3. How are these discourses appropriated, taken up, or resisted by individuals within the Spanish and English departments of a particular institution?

Methods

Participants: Participants will include faculty, administrators, and students in the Intensive English Program and the Spanish department, or, if applicable, instructors and/or administrators for both departments.

Data collection

Documents: I plan to collect various departmental and university documents including web site information, current and past course catalogues and program descriptions, as well as class documents such as syllabi, handouts, quizzes, exams, course packets and textbooks.

Interviews: I will conduct an initial background interview and at least one follow-up interview with all participating instructors, administrators, and students. As the research process progresses, I will decide to conduct additional interviews with select participants, based on class observations and/or the need to clarify or explore information from the follow-up interview. All interviews will be tape-recorded and transcribed. An example of the framework for an initial background interview is attached to this document.

Classroom observation: I will conduct at least one day of classroom observation with each participating instructor. I may ask to return to certain instructors' classrooms as the investigation continues and I feel it necessary to observe more than one session. Classroom observations will be tape-recorded and transcribed and field notes will be taken during each session.

Appendix B: Framework for Instructor Interview

I. Background Information

- Name, age, education
- Language courses taught, level, where have you taught?
- Where do you currently teach and what do you currently teach?
- Describe classroom environment now where-who are students-how many students

II. Instruction

- Do you follow a specific methodology?
- Do you use a textbook? What type of methodology does the textbook follow?
- Do you choose or is there a curriculum for the department?
- What type of activities do students do in class?
- Why do you choose those activities?
- Describe the last class you taught (or typical class)

III. Culture

- How do you teach culture (or incorporate cultural themes) in your classroom?
- Give an example of a cultural lesson
- What culture do you teach?
- How do you view your students' perceptions/attitudes on learning about cultural themes?

IV. Class and student expectations

- What are your objectives for a semester in you class?
- What expectations do you have for your students?
- How do you perceive you students' motivation?
- What motivates them? Examples?
- How do you perceive student interest and involvement in your class? Examples?

For participants who teach/have taught both ESL and Spanish

- How do your Spanish classes differ from ESL in
  --Activities/methodology
  --Student goals/motivation
  --Culture-teaching and students' reactions/interest/perceptions
  Examples?

Appendix C: Framework for Student Interview

I. Background Information

- Name, age, education
- Language courses taken, level, where taken?
- Current languages and language courses?
- Experience with the language both in and outside of the classroom- where, and in what context(s) do you use the language
- Describe classroom environment now where-who are students-how many students

II. Motivation and Objectives

- What is your motivation for taking this course?
- What are your goals and objectives for taking this course? (personal and academic)
- Do you plan on taking courses in this language in the future? Why? Why not?
- How do you see your goals in relationship with the goals of the course?

III. Classroom experiences

- What types of activities do you do in your class?
- Describe what you consider to be a "typical day" in this class?
- How would you describe your interest and involvement in the classroom activities? Why?
- How do your classroom experiences in this class compare with past class experiences? (ex: type of activities, textbook, interaction, environment)
- How does your interest and involvement in this course compare with past experiences? Why?

IV. Culture

- In what ways do you learn about culture?
- What are your perceptions/attitudes about learning culture?

V. Future goals, language use

- In what context(s) do you believe you will be using the language in the future? Why?
- If you do not anticipate continued study of the language and/or using the language in the future, why?

Appendix D: Framework for Initial Administrator Interview

Background Information

- Education
- Administrative position, years in this position
- Duties
- Courses taught currently
- Previous positions in department

Goals and Objectives

- What do you see as the main goals/objectives of the department currently?
- Rationale behind objectives
- Goals of students and how they relate to the goals of instructors, university
- How have these goals changed over the years (from personal observation as well information from other sources)
- Projections as to how these goals may change in the future? Why?

Departmental Relationships and History

- At this university, what is the current relationship between the Spanish program and the Intensive English Program?
  -Ex: Institutional- What is there institutional relationship
  Academic- Scholarship from faculty- collaborative, separate? Student populations within department separate or overlap?
  Working relationships among faculty and students in both departments?

- What do you know about the past relationship between these two programs?
- How has the relationship changed?
- Reasons for these changes?
- What do you see as the future relationship between these two departments?
- Reasons?
- Past, present and future similarities and differences between departments

Appendix E: Informed Consent Form

A Comparison of University Spanish and English Second Language Programs

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Nicole Houser, a doctoral candidate in English Composition & TESOL at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. The following information is provided in order to help you make an informed decision whether or not to participate. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to ask. You are eligible to participate in this study because you are a university administrator and/or instructor of Spanish and/or English as a second language.

The purpose of this study is to thoroughly examine and compare the contexts of teaching English and Spanish as second languages at a university. In order to do this, I will be conducting interviews with administrators, instructors, and students within each department. I also intend to conduct classroom observations.

Interviews

For administrators and instructors, there will be an initial interview that will not last more than 90 minutes. There may possibly be one (1) follow-up interview that will last no longer than 60 minutes. These interviews will be audio taped and transcribed. Administrator interviews will include questions concerning the history, current and future goals of the Spanish or English program. Questions will also address the relationship between the programs currently, as well as in the past, if known. For instructor interviews, I will ask questions concerning methods of instruction, goals and objectives of the class, and perceived student goals and motivation.

Classroom Observation

Instructors will also have the option to participate in classroom observation. If you agree to this part of the study, I will visit one (1) to no more than three (3) classroom sessions. I will be examining various aspects of the classroom, including physical setting, class activities, participant interactions, language used, as well as non verbal communication. These sessions will be audio taped and later transcribed. I will also take field notes during the class period. As compensation, I will assist in any classroom activities according to the request of the individual instructor.

There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research. All participants will receive copies of both interview and where applicable, classroom observation transcripts, in order to check for accuracy of representation. Participants will also be given the option of withdrawing comments.

Participation in this study is strictly voluntary. You are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with me. If you choose to participate, you may withdraw at any time by notifying the Project Director, Dr. Sharon Deckert, or me. Upon your request to withdraw, I will destroy all information pertaining to you. If you choose to participate, all information will be kept

strictly confidential. Pseudonyms will be used and all identifying characteristics of the university and individuals will be omitted from reports of the research findings.

If you would like further information about this project or if you have any questions you may contact me or the project director, Dr. Sharon Deckert.

Researcher: Nicole Houser, PhD candidate, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
215 Fine Arts Building
Frostburg State University
Frostburg, MD 21532
(301) 687- 4108 (office), (240) 727-7207 (home)
n.m.houser@iup.edu

Project director: Dr. Sharon Deckert
Leonard Hall 110
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, PA 15701
(724) 357-2261

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone 724-357-7730).

Researcher's Copy

VOLUNTARY CONSENT FORM:

I have read and understand the information on the form and I consent to volunteer to be a subject in this study. I understand that my responses are completely confidential and that I have the right to withdraw at any time. I have received an unsigned copy of this informed consent form to keep in my possession.

INSTRUCTORS ONLY: I agree to take part in (check below):

____Interview(s)
____Classroom observation

Name (please print):

_____

Signature:_____
_____

Date: _____ Phone where you can be reached:_____

Best days and times to reach you:

_____
____

I certify that I have explained to the above individual the nature and purpose, the potential benefits, and possible risks associated with participating in this research study, have answered any questions that have been raised, and have witnessed the above signature.

Date: _____ Investigator's signature:_____

Appendix F: Informed Consent Form

A Comparison of University Spanish and English Second Language Programs

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted by Nicole Houser, a doctoral candidate in English Composition & TESOL at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. The following information is provided in order to help you make an informed decision whether or not to participate. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to ask. You are eligible to participate in this study because you are a student of Spanish or English as a second language in a classroom that I have chosen to observe.

The purpose of this study is to thoroughly examine and compare the contexts of teaching English and Spanish as second languages at a university. In order to do this, part of my research study includes classroom observation and student interviews. You may choose to participate in either or both of these activities. A description of each of these parts follows, so that you may make an informed decision as to whether or not you want to participate.

Classroom observation

I will observe one (1) to three (3) sessions of your class, during which, I will pay particular attention to the physical setting of the classroom, class activities, participant interactions, language used, as well as non verbal communication. Classroom observations will be tape-recorded and transcribed, and field notes will be taken during each session. The notes I take during my observations and the transcripts which result from my recordings of the class will in no way influence your grade. If you choose not to participate in the classroom observation part of this study, I will omit you from all transcripts and field notes. For those students who agree to participate, I will be using pseudonyms in these transcripts and notes in order to protect your privacy.

Interviews

In the interview, I will ask you to discuss your goals for learning Spanish or English, and to describe your experiences learning Spanish or English in the past as well as in the class you are currently taking. There will be an initial interview that will not last more than 60 minutes. There may possibly be one (1) follow-up interview that will last no longer than 30 minutes. These interviews will be audio taped and transcribed. After I transcribe the interview, I will provide you with a copy of the transcript, so that you may check for accuracy of representation and clarify any information you have provided. You will also be given the option of withdrawing comments if you wish to do so.

There are no known risks or discomforts associated with this research. Participation in this study is strictly voluntary. You are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time without adversely affecting your relationship with me. If you choose to participate, you may withdraw at any time by notifying the Project Director, Dr. Nancy Bell, or me. Upon your request to withdraw, I will destroy all information pertaining to you. If you choose to participate, all information will be kept strictly

confidential. Pseudonyms will be used and all identifying characteristics of the university and individuals will be omitted from reports of the research findings.

If you would like further information about this project or if you have any questions you may contact me or the project director, Dr. Nancy Bell.

Researcher: Nicole Houser, PhD candidate, Indiana University of Pennsylvania
214 Fine Arts Building
Frostburg State University
Frostburg, MD 21532
(301) 687- 4108 (office), (240) 727-7207 (home)
n.m.houser@iup.edu

Project director: Dr. Nancy Bell
215 C Leonard Hall
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Indiana, PA 15701
(724) 357-4935

This project has been approved by the Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (Phone 724-357-7730).

VOLUNTARY CONSENT FORM:

I have read and understand the information on the form and I consent to volunteer to be a subject in this study. I understand that my responses are completely confidential and that I have the right to withdraw at any time. I have received an unsigned copy of this informed consent form to keep in my possession.

INSTRUCTORS ONLY: I agree to take part in (check below):

- ○ Interview(s)
- ○ Classroom observation

Name *(please print):*
_____

Signature:_____

Date: _____
Phone where you can be reached:_____

Best days and times to reach you:
_____

I certify that I have explained to the above individual the nature and purpose, the potential benefits, and possible risks associated with participating in this research study, have answered any questions that have been raised, and have witnessed the above signature.

Date: _____

Investigator's signature:_____

Appendix G: Table G1 English Language Program Curriculum

	***Beginning*----------→----------*Intermediate*----------→----------*Advanced*----------→**				
Group Name	**White A**	**White B**	**Red A**	**Red B**	**ESL Credit Courses**
Required Courses *Offered Every Session*	Vocabulary Reading Writing Communication Skills Grammar	Vocabulary Reading Writing Communication Skills Grammar	Vocabulary Reading Writing Communication Skills Grammar	Vocabulary Reading Writing Communication Skills Grammar	ESL 100: Academic Reading & Writing ESL 200: Research & Writing ESL 250: Speaking & Listening ESL 300: ITA Fluency
Elective Courses *Vary Every Session*	American Culture Debate English Through Art English Through Drama Pronunciation				

Appendix H: Table H1 Spanish Program Curriculum

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6">Beginning----------→----------Intermediate----------→----------Advanced----------→</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Lower Division</td><td colspan="2">Upper Division (not all courses listed)</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Completion of lower division fulfills language requirements of certain majors
All offered Every Session (Including Summer)</td><td>Bridge Courses
All offered Every 16-Week Semester</td><td>Advanced Courses
(Prerequisite of Bridge Courses)Vary Every Session</td></tr>
<tr><td>Spanish 100: Elementary Spanish 1</td><td>Spanish 150: Elementary Spanish 2</td><td>Spanish 200: Intermediate Spanish 1</td><td>Spanish 250: Intermediate Spanish 2</td><td rowspan="2">Spanish 300: Spanish Conversation

Spanish 301: Reading and Composition

Spanish 302: Advanced Grammar

Spanish 303: Advanced Reading and Composition</td><td rowspan="2">Spanish 320: Latin American Culture
Spanish 330: Early Spanish American Literature
Spanish 331: Modern Spanish American Literature
Spanish 350: Culture of Spain
Spanish 351: Early Literature of Spain
Spanish 400: Grammar Review
Spanish 450: Commercial Spanish I
Spanish 460: Issues in the Hispanic World</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Spanish 110: Intensive Elementary Spanish</td><td colspan="2">Spanish 210: Intensive Intermediate Spanish</td></tr>
</table>

Appendix I: Table I1 Participants: ELP Instructors

Name	Position	Languages Native (N), Spoken Daily (SD), Studied as (L2)	Educational Background	Teaching Background	Courses Taught at Time of Data Collection
Jennifer*	GTA at the ELP	English (N,SD) French (L2, SD), Arabic (L2), Japanese (L2), German (L2), Italian (L2)	K-12 U.S., Undergrad. Ancient History major, International Political Science minor	English as an (L2), 3 yrs. in U.S.	American Culture Elective (Red), Debate Elective (White)
Rachel	GTA at the ELP	English (N, SD), Spanish (L2, SD)	K-12 U.S, Undergrad. English Lit., Comm. minor, U.S.	English as an (L2) language in Mexico 1 yr., at SSU (1 yr.)	White B Reading, Red B Grammar, Red A Communication Skills
Jessica	GTA at the ELP	English (N, SD), Spanish (L2, SD)	K-12 U.S., Undergrad. Spanish, focus Latin American Lit., U.S.	English as an (L2) at SSU (1yr), Spanish as L2 in U.S. (6 yrs.)	ESL 200: Research and Writing ESL 250: Speaking and Listening
Paula	Contractual Instructor at the ELP	English (N, SD) Spanish (L2), French (L2)	K-12 U.S., Undergrad. Elem. Ed., Master's Library Science, U.S., MATESOL from SSU	English as an (L2) at SSU (7 yrs.)	White B Reading, Red B Vocabulary

Appendix J: Table J1 Participants: Spanish Instructors

Names	Position	Languages	Educational Background	Teaching Background	Courses Taught
Maite	GTA in Spanish Program	Spanish (N, SD) English (L2,SD) French (L2) Japanese (L2)	K-12 Spain, Undergrad. in English Linguistics, Spain	Spanish as (L2) at SSU (1 yr)	Spanish 250: Intermediate Span. 2
Silvia	GTA in the Spanish Program	Spanish (N, SD) English (L2, SD), French (L2) German (L2)	K-12 Spain, Undergrad Lit., Spain	Spanish as an (L2) at SSU (1 sem.)	Spanish 150: Elementary Span. 2
Laura	GTA in the Spanish Program	Spanish (N, SD) English(L2, SD)	K-12 Panama, Undergrad Finance, Panama, English course in Canada	Spanish as an (L2) at SSU 3 yrs	Spanish 200: Intermediate Span. 1
Ana	Contractual Instructor in the Spanish Program	Spanish (N,SD) English (L2,SD)	K-12 Dominican Republic, Undergrad. in history, D.R., Master's Spanish/ Latin Amer. Literature, U.S.	History in D.R., Span. as an (L2)at SSU 20 yrs.	Span. 301: Reading and Comp. Span. 303: Advanced Reading and Comp.
Jessica	GTA in the Spanish Program	English (N, SD) Spanish (L2,SD)	K-12, U.S., Undergrad. Span.: Latin Am. Lit., U.S.	English a (L2) at SSU (1 yr.), Span. as (L2) in U.S.(6 yrs)	Spanish 100: Elem. Span. 1* Span. 150: Elem. Span. 2*

Appendix K: Table K1 Participants: ELP Students

Name	Languages	Educational Background	Area of Study/Profession	Courses Taken at Time of Data Collection
Mai	Japanese (N,SD),English (L2, SD)	K-11 in Japan, 1 year of high school in U.S	Plans to study nursing at SSU	Red B Reading, Grammar, Communication Skills, TOEFL, American Culture Elective, Credit Writing
Haruna	Japanese (N, SD) English (L2, SD)	K-12 in Japan Medical School and Residency in Japan	Medical Doctor, Specialist in Anesthesiology	Red B Reading, Communication Skills, Vocabulary, Debate Elective, Credit Writing
Atsushi	Japanese (N,SD) English (L2, SD) Arabic (L2)	Undergraduate degree in Policy Management completed in Japan	Employee at Japanese company	Red B Reading, Communication Skills, Vocabulary, Credit Writing

Appendix L: Table L1 Participants: Spanish Students

Name	Languages	Educational Background	Area of Study/Profession	Courses Taken at Time of Data Collection
Sarah	English (N, SD) Spanish (L2)	K-12 southeast U.S., 3rd year at SSU	Broadcast Journalism major, Spanish minor	Spanish 250: Intermediate Spanish 2
Crystal	English (N, SD) Spanish (L2)	K-12 southeast U.S., 1.5 years at branch of SSU, 1.5 years at SSU	Sociology Major, Concentration in Social Justice, Religious Studies minor	Spanish 200: Intermediate Spanish 2
Rachel	English (N, SD), Spanish (L2, SD)	K-12 U.S, Undergrad. English Lit., communications minor, U.S	GTA at ELP	Spanish 250, Structure of Spanish Graduate Course
Paula*	English (N, SD) Spanish (L2) French (L2)	K-12 U.S., Undergrad. Elementary Education, Master's Library Science, U.S., MATESOL from SSU	GTA at ELP	Spanish 100, 150, 200, 250

Appendix M: Table M1 Participants: Administrators

Name	Administrative Position(s)	Educational Background	Administrative Duties	Departmental Duties
Dr. Charles Green	Chair of Foreign Language Department	B.A. in German and Political Science, M.A. Comparative Literature, Ph.D. English Literature (all in U.S.)	Oversees department's budget, course scheduling and curriculum, personnel evaluations and hiring	None (*teaches Victorian Literature and Gender Studies in English department*)
Dr. Gail Nelson	Associate Chair of Foreign Language Department and Graduate Coordinator of Foreign Language	B.A. in Spanish, minor in linguistics, M.A. in English as a Foreign Language, Ph.D. in Linguistics, Second language acquisition focus, all in U.S.	In charge of undergraduate/ graduate course scheduling, and undergrad. student placement in FL courses. As Graduate Coordinator, she advises graduate students, schedules, processes all grads student paperwork and comprehensive exams.	Teaches undergraduate and graduate courses in linguistics, L2 theory and methods
Ellen	Assistant Director of the English Language Program	B.S. in Political Science, MATESOL from SSU	Coordinates the teachers' schedules, conducts teacher meetings, organizes and evaluates teacher portfolios and files, and oversees all student testing	Teaches one ELP class per semester

Appendix N: Transcription Conventions

(pause)	Pause in speech
=	Overlapping
(( ))	Indicates laugher or non-speech reactions
CAPS	Emphasis
[ ]	Latching