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ABSTRACT

This field project seeks marry students’ desire for classroom collaboration with a shift to student-centered instruction. It demonstrates how such collaboration can increase student engagement and motivation while lowering their anxiety and inhibitions toward foreign language learning. Potential opportunities for cross-curricular collaboration are also highlighted to better satisfy students' academic and emotional needs. This project includes an interest-based language acquisition manual designed to elicit an authentic exchange of language and culture between ESL/FL students working in pairs.

Nearly 20% of the entire LHS student body, accounting for the struggles of ELL students – low graduation rate and high chronic absenteeism rate – and FL students -increase in plagiarism, less than 3% of students qualifying for the California State Seal of Biliteracy - enrolled at Liberty High School (LHS, Brentwood, Contra Costa Country, CA), and drawing on the experience that I have in working with both student populations, it is evidently clear that collaboration between the English Language Development and Foreign Languages departments and their respective groups of students can effectively, and economically, address the affective factors - anxiety, low level of motivation, low level of engagement - that greatly determine ELL and FL students’ academic achievement, and can serve as a catalyst in the overall improvement of our school as a safe and inclusive institution for higher learning.

Without a collaborative pedagogical framework and working partnership between ELD and FL faculty/students, both student populations continue to labor and struggle parallel and unbeknownst to one another. Consequently, it is imperative that we as teachers, and language educators in particular, come together to devise cross-curricular, student-centered instruction that
calls for increased peer-to-peer collaboration and cooperative learning strategies among and between both groups of students. Such cooperative-based learning will empower our students with agency to help one another achieve their respective personal and academic goals in second language acquisition, while affording them greater learner autonomy, thus holding them more accountable for their own education.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

On March 14th, 2018, nearly all of my high school students left our Intermediate Spanish class to organize in the main plaza in protest against school violence, and to demand that immediate action be taken by school officials, our greater community, and our local and national government. I took the opportunity to pause from our regular coursework to solicit students’ opinions on the issue of school violence and to provide them with a platform to voice their feelings. Of all the proposed solutions mentioned in both government and national media - arming teachers with guns, increased police presence on campus, increased mental health services, betters walls and fencing surrounding campus - I was both surprised and encouraged by my students’ proposition: increased collaboration among all students in hopes that it would yield greater respect for all students’ cultures, beliefs, and backgrounds.

Their heightened interest and engagement in our conversation, along with their insightful feedback and suggestions, prompted me to deeply reflect upon my educational philosophy and pedagogical approach. How could I marry my students’ demand for increased collaboration with a shift toward more student-centered instruction? How could such collaboration increase student engagement and motivation while lowering their anxiety and inhibitions toward foreign language learning? What opportunities for cross-curricular collaboration between the ELD and FL departments are there to service the academic and emotional needs of both populations of students? Most importantly, how would such cross-cultural cooperation transform our school into a more safe and inclusive learning environment for our students?
Despite all its linguistic, ethnic, and cultural diversity, America has become a country distinctly divided by what were once its most cherished attributes. An overly nationalistic view - in both linguistic and political terms - of our country and its role, or lack thereof, in global affairs has taken root underneath the veil of an increasingly ethnocentric, monocultural, and xenophobic socio-political landscape. One need look no further than the federal government’s travel ban (Wolf, *USA Today*, 2018) placed on predominantly-Muslim countries, the ideological clash (Liptak, *The New York Times*, 2018) between state and federal officials over the issue of illegal immigration, and the withdrawal of the United States (Stavins, *PBS Newshour Online*, 2017) from multinational trade agreements and international climate legislation.

The cultural isolationism and segregation that exists in many schools, neighborhoods, communities, and cities alike is attributable to the predominance of English as the primary – and in many cases only – language spoken within the public domain. Uniquely heterogeneous in race, language, and culture, many Americans today are regularly faced with an identity crisis in which they take upon multiple guises in order to appease standards set by the more dominant influencers of the public domain and discourse. The topic of the conversation, to whom we are talking, the context of our dialogue, and the purpose or intent of the conversation are all variables that we consciously and subconsciously take into consideration as we determine our language use. Famed American sociologist Joshua Fishman deems such factors as the domains of a language used between typical participants in typical settings (Holmes, 2011). Such everyday interactions between family, friends, colleagues, and acquaintances take place at work, school, home, and church.
Because we as a people come from such rich and diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and the United States government’s employment of English to fulfill the nationalist purpose of unifying the country through a standardized language, these domains have given way to a diglossic America, in which the familiarity and use of English has been standardized and all languages come second in vocational, academic, and political settings. The term ‘diglossia’ (Holmes, 2011) is generalized to encompass any situation where two languages are used for different functions in a language community, especially where one language is used for H [high] functions and the other for L [low] functions. Such societal dynamics can be observed when checking out at the grocery store, taking out money at the bank, attending an economics lecture at the local college, or when stopping at a gas station to fill up the tank. Although there are an increasing number of institutions that allow for such tasks and their requisite interaction to be carried out in another language, English continues to be the predominant means through which we as Americans conduct our day-to-day lives: at work, school, and in commerce.

The standardization of English within the public sphere and the relegation of one’s mother tongue to be spoken predominantly, and in many cases exclusively, at home with little application or acknowledgement from the greater community has a profound effect on ‘language vitality’, which UNESCO (UNESCO, 2003) defines as the extent to which a language is in danger, when its speakers discontinue its use, employ it in fewer communicative domains, and elect not to pass it on from one generation to the next. Negative impacts of the over standardization of English can be observed when two American women are detained for speaking Spanish at a gas station in Havre, Montana (Stack, 2019) and when select faculty and staff publicly reprimand international students for speaking Chinese in study rooms and student

According to the most recent US Census (Ryan, 2013), more than 1 in every 5 Americans speak a language other than English at home as their first language. The over standardization of English has effectively limited the amount of domains into which home languages can expand, so much so that many immigrant families have elected to abandon their home languages for fear of their children not being proficient enough in English, unable to prosper academically or vocationally. Such sentiments are rooted in the complex, complicated relationship between the two languages spoken in a given society, in which people generally admire the H [English] variety even when they can’t understand it. These attitudes are reinforced by the fact that the H variety is fixed, (Holmes, 2011) or standardized, in media, during government proceedings, and in other public services.

This is not to suggest that H and L varieties representing two different languages cannot coexist within a diglossic society. More than half of the non-native English speaking population in the United States (Ryan, 2013) speak Spanish. While the current administration continues to neglect Spanish - the second most spoken language in the United States - in not making White House web content available in Spanish (Lugo, 2018), other countries such as Paraguay, India, Mexico, and Canada have embraced multilingualism. They have successfully standardized both H and L varieties to serve both nationalist and nationist purposes. These countries have demonstrated how two or more languages can be sustained through the standardization of multiple languages in numerous domains, asserting equal value to all languages used.
In contrast, the United States’ lack of political motivation to promote multicultural and multilingual competency has contributed to increased xenophobic behavior and a diminished sense of cultural relativism, with the favorable standardization of English and subsequent neglect of other tongues predominantly spoken in the country. Fasold (1984) observed that such a monolingual approach has prompted a language shift within these L2 communities; a shift in which a community desires to give up its identity as an identifiable sociocultural group in favor of an identity as a part of some other community. Under such circumstances, immigrant families have been faced with the tough decision of defiantly maintaining their native language and customs within the home, and in doing so, creating an inner conflict within the youth of America, who are predominantly educated academically in English yet educated morally/culturally in their home language.

 Locally, on the campus of Liberty High School, such cultural isolationism and segregation have given way to an achievement gap among our most at-risk youth and even among some of the traditionally high-performing subgroups. According to the most recent Local Control Accountability Plan, or LCAP, published by the Liberty Union High School District (LUHSD, 2018) the graduation rate for English Language Learners (ELLs) was the second lowest among all student demographic groups. Moreover, the chronic absenteeism rate for ELLs rose 6% between academic years 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 to 24%, second only to homeless/foster youth students. With nearly 500 of the 550 LUHSD ELL students enrolled at Liberty – nearly 20% of the entire student body – it is imperative that admin and faculty alike devise more effective instruction that speaks to the heart of the inner struggle of these students’ experience in being afforded the space within the educational domain to nurture their own sense of self
as being more than just ‘American’. In order to close the achievement gap and better meet the needs of these students, we must give voice to their identity crisis, recognize students’ home backgrounds, and provide a space in which it can be shared and appreciated within an academic setting.

On the other side of the sociocultural divide exists an overwhelming amount of language learning anxiety on the part of foreign language (FL) students that substantially inhibits their second language acquisition (SLA) and overall language learning experience. According to Saito et al., language learning anxiety is a form of debilitative anxiety that manifests itself in students’ inhibitions toward their overall comprehension and production - namely oral - in the target language (Saito, Horwitz, & Garza, 1999). This sociolinguistic phenomenon has led to decreased engagement and lack of motivation, evidenced by less than 3% of Liberty High School (LHS) students qualifying for the California State Seal of Biliteracy, one of the established LCAP goals/benchmarks for all students (LUHSD, 2018) most especially ELL and FL students.

A rise in plagiarism throughout the campus community, particularly in mathematics and foreign language courses, has given rise to an apathetic student population, who seem content assuming a passive role in their own education, lacking any sincere interest or intrinsic motivation in their second language acquisition. Nonetheless, the anxiety and inhibition felt by these students, especially upperclassmen, is palpable. As noted by Ellis (cited in Aydin, 2018) although language learning anxiety can be facilitative in getting them to enroll in upper division coursework and partake in learning activities, it has also proven to be debilitative in getting students to take risks and divert from formulaic, predictive speech, and to an increasing extent, maintain a strong work ethic and academic integrity.
Accounting for the struggles of ELL and FL demographic groups, and drawing on the experience that I have in working with both student populations, it is evidently clear that collaboration between the English Language Development and Foreign Languages departments and their respective groups of students can effectively, and economically, address the affective factors - anxiety, low level of motivation, low level of engagement - that greatly determine ELL and FL students’ academic achievement, and can serve as a catalyst in the overall improvement of our school as a safe and inclusive institution for higher learning. Without a collaborative pedagogical framework and working partnership between ELD and FL faculty/students, both student populations continue to labor and struggle parallel and unbeknownst to one another. Consequently, it is imperative that we as teachers, and language educators in particular, come together to devise cross-curricular, student-centered instruction that calls for increased peer-to-peer collaboration and cooperative learning strategies among and between both groups of students. Such cooperative-based learning will empower our students to help one another achieve their respective personal and academic goals, while holding them accountable for their own education.

I believe that the low graduation rates and chronic absenteeism rates documented in the LUHSD LCAP study are the symptoms of an institutionalized isolation and segregation of ELL students via the over standardization of English as the dominant language within the academic domain. If we as foreign language educators begin to implement collaborative learning strategies, joining together both ELL and FL student populations, they can achieve language and cultural competency through more culturally responsive instruction. Such a cooperative learning approach to instruction will address students’ language learning anxiety while increasing
engagement and motivation. In the end, we can foster an empowering, inclusive, and safe educational environment for all students, all the while making more effective use of our most treasured and transformative asset: our students.

**Purpose of the Project**

Anyone who has spent time in a high school classroom knows all too well that there are no easy solutions to struggles with engaging and motivating young people. In fact, literature in the field of both education and adolescent psychology, as noted by Tyner and Petrilli (2018), support the notion that children are particularly challenging to motivate, as they are especially focused on the present, struggle to plan for the extended future, and cannot withstand the impulse to procrastinate. In spite of such a Herculean challenge, the purpose of this project is to mitigate low student motivation and engagement through collaborative learning pedagogy. I strongly believe that cross-curricular/cross-cultural collaboration between ELL and FL students - grounded in cooperative learning and interpersonal engagement - will increase student motivation and engagement, while lowering students’ language learning anxiety. A shift to more student-centered instruction will result in increased overall academic achievement, while fostering a more polyglossic campus climate where multiculturalism and multilingualism will begin to take root, grow, and flourish within a more safe and inclusive learning environment.

In theory, this field project addresses how both ELL and FL students experience language learning anxiety, and why traditional, teacher-centered instructional models that lack interpersonal engagement among students has led to low levels of student motivation and engagement. In practice, this field project explores peer-to-peer, student-centered instructional models being employed throughout the global language teaching community in a variety of
contexts: EFL, ESL, and FL. This field project highlights how we as language educators can increase student motivation and engagement while lowering learners’ anxiety through the successful employment of a more student-centered approach to our instruction. This field project reiterates how such a pedagogical shift in best teaching practices of both ELL and FL student populations assigns equal value to all participants and their respective cultural and linguistic backgrounds, empowering all students to mutually serve one another while playing an integral role in one another’s second language acquisition.

**Theoretical Framework**

In the review of literature in the field of second language acquisition, this field project draws upon the research of Dr. Stephen Krashen and his Affective Filter and Monitor Hypotheses. It underscores the pedagogical framework of student-centered instruction that both hypotheses call upon language teachers to adopt; to focus more on meaning, via increased comprehensible input, and less on form or function. Moreover, the review of literature explores research and studies conducted in the field of EFL, ESL, and Spanish as a FL that demonstrate how an increased emphasis on comprehension, and a diminished role on initial student output via nonverbal forms of checking for understanding, can decrease students’ language learning anxiety, allow for improved comprehension of the target language, and increase student motivation and engagement. Considerations for approaches to instruction regarding whether students’ target language has been learned or acquired are observed in great detail, as students with more learned knowledge in their L2 tend exhibit higher levels of language learning anxiety than those who acquired the language in predominantly non-academic settings.
The literature review explores the role that emotions and other affective variables play in students’ level of motivation and academic achievement, and how students will generally react negatively to a teacher-centered approach to instruction. Various studies of EFL and ESL instruction in the field have yielded the conclusion that teacher-centered instruction is ineffective in instilling a sense of student autonomy and self-efficacy, in how teachers, as proprietors of knowledge, essentially spoon-feed information to students and deprive them of the experiential learning necessary for developing an intrinsic motivation and interest in their coursework. While much of the research in the field has focused on the negative effects of emotion in student learning, this field project proposes how positive emotions such as motivation, enjoyment, accountability, and agency can empower students to take ownership of their own learning.

The literature review concludes with an overview of studies that highlight how a shift from teacher-centered toward more student-centered instruction can increase student engagement and motivation in their second language learning. The wealth of data and analysis in the field of language learning suggests that a student-centered classroom fosters a learning environment that promotes high levels of motivation and achievement for all learners. The conclusion among many in the field is that students generally perform better when they are encouraged to think for themselves instead of when the thinking is done for them. Suggestions for how to best adapt, adopt, and design student-centered instructional strategies are provided at the conclusion of the literature review for practical consideration.
Significance of the Project

Through my experience in occasionally serving as a substitute teacher for my ELD colleagues, I have grown particularly fond of and interested in Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) classes; courses with increased scaffolding and reinforcement of Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) vocabulary within a given course of study. These classes are composed exclusively of students who are non-native speakers of English, and although there exists the expectation that these students emerge from the ELD program before they graduate from high school, for many of these students, the majority of their high school classes will be taken in such a sheltered academic setting with the same group of classmates.

Just as more than 1 in every 5 Americans speak a language other than English at home as their first language, so too do those numbers closely resemble our school’s ELD population (LUHSD, 2018). The academic experience of this student population embodies the diglossic structure of the American education system and its over-standardization of English. As an AP Spanish Language and Culture instructor, I have seen how well these two language demographics - Anglo and Latino - work collaboratively and cooperatively, when given the opportunity in a heterogeneous classroom environment. They lend to one another their respective strengths while acutely addressing one another’s areas of growth. While my native Spanish speakers help the non-natives gain confidence in their pronunciation and conversation skills, my non-native Spanish speakers help their native-speaking counterparts with their grammar and register. It is such a wonderfully authentic exchange of ideas and abilities; equal parts student-centered instruction and collaborative learning activities. I’d always thought to myself what if we as a world language faculty worked together with the English Language Development
department to facilitate multilingual, multicultural exchange between our ELL and FL students?

Other countries such as Canada, India, and Paraguay are already well on their way to developing and sustaining a linguistically equitable, multicultural approach to how institutions operate. Such a pedagogical shift in instructional practices assigns equal value to all students and to their respective cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

Cardoza (2018) observes that such intentional cross-cultural instruction and increased peer-to-peer interaction between ELL and FL students is on display in primary and secondary schools throughout Toronto. Whereas English is the predominant language used - and in some cases is the only language permitted to be spoken - within the American academic domain, principals in Toronto post signs in multiple languages prominently throughout their school buildings. Teachers are encouraged to learn phrases in languages their students speak, and English-learners are expected to be included in all activities, including the reading of morning announcements and performing in school productions. Such best practices significantly bridge the gap between English as the High variety and the wealth of native languages spoken by ELL students, and creates a safe and welcoming learning environment where students are viewed as equals, regardless of their ethnic background or level of proficiency in English.

What’s more is that Toronto public schools have gone as far as to begin to standardize these minority languages through their introduction into a variety of academic and community domains, by providing parents and families with the requisite resources to foster and sustain their native language, and along with it, their customs and traditions. The Toronto school system has created several dual-language books with suggested activities and online resources in multiple languages, especially for parents. Additionally, there are free, vetted interpreters available for in-
person or phone parent-teacher conferences. In an empowering partnership with the school, Cardoza (2018) notes that parents are often invited to share aspects of their culture at the school so their children feel a sense of pride in where they come from. I can only imagine how such best practices would greatly aid in increasing the graduation rates while lowering the chronic absenteeism rates of our ELL student population. A more inclusive approach to students’ home languages would undoubtedly peak FL students’ interest in their own second language acquisition (SLA) experience in providing them with regular and authentic opportunities to practice interpersonal communication and intercultural exchange with an actual native speaker of their target language of study, or perhaps even a language that isn’t offered as a course, yet they are personally interested in learning. Teachers can even take things a step further by expressing an interest in students’ language use, as a high school sociology teacher in suburban Massachusetts (De Guzman, 2019) took a interest in his students’ use of contemporary slang.

Throughout the globe, language educators contend that foreign language learning should increase students’ intercultural competence, allowing them to see relationships between different cultures, mediate between these cultures, and critically analyze cultures including their own. Teachers have a responsibility to educate students as responsible citizens who are prepared for an increasingly globalized world. According to Jurado and García (2018) such educational benchmarks are more easily attained when a more student-centered approach - rooted in cooperative learning and interpersonal engagement - is employed in the classroom. The existing body of research in the field of foreign language learning (Liang, Mohan & Early, 1998) indicates that instruction which promotes cooperative learning enhances second language learning through opportunities for both language production and comprehension. This integrative
approach that Toronto public schools have taken in affording both ELL and FL student populations to work together on coursework embodies the type of student-centered, cooperative learning model that such research suggests is integral to students’ success in second language acquisition and learning.

The National Education Association (NEA, 2017) has identified ‘culturally aware and sensitive’ instruction as the current buzzwords permeating throughout K-12 education. Teachers are being directed, and trained, by administration to recognize cultural biases at play in their interaction with students and to negate those biases through instruction that takes into account a more inclusive approach to cultural differences in the classroom. Consequently, this field project underscores an educational philosophy which is more closely aligned with the student-centered pedagogy and best practices which instill in students the value of being not just globally and culturally aware, but also collaborative and autonomous learners.

In addition, a collaborative, cross curricular partnership between the FL and ELD faculty makes instruction more effective by increasing student motivation and engagement while lower learning anxiety, all the while liberating educators to freely make their way throughout the classroom to conduct multiple checks for understanding. Teachers are also better able to provide feedback and support more expeditiously, compared to the traditional, teacher-centered, ‘sage on the stage’ approach to instruction, to which students have grown tired of. Creating and sustaining partnerships between all those invested in students’ success should be the foundation from which a school community begins to reassess and restructure its collective and respective approaches to instruction.
If we are to become a truly inclusive campus, rooted in culturally responsive curriculum, then we must cede the ethnocentric lens through which we perceive those of other language and cultural backgrounds and exercise increased cultural relativism, for, as Fasold (1984) concludes “if the members of the sociocultural groups in a country feel that they’re simultaneously citizens of the nation they live in and members of their particular group, then [our] country [will be] close to the multiethnic nation end of the continuum” (p. 243). In pursuit of empathy toward such an eclectic mix of nationalities, races, religions, and language backgrounds, one becomes better educated and less susceptible to the prejudices and stereotypes that tend to dictate much of our national political and social discourse, giving way to safer and more inclusive schools, neighborhoods, and communities throughout America. In summary, it is our own instruction that needs to undertake the greatest overhaul, in affording ELL and FL students regular and sustained opportunities for interpersonal engagement and intercultural exchange.
Glossary of Acronyms

ADA = Average Daily Attendance

BTSA = Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment

CALP = Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency

EAP = English for Academic Purposes

EBLI = Emotion-Based Language Instruction

EFL = English as a Foreign Language

ELD = English Language Development; coursework intended for non-native speakers of English

ELL = English Language Learner

ESP = English for Specific Purposes

FL = Foreign Language student

FLA = Foreign Language Anxiety

i+1 = comprehensible input (Krashen)

IEP = Intensive English Program

L1/L2 = 1st language/2nd language

LAD = Language Acquisition Device (Krashen)

LCAP = Local Control Accountability Plan; governing document required by federal government of schools who are classified as Title 1 performing institutions and receive funding/resources which are directly tied to performance goals/benchmarks.

LHS = Liberty High School

LUHSD = Liberty Union High School District

SDAIE = Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English

SLA = Second Language Acquisition
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In the review of literature in the field of second language acquisition, this field project draws upon the research of Dr. Stephen Krashen and his Affective Filter and Monitor Hypotheses. It underscores the pedagogical framework of student-centered instruction that both hypotheses call upon language teachers to adopt; to focus more on meaning, via increased comprehensible input, and less on form or function. Moreover, the review of literature explores research and studies conducted in the field of EFL, ESL, and Spanish as a FL that demonstrate how an increased emphasis on comprehension, and a diminished role on initial student output via nonverbal forms of checking for understanding, can decrease students’ language learning anxiety, allow for improved comprehension of the target language, and increase student motivation and engagement. Considerations for approaches to instruction regarding whether students’ target language has been learned or acquired are observed in great detail, as students with more learned knowledge in their L2 tend exhibit higher levels of language learning anxiety than those who acquired the language in predominantly non-academic settings.

The literature review explores the role that emotions and other affective variables play in students’ level of motivation and academic achievement, and how students will generally react negatively to a teacher-centered approach to instruction. Various studies of EFL and ESL instruction in the field have yielded the conclusion that teacher-centered instruction is ineffective in instilling a sense of student autonomy and self-efficacy, in how teachers, as proprietors of knowledge, essentially spoon-feed information to students and deprive them of the experiential
learning necessary for developing an intrinsic motivation and interest in their coursework. While much of the research in the field has focused on the negative effects of emotion in student learning, this field project proposes how positive emotions such as motivation, enjoyment, accountability, and agency can empower students to take ownership of their own learning.

The literature review concludes with an overview of studies that highlight how a shift from teacher-centered toward more student-centered instruction can increase student engagement and motivation in their second language learning. The wealth of data and analysis in the field of language learning suggests that a student-centered classroom fosters a learning environment that promotes high levels of motivation and achievement for all learners. The conclusion among many in the field is that students generally perform better when they are encouraged to think for themselves instead of when the thinking is done for them. Suggestions for how to best adapt, adopt, and design student-centered instructional strategies are provided at the conclusion of the literature review for practical consideration.

**Language Learning Anxiety**

The influence of anxiety in general, and language learning anxiety in particular, are quantifiable in effect and observable in practice in foreign language classrooms of all levels of proficiency throughout the globe. According to Williams (2018) data from the National Institute of Mental Health reveals some 38 percent of girls ages 13 through 17, and 26 percent of boys, have an anxiety disorder. Moreover, data collected from both the Center for Disease Control (CDC) and Anxiety & Depression Association of America (ADAA) suggest that 50% of students age 14 or older with a mental illness drop out of high school (ADAA, 2019). While the causes for anxiety among students are debatable and range from increasing academic pressure and rigor,
an incessant need for social media presence, or the unrealistic expectations of parents, the effects of anxiety on students’ overall academic achievement is evident and measurable.

In an article published in Education Week, (Doyle, 2017) a 30-year veteran educator at both the high school and college level observes that half of his senior seminar students missed a month of school, while 1 in 5 students missed more than two months of class time, failing the course altogether. Locally, at Liberty High School (LUHSD, 2018) anxiety manifests itself in the chronic absenteeism rates of ELL students (24%; second highest amongst all student demographics) and low academic achievement of FL students, with only 11% of eligible students electing to enroll in upper division foreign language courses. Pekrun (as cited in Pishghadam, R., Zabetipour, M., & Aminzadeh, A. 2016) underscores the fact that the classroom is an emotional place and, therefore one’s emotions greatly influence language learning experience, motivation, progress, and self-identity. Consequently, in order to be successful in their craft, it is the obligation of educators, of all levels and subject areas, to ensure that they construct and facilitate their courses in such a manner that lower students’ stress and anxiety in how they react to the design and delivery of instruction and learning activities.

Among the different types of anxiety, Scovel (1978) suggests that trait anxiety is an aspect of one’s personality, while state anxiety is experienced at a particular moment as a reaction to a specific learning situation. Much of the literature in the field suggests that it is state - rather than trait - anxiety that most often affects students’ language learning experience. Gardner and MacIntyre (as referenced in Kassem, 2019) define FLA as “an apprehension experienced during a specific use of the target language through which the user is not proficient enough” (p. 136). This situation-specific anxiety most often occurs in certain learning contexts in
which language learners deem themselves linguistically incapable of the task at hand, whether it be speaking, writing, reading, or listening.

Although the literature in the field generally supports the idea that language anxiety is not specific to a particular language skill, speaking has been reported to be associated with the highest level of anxiety (Aydin, 2018; Doyle, 2017; Jurado and Garcia, 2018; Kassem, 2019; Saiphet, 2018) noteworthy as society tends to place a greater emphasis on speaking than other modes of communication (i.e: “Do you speak English?”). Aydin (2018) offers several factors that can lead to foreign language anxiety (FLA) including parental expectations, cultural and regional differences, class arrangement, learning strategies, comparison with classmates, motivation and interest in language learning.

With respect to the more root causes of FLA, Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (as cited in Aydin, 2018) identify three sources of language anxiety: communication apprehension, fear of negative evaluation, and test anxiety. Communication apprehension occurs when the learner, although able to communicate thoughts and ideas in their L1, lacks the communication skills to convey those beliefs in the target language. Such apprehension is not limited only to interaction between student and teacher, but also among fellow language learners and native speakers alike. Fear of negative evaluation—by teachers and fellow students—leads to learners’ avoidance of using the target language both in the classroom and in other outside domains. Although certainly not unique to foreign language learning, test anxiety manifests itself whenever students feel unprepared, incapable, or unable to do well on either a formative or summative assessment.

Communication in the target language, according to Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (as cited in Kassem, 2019) can influence the learner’s self-perception as not being proficient enough to
neither understand nor be understood in the target language, relative to the learner’s native
language (L1). MacIntyre & Gardner and Horwitz (as cited in Kassem) conclude that, because
they lack proficiency in their L2, anxious FL learners feel less competent than their peers and are
afraid of being negatively evaluated and of making mistakes. As a result, they refrain from
participating in classroom learning activities, in particular oral communication activities, so as to
not to reveal their inadequacies in the production or consumption of language. Young (as
referenced by Kassem, 2019) identified six other potential sources of language anxiety, most of
which are more grounded in students’ trait anxiety. These include personal and interpersonal
anxieties (self-confidence and self-esteem), learner experiences and perceptions toward language
learning, instructor’s philosophy of education and pedagogical approach to foreign language
instruction, the dynamic of instructor-learner interactions (manner of correcting student
mistakes), classroom procedures (having to speak in front of class), and methodology of
assessment (written tests, project-based learning, oral presentations, etc).

Reflecting on anxiety as a cause of poor language performance, MacIntyre & Gardner
(via Kassem, 2019) propose that “language learning is a cognitive activity that relies on
encoding, storage, and retrieval processes, and anxiety can interfere with each of these by
creating a divided attention scenario for anxious students” (p. 138). Furthermore, Oxford (as
cited by Kassem) argues that anxiety impedes the process of second language learning
“indirectly through worry and self-doubt and directly by reducing participation and creating
overt avoidance of the language” (p. 139). Schumann (as referenced by Kassem) summarizes the
wealth of literature in the effects of FLA in SLA in offering the following statement: “I believe
that emotion underlies most if not all cognition and I will argue that variable success in second
language acquisition (SLA) is emotionally driven” (p. 139). Consequently, it is incumbent upon all educators, most especially foreign language instructors due to the interactive dynamics of the foreign language classroom, to be mindful of the power of students’ emotional reaction to the rigors of SLA and the inevitable hardship they will endure, and to account for such struggles in their approach to instruction.

Amongst the breadth of literature in the field highlighting FLA, no singular theory has been more influential in how FL educators have modified their pedagogy and instructional approach than Krashen’s Affective Filter Hypothesis (Krashen, 1984) which illustrates the dynamic between affective variables such as stress and anxiety in second language acquisition in that learners vary greatly with respect to the presence of their Affective Filters. Essentially, students who do not maintain a positive outlook toward their second language learning will seek less of the target language—what Krashen refers to as ‘comprehensible input’—and not allow such input to enter what Noam Chomsky (as cited by Krashen) refers to as the ‘language acquisition device,’ or LAD. Such innate knowledge of ‘universal grammar’ is what distinguishes us as human beings. On the contrary, those students who possess more favorable attitudes toward their second language learning generally maintain a much lower affective filter, thus allowing more comprehensible input to reach further within their LAD.

Krashen goes on to distinguish learners by their use of affective filter, or ‘monitor’. Monitor over-users are those who remain overly conscious of their oral production (lexicon, syntax, register, grammar, etc) and who consequently are very calculated and cautious in their speech. Krashen describes these learners as victims of the Grammar Translation Method, in which students are constantly reverting back to their native language—often times being
instructed more in their L1 than in their L2—and thus have little exposure to the target language (comprehensible input).

Monitor under-users are described by Krashen as just the opposite, students who either have not learned or prefer not to employ conscious knowledge of the target language and thus do not engage in self correction or respond to error correction offered by their instructor. According to Krashen (1984), the goal of language educators is to produce optimal monitor users; those who are proficient at regulating their own monitor use, turning it off when deemed unnecessary, while turning it on when needed within more formal, academic domains. It is important to note that students’ acquired and conscious knowledge of the target language will vary substantially upon the context of their SLA experience, especially in the case of English as a Second Language (ESL) English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and native speakers of English.

With reference to Kachru’s 3 Circles Model of World Englishes (1991), speakers of English throughout the globe are classified into three groups: inner circle, outer circle, and expanding circle. The inner circle is centered around countries such as the USA, UK, and Australia where English is the High, predominant language spoken, and is where it has become standardized in institutions such as education, commerce, and politics. The outer circle includes countries where English is a byproduct of colonial imperialism of the aforementioned inner circle countries, including much of Africa and Middle-East Asia.

While inner circle countries such as the USA experience modest growth in English spoken at home - an 11% growth between 2000-2011 (Ryan, 2013) - Chinese, Arabic, Hindi, and other Asian/African languages experienced growth of 50% or more. This domestic trend is indicative of an increase of non-native English speakers abroad, composed of EFL speakers
where English isn’t predominantly spoken in their home country. These speakers of English, residing in parts of the world such as East Asia, Central and South America, outnumber native English speakers by a ratio of 3:1.

Whether teaching within an ESL context at home or especially in an EFL, ESP, or IEP abroad, it is imperative of TESOL instructors to acknowledge that most non-native speakers of English have learned, not acquired, the language within an EFL context and thus have had limited opportunities for comprehensible input. Consequently, having learned English more than having acquired it, students’ monitor will be much higher and thus will tend to exhibit the cautious, calculated approach to their learning that is typical of a high-monitor user. According to Krashen (1984), if the goal is indeed to encourage students to be optimal monitor users, than our instruction should focus more on *acquired* knowledge of English rather than *learned* knowledge; an approach to instruction that lends itself well to another one of Krashen’s theories of second language acquisition: the Input Hypothesis.

Krashen’s Input Hypothesis (1984) seeks to answer what may potentially be the most important question in the field of second language acquisition: how do we acquire language? If Krashen’s Affective Filter Hypothesis is indeed accurate, that “acquisition is central and learning more peripheral,” (p. 15) then the aim of language teachers’ approach to language teaching should be to encourage as many opportunities as possible for what Krashen refers to as ‘comprehensible input’ (i+1). The question of how we acquire language is addressed in Krashen’s assertion that “we acquire...only when we understand language that contains structure that is ‘a little beyond’ where we are now” (p. 15). Krashen suggests that it is possible for us to understand forms of language that we have yet to acquire primarily via prior schema; knowledge
that we have acquired/learned in our L1 about the world and our surroundings. Non-verbal cues (hands gestures, proximity, facial expressions, ancillaries, etc) context and context clues all contribute toward bridging the cognitive gap between i and i+1. In terms of foreign language pedagogy, it is important to point out that such an approach to SLA runs counterintuitive to the more traditional approaches to foreign language instruction observable in many FL, EFL, and ESL classrooms worldwide. In contrast to the Krashen’s input hypothesis, the overall assumption from many in the field has been that students first learn structures, then begin to master them through contextualized practice, eventually leading to fluent and accurate communication. Whether it be the choral repetition found in the Audiolingual method or the trademark rote memorization of the Grammar Translation method, instructional approaches that focus more on form and less on meaning tend to deprive learners of the necessary comprehensible input to transition from i to i+1, i+1 to i+2, etc. Krashen (1984) suggests that “a necessary condition to move from stage i to stage i + 1 is that the acquirer understand input that contains i + 1, where ‘understand’ means that the acquirer is focused on the meaning and not the form of the message” (p. 41). To the contrary, as noted by Pishghadam, R., Zabetipour, M., & Aminzadeh, A. (2016), when the primary focus is on the outcome rather than the process, “students’ final performance is only judged, which may bring about a feeling of hope or hopelessness” (p. 6) leading to a significant increase in students’ anxiety and affective filter.

As previously established by many in the field (Aydin, 2018; Doyle, 2017; Jurado and Garcia, 2018; Kassem, 2019; Saiphet, 2018), speaking has been most closely associated with heightening students’ language learning anxiety. To this end, the final part of the input hypothesis suggests that speaking cannot be taught directly, rather, that it will develop and emerge on its
own over time. According to Krashen (1984), “the best way to teach speaking is simply to provide comprehensible input” (p. 43). Krashen goes on to propose that speech will come once the learner feels ready, and that such readiness varies greatly from speaker to speaker. Furthermore, early speech tends to lack accuracy in lieu of learners’ greater focus on wanting to sound fluent, and that accuracy will come over time as the learner begins to take in and comprehend more input.

Krashen draws upon the example of caretaker speech, how parents will modify their speech in accuracy, not so much as an attempt to teach language, rather to aid in their children’s comprehension. The fact that not all communication between parent and child is exactly i+1 and at times can be much higher (incomprehensible) lends credence to the Natural Order hypothesis, the idea that aspects of language (grammar, syntax, phonology, etc) tend to be acquired in a particular order. If given enough comprehensible input through reading, speaking, music, etc., the child will eventually acquire and perfect the more nuanced aspects of a given language in making use of extralinguistic support (visual cues, realia, proximity, etc) and the ‘here and now’ nature of most parent/child communication.

Krashen notes that the input hypothesis also holds true for foreign language acquisition, as the FL student, regardless of age, acquires language just as a child would in their first language. Children acquiring a second language may say very little for a prolonged period of time following their first exposure to the second language, what is often referred to as ‘the silent period’. In accordance with the input hypothesis, Krashen (1984) poses that “speaking ability emerges on its own after enough competence has been developed by listening and understanding” (p. 45). Although the literature in the field does support that adolescent and adult
learners have the ability to acquire language more quickly due to having more extralinguistic knowledge in their L1 (Saito et al., 1999) other data suggest that older learners tend to have a higher affective filter than children (Tosun, 2018) as adults are usually not allowed a silent period. They are often asked to produce very early in a second language, before they have acquired enough communicative competence to express their ideas fluently and accurately, and will consequently revert back to linguistic features of their L1 to fill the void in competence, which, if not addressed either through increased comprehensible input or formal/informal error correction, could lead to fossilized errors in the learner’s L2.

Given the wealth of literature that acknowledges how students’ anxiety in general and affect filter in particular play an integral role in to what extent language is acquired, learned, practiced, and eventually mastered, those in the field must answer the existential question of how course content is being modified for students so that it is just above their level of comprehension. It is challenging, if not altogether impossible, to talk or read anything of genuine interest if the primary goal is to introduce and practice a particular grammatical construct. Such an approach would run counterintuitive to the overarching objective of authentic input and output in the target language, as Krashen (1984) argues that “a grammatical focus [to instruction] will usually prevent real communication using the second language” (p. 126). Moreover, given that most foreign language courses follow a curriculum based in the grammar translation method, especially the more beginning and intermediate level texts, those in the field of foreign language teaching must consider how incomprehensible input and a premature expectation for oral/written production exacerbate the issue of raising students’ affective filter and overall language learning anxiety.
Both in theory and in practice, literature in the field suggests that language teachers must transform the design and delivery of their instruction so that it is more comprehensible, while providing checks for understanding that do not demand oral output on the part of language learners until they are ready to do so. Based on coordination between speech and physical activity, Total Physical Response (TPR) is an effective alternative method to traditional instruction for a variety of reasons. In a 2017 study of elementary students of English in Jakarta, Indonesia, Fahrurrozi (2017) found that a transition to TPR-based instruction improved students achievement outcomes by as much as 87% and student attendance by as much as 22%. Fahrurrozi (2017) observed how instruction designed around the TPR model abbreviates teacher’s speech into more easily digestible chunks, provides the learner with visual cues, and activates kinesthetic and auditory senses which increase comprehension and concept retention. Pedagogical consideration for modifications to how teachers check for understanding may include the use of mini-whiteboards to quickly jot down student responses, having students hold up X number of fingers, show thumbs up/thumbs down, drawing, picture ordering/sequencing, pointing, games such as Simon says, flyswatter, pictionary, and charades, just to name a few. All focus on the message and not on form, accuracy, or fluency, and create an environment in which, as the literature in the field strongly encourages, students are not required to orally produce in the target language until they deem themselves ready, thus lowering their affective filter and language learning anxiety.

In summary, if acquisition is more central to the successful learning of a foreign language, and if comprehensible input and students’ affective filter are its essential variables, the classroom as a hub for language learning is serviceable, as Krashen (1984) cautions, “only to the
extent that it provides regular and sustainable comprehensible input,” (p. 126) while fostering an environment conducive to a low affective filter through non-verbal checks for understanding and opportunities for students to self-assess through kinesthetic, auditory, and other such nonverbal forms of comprehension of said comprehensible input. Krashen maintains that a high affective filter “acts to prevent input from being used for language acquisition” and classrooms that encourage students to be optimal monitor users are those that “promote low anxiety among students, that keep students ‘off the defensive’” (p. 23).

The body of research in the field since the introduction of Krashen’s Affective Filter and Input Hypotheses establishes three primary affective variables that greatly influence success in second language acquisition (1) Anxiety, both state and trait (2) Self-confidence, as learners who maintain a positive self-image often perform better in language courses, and (3) Motivation, as highly-motivated students (both extrinsic and intrinsic) generally do better in second language acquisition. In the next section of this review of literature, the analysis will highlight the effect of student motivation and engagement on academic achievement in language learning, and will underscore how a shift from a teacher-centered toward a more student-centered design to instruction has led to increased student motivation and engagement in a variety of EFL, ESL, and FL contexts.

**Student Motivation**

While language learning anxiety and a high affective filter can greatly diminish comprehensible input and eventual proficiency in fluent/accurate output, low student motivation and engagement substantially impedes successful second language learning, which can be caused by several flaws in the teacher-centric design and delivery of one’s instruction. Kassem (2019)
concluded from the results of Saudi EFL students’ classroom evaluations that “poor language learning outcomes in Saudi Arabia are mainly caused by the prevalence of teacher-centered approaches and spoon-feeding methods” (p. 134). Students reported low motivation, low autonomy, low self-efficacy, and negative impressions of learning English, in large part because they did not feel empowered by nor engaged in their learning experience. In reflecting on the chronic absentee rates of Liberty’s ELL student population, the pedestrian academic achievement rate and low enrollment in upper division coursework of the school’s Spanish as a FL student population, and fractional completion rates from both ELLs and FLs of the nascent Seal of Biliteracy initiative on its campus (LUHSD, 2018), it is apparent that the principle challenge of language teachers on its campus is to increase students’ motivation, interest, and engagement in achieving course goals and objectives, comprehensively reinventing their pedagogical approach to instruction in the process.

Foreshadowing the final theme of student-centered instruction, to be covered in the third section of this literature review, an expressed preference for hands-on learning is evident in the data and feedback collected from foreign language learners, as literature in the field (Aydin, 2018; Contreras-Soto et al., 2019; Fahrurrozi, 2017; Kassem, 2019; Pishghadam et al., 2016; Saiphet, 2018) suggests a majority are highly motivated to learn when afforded autonomy and agency in the classroom, and are able to develop a sense of self-efficacy. Motivation is defined by Gardner (as cited by Kassem) as “the combination of effort plus desire to achieve the goal of learning the language plus favorable attitudes toward learning the language” (p. 136). Peacock (via Kassem) goes on to define motivation as a genuine interest in and enthusiasm for learning; fully immersed in a learning task while exuding high levels of concentration and enjoyment.
Dörnyei concludes (as referenced by Kassem) that motivation is essential to the language learning process as it “provides the primary impetus to initiate FL learning and later the driving force to sustain language” (p. 136). Thus, the importance of motivation in language learning—and in all learning in general—derives from the notion that it can assist in overcoming obstacles and challenges that would otherwise stifle the learning process. Research from the field (Kassem, 2019; Saiphet, 2018; Tyner and Petrilli, 2018) indicates that of all affective factors, motivation is the most determining factor of success in FL learning.

While the literature in language pedagogy mostly distinguishes motivation as being either extrinsic or intrinsic, Gardner and Lambert (as noted by Kassem, 2019) classify motivation into two different categories: integrative and instrumental. Integrative (intrinsic) motivation describes learners who, through authentic dialogue and intercultural exchange, aspire to in some way assimilate to members of the target language community, while instrumental (extrinsic) motivation refers to seeking to obtain language as a means to an end; for vocational purposes, increased economic opportunities, or any variety of material incentives. Students who view language learning as a goal in and of itself find communication, and its accompanying challenges, interesting and are thus integratively (intrinsically) motivated. On the other hand, those who partake in language learning, fomented by external factors such as getting accepted into the college of their choice or earning high marks, are instrumentally (extrinsically) motivated. It is noteworthy that instrumental motivation is more prevalent in such settings as an EAP, ESL, ESP, or IEP program than integrative motivation to the extent that the course objectives in such classroom settings are more aligned with students’ vocational, academic, and career goals.
Akin to language learners’ anxiety, motivation is an emotion this is highly influenced by other experiential variables related to students’ overall impression of their learning and self-perception. According to Pekrun (as cited by Pishghadam et al., 2016), academic emotions, such as enjoyment, pride, boredom, and hopelessness, are the emotions commonly experienced in an academic setting, and are determining factors to students’ learning, classroom instruction, and achievement. The Academic Emotions Questionnaire (AEQ) developed by Pekrun and fellow colleagues Goetz and Perry (as referenced by Kassem, 2019) is a student self-assessment which is designed to analyze the relationship between students’ emotions and academic performance. Feelings of anger, enjoyment, hope, boredom, and hopelessness are among such series of emotions, which can be regarded as the most prevalent emotions in academic settings, particularly in the language learning domain. Emotions are indeed crucial to foreign language learning in that they can persuade a person to determine whether to study a foreign language or whether or not to even attempt or put forth an effort in doing a task in a language classroom.

Much of the existing research in the field of foreign language learning has placed a great deal of emphasis on the negative impacts of emotions like anxiety and has not invested enough in the potential benefits of eliciting positive responses from students. Pekrun (via Pishghadam et al., 2016) proposes that enjoyment, as a positive emotion, can invigorate students while they are doing tasks, and thus, enhance academic motivation. Nonetheless, negative emotions affect students' motivation, attention, and use of learning strategies to the extent that, as noted by Goleman (via Pishghadam et al., 2016) in acknowledging Krashen and his Affective Filter Hypothesis, that "students who are anxious, angry, or depressed do not learn" (p. 512).
As a result, the overarching pedagogical dilemma posited by many in the field (Contreras-Soto et al., 2019; Fahrurrozi, 2017; Kassem, 2019; Saiphet, 2018) is how to best elicit positive responses from students while preventing, to the greatest extent possible, negative emotions from embedding themselves in students’ affective filter, impeding comprehensible input, and discouraging active participation. Pishghadam, Adamson et al. (as referred to by Pishghadam et al., 2016) developed an innovative approach to SLA, which they termed Emotion-Based Language Instruction (EBLI). It is rooted in the belief that “having stronger emotions toward second/foreign language vocabularies leads to a better understanding of them and facilitates learning” (p. 513). It takes into account the reality that each individual may potentially experience a different emotion when confronted by a word or concept in a language. Consequently, particular lexicon may be learned faster and easier because learners have a greater positive image associated with the word. Pishghadam et al. (2016) refers to this positive connotation that students experience as ‘emotioncy,’ “the degree of emotions one has toward language entities” (p. 513). Based on this characterization, higher levels of ‘emotioncy’ bring about increased levels of comprehension, learning, and retention due to heightened involvement (tapping into learners’ intrinsic motivation) while lower levels of ‘emotioncy’ result in low levels of comprehension and achievement as such learning requires substantial extrinsic motivation on the part of language learners. Many can relate to having a favorite subject in school; a subject that one feels good at or is a natural in. Through the lens of the EBLI model, it is likely that such a self-assessment is the sum of many positive experiences (both academic and non-academic) within a given field of study. It’s a classic chicken-egg conundrum; one feels ‘good at’ a particular subject due to high comprehension and retention of the subject matter, and the
opposite just the same. Consequently, the mark of an effective language educator is to foster an easily-forgiving yet challenging classroom environment in which students’ who have a history of low levels of ‘emotioncy’ can begin to have positive experiences in the own language learning.

In another formal confirmation to Krashen and his Monitor Hypothesis, language learning anxiety once again presents itself in the literature in the field. Based on the findings observed by Horwitz et al. (as referenced by Pishghadam et al. 2016) anxiety is the only emotion which greatly endangered students’ positive connotations of all four English language skills. Pishghadam et al. (2016) asserts that this conclusion is in accord with previous studies that indicate anxiety may have negative impacts on both productive (difficulty with presentational and interpersonal speaking, assessing for correct grammar/spelling in writing) and perceptive (listening to audio clips, reading comprehension exercises) language skills, leading to fear of negative evaluation from both the teacher and fellow students. Pishghadam et al. (2016) concludes that these findings highlight the integral role of language teachers as both facilitators and counsellors, who should pay close attention to the emotional needs of their students and offer feedback and encouragement for meeting both the stated expectations of the course and the personal goals of each student.

It should be noted here that not all those in the field maintain that anxiety is such a debilitating force in of language learning, and have gone as far as stating that many in the field elect to place an overemphasis on language anxiety in lieu of properly acknowledging and addressing flaws in their own instruction. Sparks et al. (2018) proclaims that:

For many years, studies in the L2 literature have hypothesized that anxiety plays a causal, or at least debilitating, role in L2 learning. But, despite considerable evidence that students who report higher levels of L2 anxiety have significantly lower levels of L1
skills and lower levels of L2 aptitude prior to L2 coursework, anxiety proponents have not considered a third, or confounding, variable in learning an L2—language skills. (p. 533)

Sparks et al. (2018) note in their analysis that even Scovel, considered along with Krashen to be one of the pioneers in the field of linguistics and a propagator of language learning anxiety, found inconsistent results regarding the relationship between anxiety and L2 learning. Findings of studies by Sparks and colleagues have supported their claims that previous measurements of language anxiety are more likely to be measuring students’ L1 skill levels and learned knowledge of and proficiency in students’ L2. In other studies, Sparks et al. (2018) found numerous studies over several years that found strong relationships between language learners’ L1 skills and L2 proficiency/achievement. They discovered that the amount of exposure to reading in students’ L1 was indicative of students’ L2 proficiency and achievement, to the extent that “L1 reading exposure made unique contributions to L2 oral and written language skills even after adjusting for the effects of L1 literacy skills and L1 cognitive ability” (p. 535). As a result, in an assertion that somewhat resembles the principles of EBLI model proposed by Pishghadam et al., Sparks and his colleagues have consistently maintained that students’ affective states such as anxiety will be greatly determined by their L1 language skill levels and their self-perceptions about their L2 language learning ability and experience.

Sparks and his colleagues go as far as to directly attack the L2 anxiety hypothesis summarized by Saito et al. (1999) which states that the “essence of FL anxiety is the threat to an individual’s self-concept caused by the inherent limitations of communicating in an imperfectly mastered second language” (p. 202) in stating that, in light of contradicting evidence that
suggests that L1 language skill is a more reliably causative variable in determining students’ L2 language proficiency and achievement, “continued adherence to the anxiety hypothesis in the face of contradictory evidence suggests that its proponents are either ignoring the disconfirming evidence, interpreting new evidence as confirmation of their existing beliefs (confirmation bias), or simply failing to consider alternative explanations” (p. 552) Within the objective realm of academic literature in the field, Sparks takes his criticism of the language anxiety hypothesis even further by cautioning if anxiety and other affective variables are continued to be viewed as factors for consideration in L2 language learning differences, then “L2 educators will have less incentive to develop new, and effective, methodologies that focus on students’ individual differences in language learning skills” (p. 553) Along those lines, Mahmoudzade (as noted by Pishghadam et al., 2016) observed that, in comparison with less proficient EFL learners, “those who have higher levels of speaking proficiency experience less speaking anxiety” (p. 510).

**Teacher Motivation**

In contrast with the ongoing debate of the role of anxiety in language learning, one assertion with which many in the field can assuredly agree and relate to is that of Ames (as noted by Ahktar et al., 2018) that teachers who feel more empowered, incentivized, and motivated in performing their work-related duties as an educator yield better outcomes in student achievement, directly correlated with their ability to maintain high levels of student motivation. Moreover, Davidson (as noted by Ahktar et al.) conducted a study in Tanzania from which he concluded asserted that instructors’ lack of motivation can have a negative impact on the student performance. With nearly 1 in every 10 teachers leaving the profession every year, along with a 35% drop in teacher education enrollment between 2009-2014, according to data US federal
government analyzed by the Learning Policy Institute, it appears as though there may be a relationship between teacher motivation (or lack thereof) and interest in the profession (or lack thereof).

As many both in and outside the field may assume, the extrinsic sources of teacher motivation extend beyond financial compensation. Nevertheless, external motivators such as retirement benefits, work schedule, number of public holidays, and vacation appeal to many in the profession. However, Duzbay (as cited by Ahktar et al., 2018) concluded that a sense of autonomy and independence, empowerment via professional development opportunities, and a sense of purpose and belonging serve as prime motivators for a significant number of teachers to go into and remain in the field of education. However, of particular value to administrators and state/district officials were the findings that when teachers were forced to be a part of professional development, the level of motivation substantially declined.

Teachers’ lack of motivation can result in the adoption of a teacher-centered learning style. Teacher-centered instruction is said to prevent students’ educational growth in large part because, as Kassem (2019) notes the negative correlation between teacher-centered instruction and achievement: in teacher-centered classrooms, teachers do most of the work, while students are passive and disengaged observers. Ahktar et al. (2018) cautions that this can inevitably result in the restricted development and overall progress of students, as there is an observable impact (although implied and not explicitly measured) of teacher motivation on the level of achievement displayed by students on exams and assessments. Therefore, as the quality of teaching students receive helps facilitate the process of their cognitive development, teacher motivation and student achievement in school are strongly interrelated. Taking into consideration Darling-
Hammond’s (as referenced by Pishghadam et al.) assertion that teachers play the most influential role in promoting student achievement and the fact that emotionally intelligent teachers are better able to foster a strong rapport and effective classroom working environment, it can be concluded that teachers should play an active role in both understanding and moderating their students’ emotions in the classroom.

Pishghadam et al. (2016) suggests that these findings imply that language teachers should adjust their teaching methodology and approach “to one that can decrease the detrimental impacts of negative emotions like boredom, and increase the beneficial effects of positive emotions” (p. 519) Concerning boredom, Pekrun et al. (as noted by Kassem, 2019) asserts that boredom is induced when students do not find value in the activity they are doing, and therefore do nothing. Therefore, a fundamental shift in the teacher’s and the learner’s roles in the classroom is paramount to increased student motivation. Kassem (2019) sums it up best in suggesting that “the role of the teacher needs to change from an authoritative conveyor of knowledge into a facilitator...[while] the learners’ role needs to change from passive recipients of knowledge into active planners of their own learning” (p. 144)

In conclusion, it is imperative that foreign language instructors, and language educators in particular, come together to devise cross-curricular, student-centered instruction that calls for increased peer-to-peer collaboration and cooperative learning strategies among and between both groups of students. Such cooperative-based learning will empower our students with agency to help one another achieve their respective personal and academic goals in second language acquisition, while affording them greater learner autonomy, thus holding them more accountable for their own education.
Student-centered Instruction

Student-centered teaching is based on the pedagogical belief that particular attention to the nature of learners should be integral elements of language teaching, planning, and in the evaluation of students (Kassem, 2019). The process and overall success of learning is dependent upon the unique nature and composition of the learners, thus a singular approach to instruction will not effectively address the diversity of interests and skill sets that vary within and between groups of students. Unlike teacher-centered approaches where most work is done by teachers, student-centered instruction is an instructional approach in which students primarily are the ones who design and dictate the content, activities, materials, and pace of learning. In a student-centered model, the teacher is not a conveyor of knowledge, rather the provider of learning opportunities, from which students can learn both independently and from one another. The teacher assumes the role of coach in introducing and demonstrating to learners the skills they need for independent learning. Students are responsible for such big decisions as establishing classroom rules and expectations, monitoring and evaluating their own progress, developing grading criteria for both formative and summative assessments, and setting goals and objectives at the onset of the lesson, unit, quarter, or semester. Collaborative learning techniques such as think-pair-share, peer reviews, pairwork, group discussion, stationwork, turn-and-talks, competition, games, and project-based learning are all trademark activities that can be observed in a student-centered classroom.

With regard to foreign language pedagogy, there is a general consensus by many in the field of language learning (Contreras-Soto, 2019; Kassem, 2019; Pishghadam et al., 2016; Saiphet, 2018; Shin, 2018) that student-centered instruction leads to improved language learning
when juxtaposed with the results yielded by more traditional teacher-centered approaches to instruction. McCombs and Whistler (as noted by Kassem, 2019) suggest that a student-centered classroom fosters a learning environment that promotes high levels of motivation and achievement for all learners. Essentially, students perform better when they are encouraged to think for themselves instead of when the thinking is done for them. Alrabai (as noted by Kassem) found that teachers in EFL classrooms in Saudi Arabia generally adopt the role of presenters of knowledge rather than facilitators of learning. Consequently, Saudi students heavily rely on the teacher as the primary source of knowledge, as instructors spend the majority of class talking and sparingly allow opportunities for students to interact and work with one another, let alone speak or ask questions. A similar experience is noted in the work of Saiphet (2018) in observing EFL classrooms in Thailand, in concluding that, due to the traditional lecture-based approaches utilized in most Thai EFL classrooms, students are bored and unmotivated to learn English. The results of anonymous student surveys yielded insightful, informative feedback from students, in that with such a teacher-focused setting, many become passive learners, performing learning tasks without passion or purpose. Saiphet proposes that such a teacher-centered learning environment greatly inhibits students’ ability to learn English effectively, positing the notion that language learning requires active participation in applying the language both presentationally and interpersonally, while working collaboratively in pairs and small groups, elements of instruction that stand in stark contrast against the authoritative delivery and overall aesthetics of a teacher-centered classroom.

In South Korea, the results of the study conducted by Shin (2018) show that compared to traditional learning methods, students learn more vocabulary and demonstrate more accurate
grammar through project-based learning - a core teaching strategy of student-centered instruction - with more than 50% of students surveyed responding that they strongly agree or agree with the statement that their motivation for learning English increased, while at the same time adopting more positive attitudes towards learning English. Moreover, more than 70% of students indicated they had more confidence in their L2 language skills and hoped that, upon completion of the trial period of implementing student-centered instructional techniques, that project-based learning would become a more regular part of their learning. Shin concludes that in order for learning to transpire, students have to be interested in what they’re learning, and the relevance of the learning task should be related to the students' goals, interests, and real life experiences.

Research conducted by Kassem (2019) reveals that the teacher-centered learning model employed in Saudi EFL classrooms prompted many students to maintain several debilitative beliefs regarding success in foreign language acquisition, such as the belief that mastering a foreign language requires a special ability, is a matter of memorizing vocabulary and grammatical rules, and that a learner should master the language before using it in communication. Mohammed (as noted by Kassem) found that when randomly surveying Saudi college EFL students also reported poor achievement, high levels of language learning anxiety, poor motivation, low autonomy and a lack of self-efficacy. However, learner autonomy - students’ ability to lead the way in their own learning - doesn’t necessarily call for students to learn in isolation from one another. Rather, high learner autonomy within a student-centered classroom empowers students to not rely upon the teacher as the sole source of knowledge, information, guidance, and feedback, and to utilize one another as classmates as the primary source of such direction in their learning.
Little (as cited by Kassem, 2019) argues that learner autonomy is a critical element in student-centered instruction for three primary reasons. First, students who actively participate in their learning will progress more efficiently and effectively toward stated learning goals and objectives for the course. Second, the increased engagement that students enjoy when given the opportunity to work collaboratively together augments their sense of motivation, which serves as a catalyst in working through the inevitable hardship and struggles students face at various stages throughout their FLA experience. Lastly, to fully exercise and develop learners’ communicative competence, acquiring a language requires learning independent of the classroom environment. Therefore, autonomous learners are better equipped with the self-direction and self-motivation needed to seek and sustain opportunities, to the extent that they are available, for comprehensible input and rough/refined output.

In Chile, Contreras-Soto et al. (2019) studied the implementation of student work portfolios as an alternative to high-stakes end-of-term summative assessment as a potential strategy to lower language learning anxiety in high school ESL classrooms throughout the metropolitan region of Santiago, Chile. The study analyzes the effect of test washback, which the data yielded to have a predominantly negative impact as students reported high levels of test and language learning anxiety. Given the harmful effect of such summative assessments of students’ learning, in addition to having been found to be an inaccurate measurement of students’ L2 ability and achievement, alternative assessment procedures were being given consideration in order to better measure learners’ skills and knowledge in English.

Contreras-Soto et al. (2019) highlight the numerous advantages to project-based learning such as student work portfolios, as they better lend themselves to the inclusion of authentic texts,
providing students with a real-world context that extends well beyond the classroom. In contrast with the rather mundane, predictable format of multiple choice tests, student work portfolios often ask of students to think more creatively, drawing on skills from other courses of study and tapping into students’ interests in a variety of fields. In the results portion of the study, such an alternative to standardized tests was found to yield an increase in students intrinsic motivation to learn English while also providing Chilean EFL instructors with a more accurate assessment of their students’ language learning.

Through the implementation of alternative assessment strategies, Damiani (as referenced by Contreras-Soto et al., 2019) notes that students typically feel more challenged and engaged in their own learning, and that because students possess such high learner autonomy in a student-centered classroom, they are better equipped to overcome such obstacles as they feel more in control of both the problems presented and their associated solutions. Writing portfolios are viewed in the study as student-centered in how they require students to work together collaboratively and cooperatively. Furthermore, the portfolio tasks gave students more confidence in their command and use of English as the students felt more in control of how they were going to be assessed in the class. The results of the study also suggest that, in asking of students to demonstrate not just what they know, rather what they know how to do, language learners feel a greater sense of empowerment and, as a result, are willing to take on greater responsibilities in their own language learning, becoming active participants in the SLA process rather than passive recipients of knowledge, only to be regurgitated later on a standardized test.

In a case study conducted by Ghufron and Siti (2018) of EFL students in Indonesia, student responses from interviews and surveys conducted yielded the conclusion that, in
comparison with the control group of students who received more traditional teacher-centered methods of instruction (mainly lecture) cooperative learning strategies implemented in the experimental group generally fostered a more positive outlook toward learning English. Students cited affective factors such as increased confidence in their language skills, reducing nervousness when engaged in the target language, being given the opportunity to collaborate with classmates, and an overall increase in motivation as reasons for preferring a student-centered model to instruction.

The results of the case study seem to echo the sentiments expressed in the work of Cloud (as cited by Ghufron & Siti, 2018) which reveals that the innate social interaction between students trademark of collaborative learning activities helps reduce students’ nerves and inhibitions associated with their self-assessment of L2 language proficiency. Furthermore, Cloud states that cooperative learning activities help foster students’ development of intangibles such as leadership, turn-taking, and accountability; qualities which extend well beyond the context of language learning. Thus, language educators - and teachers of all subjects for that matter - must consider incorporating cooperative learning strategies into the classroom. The development and refining of the characteristics of a lifelong learner - teamwork, interpersonal communication skills, accountability, responsibility - should be given strong consideration as additional incentives for making the switch to a more student-centered approach to instruction.

To the extent that student-centered instruction promotes active learning and increased student engagement, Fuller et al. (2018) found supportive evidence from numerous studies in the field in how students maintain a sense of control in their own achievement of learning outcomes. Active learning strategies employed in a student-centered classroom are conducive to increased
engagement, simply in how they transform the role of students to be a more active participant in
their own learning, in working cooperatively in small groups, problem-solving, negotiating,
reasoning, and partaking in both peer- and self-assessment. Moreover, students experience
increased engagement by virtue of the less-dominant role assumed by teachers, shifting from
dictator to facilitator of learning, and providing guidance and feedback only when solicited by
students. In acknowledgement of the complexity of emotions that factor into students’ motivation
in learning (Pishghadam et al., 2016) Fuller et al. (2018) claims that student engagement isn’t
just measurable in students’ overall demeanor and classroom behavior, and suggests that there
are cognitive and emotional elements to student engagement as well. While emotional
engagement relates to how students feel about their own learning - their level of enjoyment,
interest, and hardship experienced in their language learning - cognitive engagement is linked to
how students think about or perceive their learning progress, in their own self-assessment, how
such progress measures up to that of their peers, and the extent to which it meets their teachers
stated learning outcomes and expectations for the course.

Although it seems logical that students who take charge of their own learning develop
higher levels of autonomy and interdependence with their classmates, and consequently
experience increased motivation and engagement in their learning, the transition from teacher-
centered to student-centered instruction doesn’t just take place overnight. On the contrary, as
Ghufron and Siti caution (2018) that student-centered instruction is challenging to implement in
that it calls for more time, energy, and management in the planning and execution of lesson
plans, collaborative learning activities, search for authentic texts, collection of ancillaries, and
work to provide students with access to technology-based projects or research. The heavy lifting
must take place during instructors’ prep time, already at a precious premium and thus makes teachers averse to permanently adopting a student-centered teaching model to their instruction. Furthermore, as students assume greater responsibility and autonomy in the classroom, such a transition may be met with a great deal of confusion by some students, especially those accustomed to the traditionally more passive, observant role afforded to them in a teacher-centered classroom. Finally, some teachers (perhaps especially in the K-12 setting) may be cautious to cede near full control and autonomy to their students, in fear that things will quickly get out of hand and that students will not take full ownership of their own learning when afforded the chance to do so. Nonetheless, language teachers will reap the long-term benefits that a transition to a more student-centered classroom environment yields, in giving students greater influence and agency in their learning. Allowing for regular and sustained opportunities to work in tandem with one another will yield an increase in student motivation, improve students’ behavioral, cognitive and emotional engagement, and empower them to assume a more active role in monitoring and assessing their overall progress in their foreign language acquisition.

Summary

This review of the literature focused on three themes: 1) language learning anxiety, 2) student/teacher motivation, and 3) student-centered design to instruction.

Given the fact that the classroom is an emotional place and, therefore one’s emotions greatly influence language learning experience, motivation, progress, and self-identity, it is the obligation of educators, of all levels and subject areas, to ensure that they construct and facilitate their courses in such a manner that lower students’ stress and anxiety in how they react to the design and delivery of instruction and learning activities. Furthermore, it is incumbent upon all
educators, most especially foreign language instructors due to the interactive dynamics of the foreign language classroom, to be mindful of the power of students’ emotional reaction to the rigors of SLA and the inevitable hardship they will endure, and to account for such struggles in their approach to instruction. Lastly, given that most foreign language courses follow a curriculum based in the grammar translation method, especially the more beginning and intermediate level texts, those in the field of foreign language teaching must consider how incomprehensible input and a premature expectation for oral/written production exacerbate the issue of raising students’ affective filter and overall language learning anxiety.

Although Sparks et al. (2018) makes a valid argument that L1 language proficiency may be a more causal factor in students’ L2 language proficiency and achievement, the breadth of theories, studies and conclusions made in the literature of the field (Ahktar, 2018; Aydin, 2018; Contreras-Soto et al., 2019; Fahrurrozi, 2017; Kassem, 2019; Pishghadam et al., 2016; Saiphet, 2018) give credence to the assertion that affective variables such as anxiety and motivation do in fact play a considerable role in students’ motivation and engagement, and consequently, their overall personal experience and academic achievement in foreign language acquisition. While Sparks et al. maintain that language teachers’ primary focus should be on teaching the language skills necessary for proficiency in the four modes of communication, the work Pishghadam et al. (2016) and the development of the EBLI model for instruction underscore the integral role of ‘emotioncy’ in the classroom and that emotions play in students’ perception of themselves and of their coursework.

In reflecting on the chronic absentee rates of Liberty’s ELL student population, the pedestrian academic achievement rate and low enrollment in upper division coursework of the
school’s Spanish as a FL student population, and fractional completion rates from both ELLs and FLs of the nascent Seal of Biliteracy initiative on its campus (LUHSD, 2018), it is apparent that the principle challenge of language teachers on its campus is to increase students’ motivation, interest, and engagement in achieving course goals and objectives, comprehensively reinventing their pedagogical approach to instruction in the process. As the quality of teaching students receive helps facilitate the process of their cognitive development, teacher motivation and student achievement in school are strongly interrelated. Therefore, a fundamental shift in the teacher’s and the learner’s roles in the classroom is paramount to increased student motivation.

I do believe that language teachers should consider the possible impacts of language skills on learner achievement, while also accounting for the affective variables that manipulate learners’ emotions in order to sustain optimal learning conditions for students. Furthermore, I also believe that our overall conclusion to the wealth of data and perspectives presented in the literature should not be so black and white as Sparks and his colleagues make it out to be. Rather, there is inherent value in everything that’s been proposed. There’s value in devising instructional strategies (anticipatory sets that activate prior schema and knowledge in students L1, identifying cognates between students’ L1 and those in the target language, adapting creative and academic writing norms learned in students L1 to their L2, adopting test-taking strategies [time management, pre-reading questions, annotating the text, highlighting key words/phrases, etc] from students L1 to assessments in their L2) that tap into students’ L1 proficiency to empower and enrich their level of achievement in the target language.

Additionally, there’s value in adopting learning activities and instructional strategies (use of mini-whiteboards to quickly jot down student responses, having students hold up X number of
fingers, show thumbs up-thumbs down, drawing, picture ordering/sequencing, pointing, games such as simon says, flyswatter, pictionary, and charades) that lower students’ affective filter with a de-emphasis on oral/written production while still providing language teachers with multiple and perhaps even more effective and immediate checks for students’ understanding and comprehension. Just as much as there’s value in shifting toward more collaborative, student-centered instruction (think-pair-share, peer reviews, pairwork, group discussion, stationwork, turn-and-talks, competition, games, and project-based learning) so as to increase student motivation and engagement.

Baillie and Fitzgerald (as cited by Shin, 2018) believe that project-based learning “improves cooperation and responsibility, problem solving ability, communication ability, creative thinking, critical thinking, and self-directed learning ability” (p. 97). Student-centered learning methods are ideal in that they empower students to design, organize, and cooperate with one another throughout their learning experience. Project-based learning allows students to confront practical and complex problems by themselves, test possible solutions, and work collaboratively with their peers. In such a collaborative classroom environment, learning occurs while students are in the act of negotiating meaning and relying upon one another for feedback and support. As noted by Choi (referred to by Shin) a student-centered learning atmosphere requires teachers and learners to switch roles assume parts in the learning process that are markedly different from those that they’ve grown accustomed to within the teacher-centered classroom. While there is a body of research in the field highlighting how a shift from teacher- to student-centered instruction increases student motivation and engagement (Kassem, 2019; Saiphet, 2018), diminishes students’ language learning anxiety (Aydin, 2018; Pishghadam et al.,
2016) and improves learning outcomes (Ahktar, 2018; Fahrurrozi, 2017; Shin, 2018) there is little, if any at all, research on how such a model could be implemented within a cross-curricular, cross-cultural pedagogical framework.
CHAPTER III
THE PROJECT AND ITS DEVELOPMENT

Brief Description of the Project

Given the wealth of success garnered by cooperative learning activities and techniques within a variety of backgrounds (nationality, gender, age) and classroom settings (grade level, EFL, ESL, and FL) the field project portion seeks to marry both ELL and FL students’ desire for increased classroom collaboration with not just a shift to student-centered instruction in both classroom settings, but also to include regular, sustained opportunities for both groups of students to work cooperatively with one another and what such a cross curricular partnership might yield.

Highlighted by lesson created and conducted by both ELL and FL students, along with guidance and support of ELD/FL faculty, the field project is an interest-based language acquisition manual designed to elicit an authentic exchange of language (grammar, vocabulary, sintax, morphology, phonology) and culture (customs, traditions, beliefs, perspectives) between ELL/FL students working in pairs and small groups. It also affords opportunities for peer evaluation and self-assessment, monitoring their own progress while receiving sustained, expedited feedback from their peers and instructors. Organic in composition and delivery, the field project is intended to suit the personal and academic goals of any pairing of students, whether they be ESL or EFL students and FL students of Spanish, French, etc. Although it is intended for a pairing between ESL/FL (Spanish) students, the long-term goal of the project is for it to be extended to other languages representative of Liberty High School, such as Vietnamese, Farsi, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Tagalog (LUHSD, 2018).
In seeking to address the achievement gap of both ELL and FL students at Liberty High School, it seems only prudent to adapt the principles of the student-centered classroom and design a model to instruction that not only assigns autonomy and agency to both groups of students, but also fosters a sense of codependence and cooperation between ELL and FL students in eliciting cultural and communicative competence through working together in a cooperative learning environment. Roger & Johnson (as cited by Ghufron and Siti, 2018) argue that in a cooperative learning situation, “interaction among students is characterized by positive goal interdependence with individual accountability” (p. 668). Hendrix (as noted by Ghufron and Siti) elaborates that such positive interdependence “is a condition in which the students are linked together with other students in such a way that one cannot succeed unless the group members also succeed” (p. 670). Such a collaborative partnership between students from diverse language and culture backgrounds is reminiscent of what LHS students had been calling for to resolve issues of hatred and violence in school, all the while enriching students’ overall learning experience by assuming a more active role in their education. In summary, the field project aspires to seek a better return from students as invaluable human capital in the investment of their overall academic achievement by empowering both ESL and FL learners through an intercultural, interpersonal, student-centered design to foreign language teaching.

Development of the Project

As a new language teacher, and after a year or two of trial and error implementing games and other numerous project-based learning activities as, I found myself reverting back to what worked for me as a foreign language learner back in my time as an undergraduate student, and what yielded encouraging results with my Korean students studying Spanish. I decided I would
invite some of my adult ESL students as guest speakers and facilitate small group conversations in both English and Spanish, as equitably as possible, with my AP Spanish Language and Culture students. I invited 3 students from different states of Mexico (Jalisco, Michuacan, and Nayarit) a student from the Dominican Republic, a student from Colombia, and a very voracious French-speaking student from The Democratic Republic of Congo.

My AP students formed groups of 4-5 with each one of the guest speakers, created a series of 10 questions that they wanted to ask our invited guests in the target language, and spent the first 7-8 minutes speaking in Spanish, and the latter 7-8 minutes in English. We rotated every 15 minutes so that all students had an opportunity to connect with each of the guest speakers. It was amazing to observe my students - ESL and FL alike - fully engaged in their conversations in their respective L1/L2, simultaneously playing the part of mentor and student to one another. Whereas my high school students are constantly checking their phones, waiting at the door for the bell to ring during the last 2-3 minutes of class, the entire class talked right through the bell and didn’t realize that the class had ended until my next class started to file in. The level of engagement, and enjoyment for that matter, was nothing like I had ever experienced as a teacher. Since then, I have been determined to devise a more formal means of incorporating such a student-centered approach to my regular instruction with all of my classes.

In developing this field project, I have given great thought to the Whorf/Sapir hypothesis, which states that there are certain thoughts of an individual in one language that cannot be understood by those who engage their surroundings in another language (Verspoor and Pütz, 2000). I’ve reflected on how it affects my own instruction, and the learning experiences of both my adolescent FL and adult ELL students. The Whorf/Sapir hypothesis seeks to make sense of
how language determines the way in which we understand our reality, in that there are as many possible reactions to the same or similar experiences as there are languages spoken around the world. My interpretation of this hypothesis is that it is not so much directly related to language form/function, but rather the sociolinguistic dynamics at play when “thinking” in another language.

In summary, this project seeks marry students’ desire for classroom collaboration with a shift to student-centered instruction. It attempts to demonstrate and exemplify how such collaboration can increase student engagement and motivation while lowering language learning anxiety. Potential opportunities for cross-curricular and institutional collaboration are also highlighted to better satisfy students' academic and emotional needs. This project includes an interest-based language acquisition manual designed to elicit an authentic exchange of language and culture between ESL/FL students working in pairs. The format of the project aspires to foster an empowering, inclusive, and safe educational environment for all students, all the while making more effective use of our most powerful and transformative asset: our students.
The Project

The project in its entirety can be found in the appendix.
CHAPTER IV
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Late one gloomy February evening, I received a call from my kid brother, Chase. Typically, I can barely get him to answer any of my text messages, so needless to say I was alarmed by the call, especially at such a late hour. That night, he confided in me the hardship he’d been enduring in his second semester as a college freshman, how he’d been struggling to attend class, let alone get out of bed. Failing all of his classes and feeling chronically ill, my little brother was reaching out for brotherly advice. In the weeks that transpired thereafter, we pulled together as a family and provided him the familial support he needed while he sought professional treatment for what turned out to be somatic symptom disorder; a debilitating mental condition which results from chronic stress and anxiety. Seeing my kid brother, who of the three of us siblings is the most academically and intellectually-gifted, experience so much emotional hardship shook me at my core. I began to reflect on my own students and whether they too could be experiencing the same sort of struggles with stress and anxiety, and how much of an impediment it was to their language learning and overall academic achievement. Turns out, my brother is part of a growing majority of young people whose debilitative anxiety impedes their academic progress.

The reflection process led me to analyze and consider the dynamic between native and non-native Spanish speakers enrolled in my AP Spanish Language & Culture course. When I first started teaching the course, the level of anxiety in the classroom was palpable on the first day of school. As we discussed our collective goals and concerns, the native speakers admitted to the
alien sensation of using Spanish within an academic setting, and were afraid that they didn’t know how to write or speak ‘correct’ Spanish. Krashen’s description of monitor under-users is an accurate characterization of how many native speakers acquired Spanish as their first language at home and in non-academic settings, and thus demonstrate examples of fossilized errors in orthography and grammar, and tend to struggle with more academic reading and writing due to a lack of CALP lexicon. The same can be said for ESL students who have acquired English in non-academic settings, such as the workplace, while running day-to-day errands, or with friends and neighbors. To the extent that they have become comfortable using English in such domains, especially at home amongst family/friends, such monitor under-users might elect to place more of an emphasis on fluency rather than accuracy, and have made peace with the fact that they aren’t speaking perfect English, yet speak it well enough to be understood.

On the other hand, non-native speakers in my AP class felt just as anxious as their native counterparts, but for different reasons. Krashen’s characterization of monitor over-users is reminiscent of second language learners of Spanish. Well-versed in grammar rules and experts of verb conjugations who, non-native speakers tend to focus on accuracy over fluency, and struggle in the more colloquial, spontaneous aspects of oral communication. Additionally, EFL students who hail from countries where the Grammar Translation Method is the predominant approach to instruction, such as China, South Korea, and Japan, also fall under this category and description. For this reason, as Krashen initially asserted and ESL educator Roberto Guzman echoed in his TED talk address to fellow colleagues in language education (Guzman, 2019) foreign language instructors must place a greater emphasis on content and not so much on form, so as to encourage students to make mistakes and learn from them.
Over the course of teaching the AP group, it became increasingly evident to me that it was imperative for the two demographic groups to work collaboratively with one another to effectively address one another’s obstacles to learning. Non-native speakers’ knowledge of CALP in Spanish - grammar terminology, certain vocabulary, ability to recognize cognates, accent placement, and background reasoning - was superior to that of many of their native-speaking classmates, thus they had something of value to offer. Native speakers proficiency and familiarity with BICS in Spanish - idiomatic expressions, slang, pronunciation, familiarity with culture, customs, and traditions - provided context and enrichment for non-natives and helped them transition from formulaic, predictable speech and writing to more original, spontaneous oral and written responses in Spanish. One’s strength was another’s weakness, and vice versa. They were a perfect match for one another.

Although there is little current research in the field that directly supports the thesis of peer-to-peer instruction between ESL and FL students lowering language learning anxiety while increasing student motivation and engagement, there is a wealth of research in the fields of ESL, EFL and Spanish as a foreign language that supports the idea of a transition to a more student-centered approach to instruction. Although there has been some research in the field that argues that language learning anxiety is more likely a byproduct of low communicative competence, an overwhelming body of initial and contemporary research in the field has established anxiety in general, and language learning anxiety in particular, to be one of the primary factors of poor academic achievement in language learning.
Krashen’s initial research and hypothesis continues to play out in language classrooms of all ages and proficiency levels as students, with increasingly lower attention spans and peaking desire to connect interpersonally, are bound to the limitations of a teacher-centered, grammar translation-style approach to instruction that only exacerbates the negative affective variables (anxiety, boredom, lack of motivation/engagement) that widen the achievement in gap for both ESL/EFL and FL student populations. Consequently, I believe that a language partnership program between the two demographics is essential to bridging the gap in academic achievement while empowering both groups of students to be ambassadors of their own language and culture for the benefit of their language counterpart, all the while increasing student motivation and engagement, addressing behavior, classroom management, attendance, and chronic absenteeism issues on K-12, adult, college, and university campuses alike. Ironically, all of this can be achieved at little or no cost to administrations and districts, in having students serve as experts of their own language and culture, requiring no additional financial capital investment. Moreover, a peer-to-peer instructional model has the potential to actually increase school/district revenue, in increasing average daily attendance (ADA) by addressing chronic absenteeism of ELL students through increased engagement, motivation, and inclusion.

An increase in academic achievement could be accomplished in having more students - ELL and FL alike - qualify for the California Seal of Biliteracy, distinguishing schools and making them sought after by families within and outside the district to have their children attend, thereby increasing revenue via increased enrollment. Lastly, in light of diminishing interest in education as a profession, a shift to more student-centered instruction would decrease teacher burnout by shifting more accountability and responsibility on students to play a more active role
in their own learning, saving districts tens of thousands of dollars in not having to commit as many funds to teacher recruitment, new teacher training programs such as BTSA, and the regular use of subs to fill both short and long-term voids created by the departure of exhausted, burnt out teachers. An investment in our most treasured asset - our students - was echoed recently by Peter Tabichi, winner of the Global Teacher Prize, in his assertion that “[if] given the chance, if we invest in the young people, they are going to do great things” (Odula, 2019).

**Recommendations**

In my experience as a language teacher, I had my dessert before delving into the main course of my career in education. Having started as a Spanish instructor at an international school in South Korea, I was spoiled by my students’ motivation and discipline for learning. As a novice teacher, I was appalled at how interested and engaged they were in their studies, in spite of my own struggles to be an effective teacher. Over time, however, as I became more familiar with the education system in Korea and the societal expectation of its youth, I became disenchanted by the purely extrinsic motivation of my students, and the immense academic pressure that they had to endure. It was all about the grade. If a student got an A-, their first reaction would be to question why it wasn’t an A or an A+, and what they could do to change it. Whereas I had originally met such solicitations with admiration and respect for students’ strong work ethic, I was now disheartened that students had tunnel vision, and had lost sight of their overall learning experience while engaged in feverish competition with their fellow classmates. Although I still feel very new to the field of education, those humble beginnings as a new teacher in Korea feel like a distant memory when juxtaposed with the apathetic demeanor of my sophomore Spanish students. It’s night and day.
When I was going through the teacher credential program, the instructor for my classroom management course, my first course ever as an intern, cautioned that if you’re exhausted at the end of a class, you’re going about it all wrong. If you’re exhausted at the end of planning a lesson, then you’re on the right track. In a student-centered classroom, students are the ones doing the heavy lifting, freeing the teacher to make their way throughout the classroom to observe how students are doing and providing direction, feedback, and encouragement wherever needed. Student discipline becomes less of an issue because, when given clear expectations and the tools for how to satisfy them, most students naturally rise to the challenge and focus on the task at hand. Being able to use proximity as to redirect off-task behavior is more conducive when teachers aren’t assuming a stationary position and are instead free to roam around the classroom as they see fit.

While a number of districts nationwide have adopted “no zeroes” policies, banning grades lower than a 50 or 60 on any given assignment or exam, under the rationale that such low grades could make it mathematically impossible for students to recover (Tyner & Petrilli, 2018) a student-centered approach to instruction shifts greater responsibility from teacher to student and empowers them to play a more active role in their own learning and academic achievement. A student-centered classroom model enables the teacher to increase checks for understanding and provide students with more guidance and support, while at the same time affording students with more opportunities to monitor their own progress through enhanced peer and self assessment.

While several districts have also implemented “mandatory retake” policies, requiring that teachers allow students to retake exams or redo assignments if they receive a low grade the first time (Tyner & Petrilli, 2018) a student-centered instructional model places a greater sense of
accountability and learner autonomy on students, instilling in them intangibles such as a strong work ethic, ownership, and responsibility; attributes that will serve them well in life, well after they graduate, in whatever field or trade they elect to dedicate their career toward.

In returning back to that day where my students and I discussed potential solutions to school violence, I believe that a language partner program, along with a general shift to more student-centered instruction, will yield the type of increased collaboration among all students that they yearn for and will instill a greater respect for all students’ cultures, beliefs, and backgrounds. Undoubtedly to be met with resistance from veteran and new teachers alike, the notion that students learn better from one another than they do from the teacher is substantiated by the gross research and findings in the field of second language acquisition. For a successful transition to student-centered instruction to transpire, teachers will need to embrace the inevitable ‘organized chaos’ of a student-led classroom environment, and be willing to invest more time and energy into planning differentiated lessons.

In spite of all the logistical and pedagogical challenges that such a fundamental paradigm shift faces, we owe it to our students to follow through. We should be inspired by thoughtful insight and invigorated by the challenge to learn new, innovative, and more effective approaches to our craft. As language educators, one of our learning goals should be students’ use of language to form a more inclusive, comprehensive outlook on the world and the global issues that affect us all. In a recent interview (McGinnis, 2019) former President Barack Obama noted that “part of diplomacy is letting other people know you appreciate their cultures, stories, histories. When people feel as if they are known, understood and seen, then they are more open to your perspectives.” If we are to successfully address the achievement gap of both EL and FL students,
school violence, and the myriad other issues that we are confronted with as a global community, we would be wise to heed the advice of our most cherished asset - or students - and begin to empower those who have traditionally been afforded little voice nor recognition to work in collaboration with one another and discover that there truly is very little that separates us, that we have more in common than we realize, and that language should not be a barrier to communication, but rather a vehicle to communicate and share the rich diversity of ideas, experiences, and perspectives needed on the frontlines of educational, political and social justice.
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**Examples of Peer-to-Peer Approach to Instruction (Lesson Plans)**

1. **Customs & Traditions (English/Spanish)** - pgs. 19-25
   Designed and composed by Jesus Jimenez & Steven Gonzalez of AP Spanish Language & Culture, LHS, 2019

   Designed and composed by Melanie Nomberto & Gonzalo Ordaz of AP Spanish Language & Culture, LHS, 2019

3. **Food/Culture Around Christmas (English/Spanish)** - pgs. 38-49
   Designed and composed by Wendy Tinoco, Nathan Valdez, & Diana Velez of AP Spanish Language & Culture, LHS, 2019

4. **Art & Culture (English/Spanish)** - pgs. 50-62
   Designed and composed by Elmer Martinez & Jhoyve Castillo of AP Spanish Language & Culture, LHS, 2019
Growing up in the monotony of a small town that until relatively recently used to have only one stoplight, I fell in love with San Francisco and all its ethnic and cultural diversity. When I was 3, my father started hosting a home improvement radio program on KCBS, and would take me to the city with him every Saturday morning. Although it was only a mere 50 miles west of where we lived, the overall atmosphere was as different as night and day, with people from so many different backgrounds, speaking languages that I couldn’t understand. It was all just so foreign to me, and it was that sense of being a stranger in a strange land that instilled in me a love, passion, and curiosity for travel, culture, and foreign language studies.

After backpacking western Europe with a high school pal for 6 weeks the summer of graduation, it wasn’t a question of if I would study abroad as an undergraduate student at San Francisco State University, but rather a question of when. After having limited success in taking intermediate Spanish classes, one day I came across a flyer advertising the language buddy program hosted by the International Education Exchange Counsel (IEEC). Composed of both international students and American study abroad prospective participants & alumni, the IEEC was by far the largest student organization on campus, with more than 1,500 members and an extensive worldwide network of former members.

In anticipation of my academic year abroad studying Spanish in Chile, I decided...
to become a member and sign up for their language buddy program. After completing the initial placement survey, I was paired with an international student from Chile studying international relations at SFSU. She and I became fast friends, meeting up at least once a week to peer teach one another. Had it not been for Daisy, I certainly would not have passed Intermediate Spanish (on my third attempt) nor had the confidence or conviction to uproot myself and live abroad for an entire year. I would like to think that I had a hand in coaching her through writing term papers in English and practice runs of her oral presentations. To this day, we keep in close touch.

What began as a casual pairing of two students with similar goals and aspirations blossomed into a friendship that yielded a lifelong affection and interest in one another’s language, culture, customs, and history. Daisy and I became roommates during her last semester at SF State, while I spent my first semester in Santiago living with her cousins in an authentic homestay experience. From such an organic partnership, I learned more about the Chilean dialect, slang, history, and traditions than I ever would have from a travel journal or textbook, and hopefully she too about American culture and customs. I knew then the power of leveraging interpersonal relationships to provide a vehicle and context for intercultural and language exchange.

When I returned from my year abroad in Chile, I became co-president of the IEEC and an on-campus ambassador for the Office of International Programs (OIP). In my capacity as an OIP ambassador, I would give 5-minute in-class presentations in various departments throughout campus, educating students of the benefits and opportunities of studying abroad. While immersed in this work and in my last year of studies, my advisor and mentor shared with me an opportunity to partake in a summer study abroad opportunity in Seoul, South Korea. Having never been to Asia and having no set plans for life post-graduation, I jumped at the opportunity and yet again signed up for the language buddy program.

Although a bit shy and introverted in the beginning, Vincent warmed up to me quickly when he found out that I was also a big baseball fan, having worked at the Giants stadium part-time as an usher. Our experience as language buddies was invaluable, as Vincent really struggled in presentational speaking, not having been afforded many opportunities back home. For me, I couldn’t even point out South Korea on a map, had never tried Korean food, didn’t know what K-pop was, and did not
know a word of Korean. Vincent walked me through all that and more, and as a result, I hit the ground running upon arriving in Seoul, and even got to stay with Vincent in the dorms as roommates!

What was initially supposed to be a 4-week summer session abroad grew and evolved into a 3-year stay in Korea as an EFL and Spanish instructor at an international school. Although highly motivated and diligent in their studies, my students (many Korean) were limited in their acquisition of Spanish due in large part to a lack of context. In addition to taking my students out for Mexican food, learning the basics of salsa and merengue, and chanting in Spanish for the local soccer team, I decided to leverage the relationships formed with others in the international expat community living in Korea and invite them to come speak to my Advanced Spanish students. Being a class of only 4 students, I was able to pair each one up with a native speaker (Costa Rica, Venezuela, Mexico, and Chile).

My students were to each prepare a set of 10 questions they wanted to ask about our guests' home country and their impressions of living in Korea. Students were also prepared to provide answers to their own questions if prompted by their language partner.

We allocated 10 minutes per conversation, all in the target language, with an occasional opportunity to use English and/or Korean for clarification or enrichment of the conversation, then we rotated partners. At the end of class, when students had a chance to debrief and relay their overall impressions, they indicated that although they were really scared and nervous in the beginning, they were very surprised by how much of the conversation they actually understood, and even more astonished by how much language they were able to produce. They reported a higher level of engagement during the conversations, and increased opportunities to seek help or clarification whenever they didn’t understand something. It was a very humbling and rewarding experience as all those involved felt like they were able to contribute and gain something from the exchange; a sense of interdependence that, as a novice teacher, really peaked my interest and had me exploring ways in which I could facilitate such engagement more regularly in my classes.
Genesis of Language Partner Program

After 3 years of living and teaching in Korea, and falling in love, my wife and I decided to relocate back to my hometown and start a life together. The transition back was challenging in a variety of aspects, most notably in my career as an educator. I decided to continue giving teaching a chance, since it would afford my wife and I regular opportunities to return to her native home of Seoul in the summers, and it was the field in which I had the most experience, albeit still very limited.

My first year as a teacher in America was tumultuous, to say the least. Having previously worked with highly motivated students who were bound for higher education, I inherited a group of predominantly apathetic adolescents who had little interest in the subject matter and were very challenging to motivate and manage. While English is the gold standard by which students in Korea are measured academically, Spanish in America is an afterthought; an elective in high school that isn’t afforded much in terms of clout or resources. My new challenge was to again provide an authentic context for learning for my students that would peak their interest and get them to buy into what I was selling.

After a year or two of trial and error implementing games and other numerous project-based learning activities, I found myself reverting back to what worked for me as a foreign language learner back in my time as an undergraduate student, and what yielded encouraging results with my Korean students studying Spanish. I again started with my most advanced students, this time with my AP Spanish Language and Culture students. I decided I would invite some of my adult ESL students as guest speakers and facilitate small group conversations in both English and Spanish, as equitably as possible. I invited 3 students from different states of Mexico (Jalisco, Michuacan, and Nayarit) a student from the Dominican Republic, a student from Colombia, and a very voracious French-speaking student from The Democratic Republic of Congo.
My AP students formed groups of 4-5 with each one of the guest speakers, created a series of 10 questions that they wanted to ask our invited guests in the target language, and spent the first 7-8 minutes speaking in Spanish, and the latter 7-8 minutes in English. We rotated every 15 minutes so that all students had an opportunity to connect with each of the guest speakers.

It was amazing to observe my students - ESL and FL alike - fully engaged in their conversations in their respective L1/L2, simultaneously playing the part of mentor and student to one another. Whereas my high school students are constantly checking their phones, waiting at the door for the bell to ring during the last 2-3 minutes of class, the entire class talked right through the bell and didn’t realize that the class had ended until my next class started to file in. The level of engagement (and enjoyment for that matter) was nothing like I had ever experienced as a teacher. Since then, I have been determined to devise a more formal means of incorporating such a student-centered approach to my regular instruction with all of my classes.

Campus Profile: Liberty High School
Liberty High School is located in eastern Contra Costa County, approximately 55 miles east of San Francisco and 63 miles south of Sacramento. Established in 1902, it currently serves 2,715 students in grades 9-12 in the communities of Brentwood, Oakley, Byron, Knightsen, Discovery Bay, and Antioch. There is a rich sense of tradition in our community, and generations of families have attended Liberty. Originally an agricultural community, the area experienced significant growth in the last 20 years and now there is a mixture of farms, small businesses, homes and apartments within the boundary of the school.

The student population is 43% White, 34% Hispanic Latino, 9% African American, 6% Filipino, 4% two or more races, and 4% Asian. Nearly 32% of the students are socioeconomically disadvantaged, 13% are students with disabilities, and 22% are English Language Learners. The success of the English Learner program is due to the hard work of teachers, support staff, bilingual liaisons, and administrators in ensuring that English Learners receive timely and effective support. School administration plans to build upon this success by continuing to provide staff development in the areas of academic language support, as well as strategies for teaching language acquisition while accessing academic content. In addition, ELD supplemental instructional materials are provided to teachers for student use. Technology is available for student use, with the addition of 12 laptop carts. Liberty's Chronic Absenteeism Rate for "All Students" is 15.9%. To decrease the rates of chronic absenteeism, the school administration has implemented positive attendance programs. Additionally, teachers have received training in lesson plan development in unleashing curiosity to increase student
engagement. More clubs and activities with multi-cultural emphasis help students to better connect to school. The most recent version of our student database system has the capability of identifying students with attendance issues early in the year to provide those students with additional support and guidance.

Nonetheless, according to the most recent Local Control Accountability Plan, or LCAP, published by the Liberty Union High School District (LUHSD, 2018) the graduation rate for English Language Learners (ELLs) was the second lowest among all student demographic groups. Moreover, the chronic absenteeism rate for ELLs rose 6% between academic years 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 to 24%, second only to homeless/foster youth students. Less than 3% of the class of 2017-2018 qualified for the California State Seal of Biliteracy, one of the established LCAP goals/benchmarks for all students (LUHSD, 2018) most especially ELL and FL students. Lastly, with ELL student enrolled in ELD and SDAIE coursework, there are scarce opportunities for ELL and FL students to interact and collaborate with one another, with limited inclusion of ELL students in clubs, sports, and other extracurricular activities.
Located directly across the street from Liberty High School, Liberty Adult Education opened its doors in 1937, offering an ESL class as its first class. In the 1940’s, during World War II, LAE trained citizens in classes related to civilian defense and military support. The school grew with the expanding population as veterans returned home and were seeking basic skills. At this same time, LAE responded to the needs of the growing agricultural immigrant population.

Liberty Adult Education offers 120 to 150 classes each semester and publishes two catalogs per year (Summer/Fall and Winter/Spring). Class sizes vary, depending on the program, from 8 to 85 students. ESL and ABE/GED classes average about 25 students and daytime CTE classes average about 18. Classes/Courses are offered Monday through Friday during the daytime, and Monday through Thursday evenings.

ESL has traditionally been the largest program at LAE, however in recent years, the ABE/GED program has moved it into second place. Many ESL students could not find work as a result of the economic downturn and relocated back to their country of origin. Many community members also lost their jobs and returned to school to refresh their basic skills or obtain a GED.

The ESL program at Liberty Adult Education offers multiple levels of English as a Second Language classes, from the basics of the alphabet and numbers to the advanced levels for students preparing for college or a career. At each level, students develop their English skills
through reading, writing, listening and speaking activities. Students learn how to use English in real life situations while learning about American culture. The English as a Second Language program is an open entry program. Students may register and enter classes at any time.

Liberty Adult Education also shares the facility with various other district programs for disabled adults and at risk youth. The campus also houses the EASTBAY Works One Stop Career Center. Due to its “next door” proximity, LAE enjoys direct access to the East Bay Works One Stop Career Center which is a joint venture of public entities, non-profit agencies, and private organizations matching businesses and job seekers.

The mission of Liberty Adult Education is to be a catalyst in the community for all adult learners, by equipping them with the necessary 21st Century skills to compete and succeed in an increasingly global society. Through comprehensive academic and enrichment programs, engaging curriculum, and dynamic instruction, LAE seeks to inspire lifelong learning. Lastly, Liberty Adult Education fosters students’ abilities to succeed in actively supporting the pursuit of their personal, educational, and career goals.

**Essential Aspects of Design for an Effective Peer-to-Peer Course**

**The 5 Design Elements of an Effective Peer-to-Peer Course**
1. Know Your Students

Although teachers may have an agenda given by admin to follow and course standards to adhere to, at the end of the day, the class should be about the students. *Who are your students? What is their academic and personal background? What are their goals and projected outcomes for your course, and what are their future aspirations that extend well beyond it? How does the criteria in the course outline relate to their goals and aspirations?* These are the very questions that teachers and students alike must ask and seek answers to at the onset of a course, and establish learning goals and course objectives that reflect the desires and interests of all those invested.

Consequently, the initial class sessions should be spent addressing these questions, giving all stakeholders an opportunity to establish relationships with one another. An effective educator diligently annotates these goals while assessing students’ proficiency levels and uses the garnered feedback to amend or enrich aspects of the course syllabus so that it better reflects and addresses the wants and needs of the students.

2. Choose Realistics Learning Goals & Measurable Objectives

One of the biggest mistakes junior educators tend to make is setting lofty, hard-to-measure objectives for their lessons. One of the key factors of student success and academic
achievement is the accurate establishment of learning goals and objectives that reflect the course outline and scope & sequence assigned to the course by the department or school. As a result, the primary role of an effective educator is to devise, design, and implement a scope and sequence that effectively addresses and assesses students’ knowledge, comprehension, and mastery of the stated learning goals and lesson objectives.

It is important here to note that learning goals are the long-term aspirations that both students and teachers hope to achieve by the end of the term, while lesson objectives outline the smaller steps which students take en route to fulfilling the learning goals stated for the course. Lesson objectives should be quantifiable; easy for teachers to check and even easier for students to self-assess and use to monitor their own learning.

3. Pick Exciting Topics and Contexts for Learning

Ideally, a textbook would do this all for you. However, we can all attest as either a student or teacher that very few textbooks are up to the task. Therefore, it is imperative that teachers solicit student feedback and suggestions in what they’d like to cover. If one of the primary learning goals of all those invested - students, teachers, and admin alike - is for students to improve their communicative competence and increase their reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills, then the role of the student is to provide the teacher with topics of interest (news, politics, music, art, history, etc.) and for the teacher to provide accessible language/vocab/grammar that is just above the students’ level of comprehension (i +1) all within an authentic context.
No easy task, to be sure, but this is the challenge that should bring out the best in both student and teacher; working cooperatively within a constant feedback loop while satisfying the goals of all those invested. An ideal way for teachers to obtain valuable data from students is to have them complete an interest survey as part of or upon completion of their level placement test, and to be afforded that data prior to the start of instruction so that the teacher may incorporate it in the scope and sequence for the course.

4. Use a Range of Teaching Approaches and Methods

Even though a course may have a particular focus on reading, grammar, pronunciation, or vocabulary, it’s important for teachers to acknowledge and understand that lessons will inevitably require of students to exercise all four modes of communication. Therefore, enriching lessons with the use of an eclectic variety of technology and resources (websites, video clips, live radio/TV broadcasts, newspaper/magazine articles, mp3/CD audio recordings, maps, realia, etc.) is imperative in exposing students to authentic language, exercising multiple modes of communication, and affording them with a more relevant and meaningful learning experience. It is important to note that the challenge here for teachers will be to ensure that content stays close to students’ proficiency level (i +1).

5. Provide Frequent and Multiple (Self-) Checks for Understanding

One of the primary benefits of a peer-to-peer, student-centered approach to instruction is that it not only affords students with increased opportunities for peer review and assessment, but that it also asserts the teacher into a more facilitative role in being able to freely circulate throughout the classroom and provide clarification, feedback, and support. Therefore, it is important that the instruction and learning activities of a lesson account for significantly more
guided instruction and practice *between* students, and that direct instruction from teacher to student be limited.

The natural flow of a peer-to-peer design for instruction is for the teacher to start off class with an effective anticipatory set, activating students’ prior knowledge of a topic that is of personal - and ideally shared - interest. After an opportunity to share prior knowledge in the target language with a partner and yet again within small groups, the teacher then embarks on brief direct instruction of a given concept, introduces the next learning activity, provides examples, elicits students’ examples, and then sets students off to partake in the learning activity while going around and checking for understanding. A final check at the end of the lesson as a group allows both student and teacher the opportunity to assess their own performance. We will go into greater detail in terms of the essential steps to follow for a successful design of a peer-to-peer classroom lesson in the next section of this teaching manual.

**10 Easy Steps to Follow for Peer-to-Peer Lesson Design:** Here are 10 Easy Steps for students and teachers alike to follow when designing a peer-to-peer lesson. The time allocated to conduct each step during actual class time is allocated according to a 90 min class session model.
1. Learning Objective(s) - (2 min) What new knowledge and/or skill should students be able to demonstrate by the end of this lesson? Ideally, the learning objective(s) should be limited (no more than 3) and mutual (relevant and of interest to both ELL and FL students). This can be assured by pairing students according to the results of the language learning preference survey. Additionally, learning objectives should be easily measurable (quantifiable if at all possible) so as to make it easier for both students and teachers to assess students’ overall progress and achievement.

2. Resources - (1 min) What technology/materials will students need to fully participate in this lesson? Resources that lend themselves to differentiated instruction and satisfy multiple learning styles (auditory, artistic, visual, kinesthetic, etc.) should be taken into consideration.

3. Anticipatory Set - (5 min) How will students activate/access their prior knowledge to improve their comprehension and understanding of this lesson? This is the initial hook that should grab students’ interest, and could be a short video clip, a song, a work of art, or a news headline. The purpose of the anticipatory set is to get students thinking about your chosen lesson topic and to access prior schemata. Include 2-3 prompts or questions in your anticipatory set to get students thinking, writing, and talking in the target language.

4. Introduction - (3 min) What key vocabulary/grammar concepts will be covered in this lesson? The introduction should begin with a brief overview of what will be covered in the lesson, along with an introduction to the key vocab/grammar covered in the lesson. This can be written on the whiteboard, notebook, or on a notecard for students to refer to throughout the lesson.
5. **Direct Instruction - (8-10 min)** This is where the teacher (or leading student) takes the wheel and demonstrates how to use key vocab/grammar concepts within an authentic context (asking for/giving directions, talking about hobbies/interest, compare/contrast of how holidays are celebrated in the target culture, etc.) Students should have ample opportunities to ask questions and elaborate upon key vocab/grammar concepts.

6. **Guided Practice - (15-20 min)** It is suggested here that the learner not be asked to produce authentic written/spoken language just yet, but rather be given the opportunity to demonstrate understanding through non-verbal comprehension checks, such as fill-in-the-blank, formulaic writing activities, pictionary, charades, simon says, matching, sequencing story fragments in chronological order, listening comprehension questions, reading comprehension questions, etc.

7. **Peer Practice - (15-20 min)** This segment of the lesson should begin with feedback from the teacher or leading student, in the learners L1 if need be, along with an opportunity for the learner to ask questions in their L1. Thereafter, the peer practice activity itself should begin with a reading/listening prompt, followed by a non-verbal comprehension check (holding up fingers, writing on mini-whiteboards, thumbs up/thumbs down, etc.) and then transition to formulaic writing responses. After having another opportunity to solicit feedback, learner begins to use written responses in a short dialogue.
8. Group Practice - (8-10 min) ELL/FL partners pair up with another set of students to form a group of four. Repeat short dialogue in a small group conversation.

9. Peer/Self Assessment - (10-12 min) This section of the lesson is meant for predictable, short spurts of authentic language output. Speed-dating - where students rotate partners every minute - is especially effective. Inside-outside circle, jigsaw reading, and ‘find someone who’ matching are also effective in getting students to practice newly acquired concept/skill.

10. Revisit Learning Objective(s) - (5-7 min) What new knowledge and/or skill are students now able to demonstrate/communicate? Students return back to their original partner. Learner debriefs leading student on what went well and what didn’t, and solicits feedback/suggestions. Learner then completes an exit ticket, with questions in the target language based on the stated learning objective for the lesson. Leading student then assesses learner responses and asks learner to assess their own achievement and progress. Teacher then leads entire class on a collective share of successes and ways to improve the lesson for next time.

Note: Applications for such peer-to-peer instruction can be carried out in a variety of classroom settings, including but not limited to the following:

- ESL and FL students in high school language courses
- ESL and FL adult students in adult education language courses
- ESL adult students and FL high school students, and vice versa, in both high school and adult education language courses (where logistically feasible)
- ESL and FL university students in university language courses
- ESL and FL university students as part of language exchange program, as sponsored by study abroad office, international student organization, or on-campus academic support center for international students (i.e. American Language Institute)
- EFL and FL students of all grade levels in an online-based exchange program (Skype, Zoom, Google Hangouts, etc.)

Examples of Peer-to-Peer Approach to Instruction (Lesson Plans)

I. Customs and Traditions (English)
Objective

- Know at least two different cultures and some traditions.
- Compare two traditions and the way they are celebrated.
- Identify their customs by celebrating those traditions.

Materials

- Whiteboard and Markers
- Pencil
- Notebook
- Cell Phone

Warm-Up

What is a Custom and what is a Tradition?

What are some traditions that your family celebrates?

Introduction (Define)

- Tradition
- Culture
- Customs
- Celebration

**Listening Practice with Partners** - With your partner, use your mobile device to search for a video that describes your favorite tradition and share it among you. Share what you like about different traditions.

Example: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vvMCtJwPZ2Q](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vvMCtJwPZ2Q)

What I like about the day of the dead is that we are back together with our loved ones who are no longer with us. It is also the day we commemorate them all.

**Reading Practice** - Review the questions before reading. Then read the article individually and ask your partner about the words you do not understand. Then answer the questions reviewed before reading the article.

1. How do traditions survive from generation to generation?
2. Why is it important to know our customs and traditions?
3. What effect do traditions have on the future of human beings? Why?

**Customs and traditions**

We human beings create culture. Our ways of thinking, feeling and acting, the language we speak, our beliefs, food and art, are some expressions of our culture.
This set of knowledge and experiences is transmitted from generation to generation by different means. Children learn from adults and adults from the elderly. They learn from what they hear and what they read; They also learn from what they see and experience for themselves in daily coexistence. This is how the traditions are inherited.

Through the transmission of their customs and traditions, a social group tries to ensure that the younger generations give continuity to the knowledge, values and interests that distinguish them as a group and make them different from others.

To conserve the traditions of a community or a country means to practice the customs, habits, ways of being and ways of behavior of the people.

To know ourselves better as people and as a human group, it is important to reflect on our customs and traditions, to think and dialogue with the community about what we can rescue from the legacy of our ancestors. It is also necessary to discuss with what criteria we accept or reject the customs and traditions of other peoples. We can take advantage of our cultural heritage if we consider that customs and traditions are bonds that strengthen the relationships of a community, that give it identity and its own face, and make it easier to project a common future.

**Writing Practice** - Write a response of 2-3 sentences for each question using the present tense.

1. What is your favorite tradition? Why?
2. How does your family accustom to celebrate this tradition?
3. How do you feel when the date of your favorite tradition arrives?
Speaking Practice (Evaluation) - Present in small groups the following information:

- Share at least two different cultures and some traditions of those cultures.
- Mention the differences between traditions and the way they are celebrated in those cultures.
- Identify the customs of celebration of different traditions in both cultures.

I. - Customs and Traditions (Spanish)

Español AP Lenguaje y Cultura – Periodo 6

Planeación

Maestros: Jesús Jiménez y Steven Gonzalez

Fecha: 04/26/2019

Objetivo

- Conocer al menos dos culturas diferentes y algunas tradiciones.
• Comparar dos tradiciones y la forma en que son celebradas.
• Identificar sus costumbres al celebrar esas tradiciones.

**Recursos**

• Pizarra con Marcadores
• Lapiz
• Cuaderno
• Movil

**Para Empezar**

¿Qué es una Costumbre y qué es una Tradición?
¿Cuáles son algunas tradiciones que celebra tu familia?

**Introduccion (definir)**

- Tradición
- Cultura
- Costumbres
- Festejo
- Celebracion

**Práctica de Escuchar en Parejas** - Con tu compañero, busquen en sus móviles un video que describa su tradición favorita y compartanla entre ustedes. Compartan que les gusta de las diferentes tradiciones.

Ejemplo: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vvMQtJwPZ2Q](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vvMQtJwPZ2Q)

Lo que me gusta del día de los muertos es que volvemos a estar juntos con nuestros queridos que ya no están con nosotros. Además es el día en que los conmemoramos a todos ellos.
Practica de Leer - Repasa las preguntas antes de leer. Después lee el artículo individualmente y pregunta a tu compañero sobre las palabras que no entiendas. Después contesten las preguntas que repasaron antes de leer el artículo.

1. ¿Cómo sobreviven las tradiciones de generación en generación?
2. ¿Porqué es importante conocer nuestras costumbres y tradiciones?
3. ¿Qué efecto tienen las tradiciones en el futuro de los seres humanos? ¿Porqué?

Costumbres y Tradiciones

Los seres humanos creamos cultura. Nuestras formas de pensar, de sentir y de actuar, la lengua que hablamos, nuestras creencias, la comida y el arte, son algunas expresiones de nuestra cultura.

Este conjunto de saberes y experiencias se transmite de generación en generación por diferentes medios. Los niños aprenden de los adultos y los adultos de los ancianos. Aprenden de lo que oyen y de lo que leen; aprenden también de lo que ven y experimentan por sí mismos en la convivencia cotidiana. Así se heredan las tradiciones.

Mediante la transmisión de sus costumbres y tradiciones, un grupo social intenta asegurar que las generaciones jóvenes den continuidad a los conocimientos, valores e intereses que los distinguen como grupo y los hace diferentes a otros.

Conservar las tradiciones de una comunidad o de un país significa practicar las costumbres, hábitos, formas de ser y modos de comportamiento de las personas.
Para conocernos mejor como personas y como grupo humano, es importante reflexionar acerca de nuestras costumbres y tradiciones, pensar y dialogar con la comunidad acerca de que podemos rescatar del legado de nuestros antepasados. También es necesario discutir con qué criterios aceptamos o rechazamos las costumbres y tradiciones de otros pueblos. Podemos aprovechar nuestra herencia cultural si consideramos que las costumbres y tradiciones son lazos que estrechan las relaciones de una comunidad, que le dan identidad y rostro propio, y facilitan proyectar un futuro común.

**Práctica de Escribir** - Escribe un respuesta de 2-3 oraciones por cada pregunta usando el tiempo presente.

1. ¿Cuál es tu tradición favorita? ¿Porqué?
2. ¿Cómo acostumbra tu familia a celebrar esta tradición?
3. ¿Cómo te sientes cuando llega la fecha de tu tradición favorita?

**Práctica de Hablar (Evaluación)** - Presentarán en grupos pequeños la siguiente información:

- Compartir al menos dos culturas diferentes y algunas tradiciones de esas culturas.
- Mencionar las diferencias entre las tradiciones y la forma en que se celebran en esas culturas.
- Identificar las costumbres de celebración de las diferentes tradiciones en ambas culturas.

**Examples of Peer-to-Peer Approach to Instruction (Lesson Plans)**

II. - Ranchera Music & Country Music (English)
Ranchera Music and Country Music

Gonzalo Ordáz y Melanie Nomberto

Learning Goals:

- Communicate 3 differences between ranchera and country music.
- Identify the instruments they use in both genres.
- Distinguish the difference between Mexican culture and Western culture.
Resources:

- Pencil / Pen
- Cellphone
- Paper / Notebook

---

Short Answer Prompts

Activities

2 Minute Speaking Prompts

10 mins 5 mins 30 mins 10 mins 6 mins

Short Vocabulary Quiz

Listening comprehension prompts / Writing prompts
Anticipatory Set:

The students will answer the questions using prior knowledge of grammar and vocabulary.

1. What instruments do you think the country and the ranchero have in common?

1. What is a typical outfit for a vaquero or a cowboy?

1. Do you listen to these genres? And if so, what are some of your favorite Ranchera and Country songs?

Vocabulary:

- Music
- Guitar
- Cowboy Hat
- Drums
- Cowboy Boots
- Horse
- Ranch
- Belt
Pair Practice:

https://create.kahoot.it/share/la-musica-ranchera-vs-country/facc61ca-150d-46c4-8a9e-3b928f9dbc41

---

Review the learning goal:

With your partner, answer these phrases:

- Cowboys wear _______ and ________.
- The "_______" came from "_______"
- The original cowboy was the ________.
Reading practice:

On your cell phone, record a 2 minute conversation with your partners by answering this question:

Do you listen to these genres? And if so, what are some of your favorite Ranchera and Country songs?

Writing Practice:

1. Do you like the style of the cowboys?

2. Would you like to live on a ranch?

3. Where did the style come from?

4. Where did the "blue yodel" come from?
Practica de Hablar (Presentacion):

Your partner will speak for 30 seconds to indicate the following information:

1. The ranchero style:

2. What they talk about in the songs:

3. Which songs do you listen to:

Pair Practice:

- Can you communicate 3 differences between ranchera and country music?
- Can you identify the instruments you use in both genres?
- Can you tell the difference between Mexican culture and Western culture?
II. - Ranchera Music & Country Music (Spanish)

Metas de Aprendizaje:

- Comunicar 3 diferencias entre la música ranchera y el country.
- Identificar los instrumentos que usan en los dos géneros.
- Distinguir la diferencia entre la cultura mexicana y la cultura occidental.
Recursos:

- Lapiz / Lapicera
- Teléfono Móvil
- Papel / Cuaderno

Preguntas de respuesta corta
Actividades
Conversaciones de 2 minutos

10 mins  5 mins  30 mins  10 mins  6 mins

Prueba corta de Vocabulario
Listening comprehension prompts / Writing prompts
Conjunto Anticipatorio:

Los alumnos responderán a las preguntas y elegirán el conocimiento previo de gramática y vocabulario de los alumnos.

1. ¿Qué instrumentos crees que tienen en común el país y la ranchera?

1. ¿Qué es un atuendo típico para un vaquero o un cowboy?

1. ¿Escuchas estos géneros? Y si es así, ¿cuáles son algunas de tus canciones favoritas de Ranchera y Country?

Vocabulario:

- Musica
- Guitara
- Tejanas
- Tambores
- Botas Vaqueras
- Caballo
- Rancho
- Cinto
Práctica en pares:

https://create.kahoot.it/share/la-musica-ranchera-vs-country/facc61ca-150d-46c4-8a9e-3b928f9dbc41

Revisar la meta de aprendizaje:

Con tu pareja, contesten estas frases:

- Los vaqueros usan ________ y ________.

- El “_______” vino de “_______”

- El cowboy original era el ________.
Practica de leer:

En tu celular graba una conversación con tu parejas de 2 minutos contestando esta pregunta:

¿Escuchas estos géneros? Y si es así, ¿cuáles son algunas de tus canciones favoritas de Ranchera y Country?

---

Práctica de escribir:

1. ¿Te gusta el estilo de los vaqueros?

1. ¿Te gustaría vivir en un ranchó?

1. ¿De donde vino el "blue yodel"?

1. ¿De donde vino el "blue yodel"?
Practica de Hablar (Presentacion):

Tu pareja va a hablar por 30 segundos para indicar la siguiente información:

1. El estilo ranchero:

1. De lo que hablan en las canciones:

1. Cuales canciones escuchan ustedes:

Practica en Pares:

- ¿Puede comunicar 3 diferencias entre la música ranchera y el country?
- ¿Puede identificar los instrumentos que usan en los dos géneros?
- ¿Puede distinguir la diferencia entre la cultura mexicana y la cultura occidental?
Examples of Peer-to-Peer Approach to Instruction (Lesson Plans)

III. - Food/Culture around Christmas (English)

Culture and food on Christmas

By: Wendy Tinoco, Diana Velez, and Nathan Valdez period: 6

Objective

At the end of this lesson, students will be able to...

Communicate 5 different cultural traditions on Christmas

Recognize the different foods each culture eats on Christmas

Learn and teach the importance of knowing other cultures traditions
Materials

The materials students will need will be...
Pencil, paper, color pencils, a partner, brain, a phone, and the will to want to learn.

To begin: Vocabulary about Christmas and Foods

Mexicans:          Americans:
Tamales            Fruitcake
Champurrado        Mashed potatoes
Ponche             Turkey
Pozole             Gingerbread cookies
Atole              Alcohol
Tequila            Bread rolls
Beer               Mac n cheese
Practice in pairs

Students will need to get in pairs or groups of no more than four, and they will draw a food or drink of their choice from either culture. They will then have to draw and share the importance of the food or drink to the culture on Christmas.
Listening Practice

- Before reading

- What do traditions signify in your culture?
- Why are traditions important to you?
- What are the benefits of having a tradition?

The importance of having traditions

The reason why traditions are important is that they convey shared values, stories and goals from one generation to another. They motivate societies to create and shape a collective identity, which in turn serves to shape individual identities. Traditions have several key elements. First, it is some kind of ceremonial ritual. Second, they involve a group of people. It is collective and social in nature. Third, they are taken care of by guardians, like historians, who have access to knowledge or the truth behind the sacred rituals and are responsible for spreading it. Fourth, they appeal to the emotion within individuals to achieve a greater sense of self-awareness. In some cultures, these rituals are important for self-identity in the context of a larger society. A tradition can have a deep and lasting impact on the way a person sees himself in the future. In families, traditions are a source of identity. At a macro level, they can teach children the origin of the family while at a micro level, they serve as a reminder of small events that have shaped their family and children, for example, spending the summer in the same house as the lake each year. In addition to this, numerous studies have shown that families that develop traditions have a stronger emotional connection than those that have not established rituals together. Celebrating traditions helps us stay connected to our culture and is also an excellent opportunity for cultural exchange, understanding and appreciation for cultures around the world.
**Listening Practice**

- After reading

  - According to the article, why are traditions important?
  - What are the various elements?
  - How is it that celebrating traditions helps people?

**Writing Practice**

- Write a response of 2-4 sentences for the following questions. Help your partner if they need it:

  - What other tradition do you like to celebrate other than Christmas?
  - What do you like to do when that tradition happens?
  - How does the family feel when they celebrate it?
**Speaking Practice (Conversation)**

-Talk with a partner for a few minutes about the following questions

- What is your personally favorite tradition?
- What do you like to do during that tradition?
- How long have you been celebrating this tradition?

**Speaking Practice (Presentation)**

-Talk in front of the class for 30-45 seconds, on the following questions

- Talk about the 5 different foods that you crave, from the introduction photos
- Say 3-5 benefits of having and celebrating Christmas, or other traditions
- Indicate how much time your family has celebrating Christmas

III. - Food/Culture around Christmas (Spanish)
OBJETIVO

Al final de esta lección los estudiantes van a saber cómo

- Comunicar, 5 diferentes tradiciones que las dos culturas hacen
- Mostrar las diferentes comidas que las diferentes culturas comen
- Enseñar la importancia de conocer a la otra cultura
Recursos

- Los recursos que los alumnos usarian de tecnología o material para que puedan participar completamente en la lección son
- Un Lápiz
- Papel
- Lápices de colores
- Un compañero
- Cerebro
- Un teléfono móvil
- Y ganas de aprender

Para empezar: Vocabulario de Navidad y sus comidas

Mexicanos:
- Tamales
- Champurrado
- Molida
- Ponche
- Pozole

Americanos:
- Pastel de fruta
- Papa
- Pavo
- Hambre de jengibre
**INTRODUCCIÓN**

**PRACTICA EN PAREJAS**

Estudiantes van a estar en grupos, y van a dibujar una comida de cada cultura. Entre sus grupos van a escoger una comida o bebida que ellos quieren elegir y lo van a dibujar y explicar lo que es y su importancia para cada cultura.
Practica De Leer

-Antes de leer

- ¿Qué significa las tradiciones en tu cultura?
- ¿Por qué son importantes las tradiciones para ti?
- ¿Cuáles son los beneficios de tener una tradición?

La importancia de tener tradiciones

La razón por la que las tradiciones son importantes es que transmiten valores compartidos, historias y objetivos de una generación a otra. Ellas motivan a las sociedades a crear y compartir una identidad colectiva, que a su vez sirve para dar forma a las identidades individuales. Las tradiciones tienen varios elementos clave. En primer lugar, se trata de algún tipo de ritual ceremonial. En segundo lugar, involucran a un grupo de personas; es colectiva y social en la naturaleza. En tercer lugar, son cuidadas por guardianes, como los historiadores, que tienen acceso al conocimiento o a la verdad detrás de los rituales sagrados y se encargan de difundirlo. En cuarto lugar, apelan a la emoción dentro de los individuos para lograr un mayor sentido de auto-conciencia. En algunas culturas, estos rituales son importantes para la auto-identidad en el contexto de una sociedad más grande. Una tradición puede tener un impacto profundo y duradero en la forma en que la persona se ve a sí misma en el futuro. En definitiva, las familias las tradiciones son una fuente de identidad. En un nivel macro, pueden enseñar a los niños el origen de la familia, mientras que en un nivel micro, sirven como recordatorio de pequeños eventos que han dado forma a su familia e hijos, por ejemplo, pasar el verano en la misma casa del año a año. Adicional a ello, numerosos estudios han arrojado que las familias que desarrollan tradiciones tienen una conexión emocional más fuerte que aquellas que no han establecido rituales juntos. Celebrar las tradiciones nos ayuda a mantenernos conectados a nuestra cultura y es también una excelente oportunidad para el intercambio cultural, la comprensión y el aprecio por las culturas de todo el mundo.
Práctica de Leer

- Después de leer

- ¿Según el artículo, por qué son importantes las tradiciones?
- ¿Cuáles son los varios elementos?
- ¿Cómo es que celebrar tradiciones, les ayuda a la gente?

Práctica de Escribir

- Escribe una respuesta de 2-4 oraciones para las siguientes preguntas. Ayuda a tu partenaire si lo necesita.

- ¿Qué otra tradición te gusta celebrar que no sea la navidad?
- ¿Qué te gusta hacer cuando ocurre esa tradición?
- ¿Cómo se siente la familia cuando lo celebran?
Practica de Hablar (Conversacion)

- Hablar con un compañero por unos minutos sobre las siguientes preguntas

  - ¿Cual es tu personalmente favorito tradición?
  - ¿Que te gusta hacer durante la tradicion?
  - ¿Cuanto tiempo tienen celebrando esta tradición?

Practica de Hablar (Presentacion)

- Hablar enfrente de la clase por 30-45 segundos, sobre las siguientes preguntas

  - Platicar de las 5 diferentes comidas que se te antojan, de las fotos de introduccion
  - Decir 3-5 beneficios de tener y celebrar la navidad o otra tradiciones
  - Indicar cuanto tiempo tiene tu familia celebrando la navidad
Examples of Peer-to-Peer Approach to Instruction (Lesson Plans)

IV. - Art & Culture (Spanish)

ARTE CULTURAL

Jhoyve Castillo y Elmer Martinez

1. Los estudiantes sabrán como...

- Sabrán que es el arte cultural.
- Podrán indicar algo que represente su arte cultural
- En qué beneficia el arte cultural
2. NECESITARAN

- Lapiz
- Hojas blancas
- Colores
- Y mucha imaginación

3. CONOCIMIENTO

- Que sabes tu del arte.
- Te gustaría representar lo que sientes por medio del arte.
- Conoces algún artista de América Latina.
- Con qué objetos utilizados en el arte te describirías a ti mismo.
4. VOCABULARIO

- Dibujar
- Leer
- Pintar
- Convivir
- Construir
- Escuchar musica de cada cultura
- Cocinar
- Fotografia
5. Trabajo en parejas.

Habla con tu compañero de al lado sobre algo que tengan en común y luego con los materiales dibuja lo que representa a los dos.

6. Practica de leer.

1. ¿Has escuchado de Salvador Dalí?
2. ¿Conoces alguna obra de Salvador Dalí?
3. ¿De donde crees que es el señor Dalí?
**BIOGRAFÍA DE DALÍ**

Salvador Dalí nació en una madrugada de la primavera de 1904 en el seno de una familia burguesa, hijo de un notario bienpensante y de una sensible dama aficionada a los pájaros. Muchos años más tarde escribiría en su autobiografía *La vida secreta de Salvador Dalí* (1942): "A los tres años quería ser cocinero. A los cinco quería ser Napoleón. Mi ambición no ha hecho más que crecer y ahora es la de llegar a ser Salvador Dalí y nada más. Por otra parte, esto es muy difícil, ya que, a medida que me acerco a Salvador Dalí, él se aleja de mí".

Puesto que la persecución sería incesante y el objetivo no habría de alcanzarse nunca, y dado que en ningún recodo de su biografía estaba previsto que hallara el equilibrio y la paz, Dalí decidió ser excesivo en todo, interpretar numerosos personajes y sublimar su angustia en una pluralidad de delirios humorísticos y sombríos. Se definió a sí mismo como "perverso polimorfo, rezagado y anarquizante", o "blando, débil y repulsivo", aunque para conquistar esta laboriosa imagen publicitaría antes hubo de salvar algunas pruebas iniciáticas, y si el juego favorito de su primera infancia era vestir el traje de ray, ya a los diez años, cuando se autorretrató como *El niño enfermo*, explora las ventajas de aparentar una constitución frágil y nerviosa.

Su precozidad es sorprendente: a los doce años descubre el estilo de los impresionistas franceses y se hace impresionista; a los catorce ya ha trabajado conocimiento con el arte de Picasso y se ha hecho cubista, y a los quince se ha convertido en editor de la revista *Studium*, donde dibuja brillantes pastiches para la sección titulada "Los grandes maestros de la Pintura".

**ENTENDISTE**

1. ¿A qué hora nació Dalí en 1904?
2. ¿A qué se dedicaba su papá?
3. ¿A qué edad se quería dedicar a la cocina?
7. PRACTICA DE ESCRITURA.

- Que te gusto de la biografía.

- Cómo te sientes sobre el arte de tu cultura.

- Qué es lo que más representa tu cultura.

8. PRACTICA DE HABLAR.

Con tu compañero habla por 30 segundos para compartir la siguiente información.

- Hablar sobre las obras de arte que conozcan.

- Indica a cuantos pintores o artistas conoces.

- Que beneficios tiene el arte cultural.
9. Qué aprendiste de esta lección

Comunica a tu compañero@ lo siguiente:
- 3 cosas sobre Salvador Dali.
- 3 cosas que aprendiste sobre el arte cultural.
- si pudieras pintar lo harías para dar a conocer tu cultura.

IV. - Art & Culture (English)

CULTURAL ART

by Jhoyve Castillo and Elmer Martinez
1. **Students will be able to**

- tell what cultural art is.
- tell something that represents art.
- benefits of cultural art.

2. **Students will need**

- pencil
- white paper
- colors
- a lot of imagination
3. KNOWLEDGE

- what do you know about art?
- would you like to represent what you feel through art?
- do you know any artist from latino America?
- what objects utilized in art will you use to describe yourself?

4. VOCABULARY

- Draw
- Read
- Paint
- construct
- listen different cultural music
- cook
- photograph
5. Pair Practice

Talk to the person next to you about something you two have in common, then with the materials draw what represents you both.
6. READING PRACTICE

1. have you hear about Salvador Dali?
2. Do you know any work of Dali?
3. Where do you thing Salvador Dali was born?

DALI'S BIOGRAPHY

Salvador Domingo Felipe Jacinto Dalí i Domènech, Marquis of Dalí de Púbol, better known as Salvador Dalí, was born on May 11, 1904, in Figueras, Spain, and died on January 23, 1989, in the same place.

Salvador was a well-known set designer, sculptor, draftsman, engraver, writer and especially a great painter. He is considered to be the greatest representative of surrealism for his pictorial creations of dreamlike, eccentric and bizarre elements.

Dalí was born as the second son of a bourgeois family, the first-born Salvador Gala Anselmo died nine months earlier. The fact that they shared the same name, added to that his parents indicated that he was a reincarnation of his brother, generated in Dalí the impression of being a copy that replaced his brother, which made him live with a strong personality crisis. In 1908,
DID YOU UNDERSTOOD

1. when was Born?
2. when did he die?
3. was he the first brother to born?

7. WRITING PRACTICE

1. what did you like about the biography?
2. How do you feel about cultural art?
3. what represents your culture the most?
8. SPEAKING PRACTICE

with the person sitting next to you talk for 30 seconds about this information.

talk about the art you know.

talk about how any artist do you know.

what benefits have the cultural art.

9. WHAT DID YOU LEARN ABOUT THE LESSON.

- 3 things about Salvador Dalí.
- 3 things you learn about cultural art.
- If you could paint about your culture will you do it. why?