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The Acquisition of Spanish Through Videoconferencing and Video-Based Lessons by Individual Fifth Graders

Annette L. Norwood

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to provide an in-depth examination of the language learning experiences of four fifth-grade students learning Spanish through videoconferencing and video-based lessons. This interpretive qualitative study involved intensive data collection over a period of 7 months through participant observation, audio and video recording of classes with subsequent transcription, and interviews of the students and their teachers.

The following points of focus guided this research: (a) What instances of interaction and output are observed in the different instructional settings?; (b) Are patterns of change observed in learners' language production during the period under study?; (c) What individual learner factors help to explain differences in the participants' Spanish output?; and (d) What are the participants' preferences and perceptions concerning different aspects of the Spanish program?

A careful examination was made of the participants' oral Spanish output. Examples of their oral and written output and oral interactions were given. The participants differed among themselves in the amount of oral output each produced, and individual participants showed differences in productivity in the different instructional settings.

No patterns of change were discerned in the language used by two participants. A third showed evidence of growth in some areas of language use. The fourth, Edward, showed the greatest growth.

Many individual learner factors were examined. Among them were attitude toward Spanish, use of Spanish in and out of school, and overall academic achievement. All participants except for Edward were in their fourth year in the Spanish program; he was in his second year.

All of the participants preferred learning Spanish through videoconferencing or teacher-led classes to learning it through the video-based lessons. In comparisons of videoconferencing and teacher-led classes, all participants expressed a preference for teacher-led classes.

Themes that emerged were (a) the importance of the on-site Spanish teacher, (b) contributions of the video lessons, and (c) limitations in interaction and output.
Chapter 1. Introduction

I still remember some of my early experiences learning a foreign language. After a brief introduction to Spanish and French in the seventh grade, I began to study Spanish on a regular basis in the eighth grade in the 1974–1975 school year. I have fond memories of my teacher that year, and I can remember listening to tapes in a language laboratory, wearing headphones. I was tested on conjugations that I was trying to learn; I had a hard time with them at first. I memorized dialogues and can still recall the first line of one word for word, even though I have not read, heard, or spoken that particular sentence for more than 30 years. The dialogue was about an airplane trip. In the first line, an airline employee announced to passengers the departure of Flight 200, bound for Madrid, and asked all to board the plane, please.

There have been great changes in foreign language education over the past three decades. The field of second language acquisition (SLA) has taken root and become firmly established in its own right, providing theoretical formulations and empirical evidence. Language teaching approaches and methods of earlier days have fallen out of vogue and been replaced by others. New technological developments are being incorporated into the teaching of foreign languages. And yet, many important questions, some of them new, remain unanswered.

At Dolphin Point Elementary School (a pseudonym, as are the names of the other elementary schools involved in this research), located in West Central Florida, students were taught Spanish through interactive videoconferencing and video-based lessons throughout most of the 2004–2005 school year. These technologies provided an opportunity for language learning that would not otherwise have been offered at this school.

Dolphin Point students in the first through fifth grades participated in weekly interactive videoconferencing sessions. Each class at Dolphin Point was matched with a class from one of two other elementary schools on the basis of like grade level and scheduling considerations. For any given pair of matched classes, the Spanish teachers at two schools worked together to teach the videoconferencing sessions. This represented a change in procedure from the previous school year when Spanish teachers at different schools alternated on a weekly basis in assuming sole teaching responsibility for matched classes.

The other component of the Spanish program at Dolphin Point consisted of video lessons. During most of the school year, students watched two lessons a week of the commercially produced series, Español para ti (developed by the Clark County Elementary School Divisions, Nevada, in collaboration with KLVX, Communication Group, Channel 10). In the months of January through April,
brief supplemental videos were also shown on Fridays. Classroom teachers had the responsibility of showing *Español para ti* videos and facilitating activities based on them.

What is it like for a Dolphin Point student to learn Spanish in this way? In videoconferencing sessions, what kinds of interaction does the student take part in, and what is his or her language output like? What is the student's language output like in video-based lessons facilitated by the classroom teacher? How does a given student approach learning Spanish in these contexts, and what are the student's preferences and perceptions? Does the student show evidence of change in language production during the course of a school year?

Answers to the questions just posed could provide a detailed picture of a learner in this particular foreign language program. Before focusing in so closely, however, it would be well to step back and take a wider view. After all, many issues come into play in relation to the Spanish program at Dolphin Point Elementary. As an example of an elementary school foreign language program, it is related to elementary school foreign language programs of the past, as well as to contemporary programs. It incorporates videoconferencing and videos, technologies for foreign language teaching and learning that have not been widely researched, especially in relation to foreign language in the elementary school (FLES). SLA theory certainly enters into a discussion of this FLES program, and the specific theoretical consideration of the age of the language learners also has a place.

**Background**

Current efforts in the area of foreign language in the elementary school may be better understood by placing them in the context of developments in the field of foreign language education. The granting of federal funding for the development of national standards for foreign language learning in January 1993 was a landmark event (Lafayette & Draper, 1996). These are standards for students in kindergarten through the 12th grade; they thus affirm the importance of foreign languages in the education of all students. On the state level, Florida has also recognized the vital place of foreign languages in the core curriculum, resulting in the publication of the *Florida Curriculum Framework – Foreign Languages: PreK-12 Sunshine State Standards and Instructional Practices* (Florida Department of Education, 1996). This document argues in favor of a long sequence of foreign language instruction, beginning in kindergarten and continuing through the 12th grade “in order for students to reach a confident level of second language proficiency” (p. 32).

Recognition of the importance of the teaching of foreign languages at all levels of schooling was accompanied by an increase in the number of elementary schools offering such instruction in the 1990s. According to two national surveys conducted by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), in the 10-year span from 1987 to 1997 the percentage of public elementary schools that reported teaching foreign language increased from 17% to 24% (Rhodes & Branaman, 1999, p. 12). There was also increased interest in providing foreign language instruction
among those public elementary schools that reported not offering this instruction at the times of the surveys: up from 48% in 1987 to 52% in 1997 (Rhodes & Branaman, 1999, p. 14). Additionally, the CAL surveys provided an examination of the types of foreign language programs offered in elementary schools.

Changing economic and political conditions in the first years of the 21st century have brought with them changes in FLES offerings. Marcia Rosenbusch (2004) has reported on threats to early language programs and the sources of these threats, as revealed by a recent survey. The main threats are program elimination and the scaling back of programs. Their sources include financial or budget problems; “a lack of understanding and valuing of the elementary school foreign language program among administrators and staff” (p. 11); a lack of qualified teachers; changes in elected officials and other political issues; the move to limit class offerings to the Spanish language, eliminating other languages; and the negative attitudes of some parents.

Although threats to established programs are currently a concern, they are not the whole story. Throughout the nation, different local needs and resources have led to the development and implementation of differing program models, which in turn have different goals. Research has shown that greater gains in foreign language proficiency are achieved through program models that involve students in using the foreign language for greater periods of time (Gray, Rhodes, Campbell, & Snow, 1984; Met & Rhodes, 1990).

Total immersion, in which 50 to 100% of the total time in school is spent using the foreign language, mostly as a means of instruction, is at one end of a continuum of program models. Total immersion has the most ambitious goals for the development of functional language proficiency, as well as mastery of subject content and understanding of the foreign language culture or cultures (Curtain & Dahlberg, 2004; Gilzow & Rhodes, 2000).

Two other program models, partial immersion and two-way immersion, are very similar to total immersion but have somewhat less ambitious goals, especially in regard to developing functional language proficiency. In these models, approximately 50% of time in school is spent using the foreign language. Two-way immersion (also known as dual language, two-way bilingual, or developmental bilingual education) involves both native speakers of English who are learning the foreign language and native speakers of that language who are learning English as a second language (Curtain & Dahlberg, 2004; Gilzow & Rhodes, 2000).

Content-based FLES is another program option. In schools following this model, from 15 to nearly 50% of the time is spent in language instruction and in using the language to teach other subject matter. The study of subject content in the foreign language is a means to gain skills in the foreign language, and the mastery of this subject content is a program goal. Although not aiming for the development of the functional proficiency that is possible in the immersion models, proficiency in the foreign language is an important goal of content-based FLES. Understanding of the foreign language culture or cultures is another program goal (Curtain & Dahlberg, 2004; Gilzow & Rhodes, 2000).
Next along the continuum of program models is FLES, in which study of the foreign language takes up 5 to 15% of time in school. Like content-based FLES, this program model promotes understanding of the foreign language culture or cultures, as well as fostering the development of foreign language proficiency, though in the FLES model, listening and speaking are usually emphasized to a greater extent than reading and writing (Curtain & Dahlberg, 2004). Many FLES programs are content related, meaning that subject content is used to enrich the program but that mastery of this content is not a program goal (as distinguished from content-based FLES; Curtain & Dahlberg, 2004).

At the far end of the program-model continuum are foreign language exploratory or experience (FLEX) programs. These programs take up as little as 1 to 5% of time in school. According to Curtain and Dahlberg (2004), some of the most common FLEX goals are “introduction to language learning, awareness and appreciation of foreign culture, appreciation of the value of communicating in another language, enhanced understanding of English, [and] motivation for further language study” (p. 426).

**Topic and Points of Focus**

Although the descriptions of program models above provide a helpful framework for classifying and thinking about elementary school foreign language programs, it should be remembered that each program is unique in some ways. Returning to the Spanish program at Dolphin Point Elementary, a primary characteristic that distinguishes it is its integration of technology. In fact, this type of program has received a special designation in the County that developed it: Foreign Language in the Elementary School Through Technology (FLETT). The FLETT model takes advantage of Polycom videoconferencing equipment to offer instruction through interactive videoconferencing. The onetime cost of the Polycom equipment and wiring was $25,000 for each school, paid for by federal grants. Another component of the FLETT model is the *Epañol para ti* video program, with lessons facilitated by classroom teachers. The amount of school time that is devoted to Spanish instruction is approximately 5%. The following program goals are listed in FLETT information:

1. To promote the gradual development of listening and speaking skills in Spanish, a widely spoken language in the United States and around the world.
2. To build enthusiasm for language learning through early success.
3. To increase students’ awareness of their native language, enhancing cognitive growth and promoting higher student achievement.
4. To enhance knowledge of world history and culture, thereby increasing global awareness and respect for diversity. (No citation is given for this quotation to protect the identity of Dolphin Point Elementary School.)

In amount of school time involved and in the goal of developing Spanish listening and speaking skills, the FLETT program at Dolphin Point could be classified as
This research study concentrates on issues of language acquisition thought to be associated with the first goal, the gradual development of listening and speaking skills, and also includes the consideration of some student writing in the form of vocabulary words copied from video lessons. The experiences of four learners in this setting are examined through qualitative case studies. The points of focus that came to guide the research involve instances of interaction and output, change in language production over time, individual learner factors, and preferences of learners in regard to language instruction. Although the possibility existed of beginning this research with another focus, interaction and output were initially chosen because there is a theoretical basis for their study (see “Input, Interaction, and Output” in Chapter 2), because they are easily observed if present, and because of my prior experience studying interaction in a Spanish FLEX program (see “Researcher Background and Perspectives” in Chapter 3).

The points of focus with which I began this research study early in the 2004–2005 school year are presented below in question form. In them, the term learners is applied to the four case study students.

1. What instances of interaction and output are observed in videoconferencing lessons that are taught by the FLES teacher in the research site?
2. What instances of interaction and output are observed in videoconferencing lessons that are taught by the FLES teacher in the remote site?
3. What instances of interaction and output are observed in video-based lessons and in activities that are facilitated by the classroom teacher?
4. Are patterns of change observed in learners’ language production during the period under study?

My initial formulation of the points of focus was based on my observations of the FLETT program at Dolphin Point in the 2003–2004 school year. My points of focus were subsequently amended and supplemented, based upon changes in the implementation of the FLETT program and themes that emerged during the course of this interpretive qualitative study.

I have already mentioned a change in the videoconferencing component of the Spanish program at Dolphin Point from the 2003–2004 school year to the following one, during which this study was conducted. At the time of this study, instead of alternating responsibility for teaching pairs of matched classes, the Spanish teachers at the schools where the classes were located jointly taught the classes through videoconferencing. In the case of the fifth-grade class from which my participants were drawn, the Spanish teacher at the other school, Nick Straten, assumed sole responsibility for teaching both classes on only two occasions, and the Spanish teacher at Dolphin Point, Lissette Ford, did not assume sole responsibility for teaching both classes at any time, although she
did teach the Dolphin Point students by herself on occasions when there was no videoconferencing, as well as before and after videoconferencing sessions.

Because there were no videoconferencing lessons taught solely by the Spanish FLES teacher at the research site and there were only two videoconferencing lessons taught solely by the Spanish FLES teacher at the distant site, it was not possible to retain the first two points of focus, dealing with the instances of interaction and output that might have been observed had these teachers assumed sole responsibility for teaching videoconferencing lessons on a regular basis. I decided to group all instructional settings together in a new point of focus that would replace not only the first two but the third, as well. I did this not only for the sake of brevity but also to reflect the process through which I observed my participants in a number of different settings and came to realize that verbal output on the part of individual students was not encouraged in all of them. Retaining interaction and output as its basis, the new point of focus became: What instances of interaction and output are observed in the different instructional settings? Although different types of settings are grouped here, it is recognized that when teaching episodes are viewed in detail, the type of instructional setting will be made explicit.

Another change in Spanish instruction from the previous year was the addition of a written component. In video-based lessons, students wrote vocabulary words and a statement of the main idea of the lesson on index cards. Some of these cards were picked to be used in lessons in the Tele Café. Although I have not specified this in the preceding point of focus, my examination of the students’ output included both oral and written production.

Of the original points of focus, I retained the fourth: Are patterns of change observed in learners’ language production during the period under study? A careful consideration of the oral Spanish output of my case study participants and of possible patterns of change in their production over time revealed notable differences among the participants. My growing interest in the reasons for the differences led me to explore the following point of focus: What individual learner factors help to explain differences in the participants’ Spanish output?

Through interviews, I learned many things about the preferences and perceptions of my participants in regard to different aspects of the Spanish program at Dolphin Point. Instead of grouping these by individual participant, I chose to bring them together in one section, because I felt that the patterns of preferences that could be discerned in this way were important and could further an understanding of the FLETT program. The point of focus that I used was: What are the participants’ preferences and perceptions concerning different aspects of the Spanish program?

In order to clearly present the points of focus that ultimately guided this research, I list them together here:

1. What instances of interaction and output are observed in the different instructional settings?
2. Are patterns of change observed in learners' language production during the period under study?
3. What individual learner factors help to explain differences in the participants' Spanish output?
4. What are the participants' preferences and perceptions concerning different aspects of the Spanish program?

Data collection during this study included observations, videotaping and audio recording of lessons with subsequent transcription, field notes, and interviews of students and teachers that were audio recorded and subsequently transcribed. This use of multiple data sources, triangulation, is an important strategy in qualitative research to strengthen the objectivity of the study and its results.

Rationale and Significance
The research reported here has brought together the areas of elementary school foreign language instruction and technology-mediated language instruction. Specifically, the use of interactive videoconferencing and video-based lessons to teach Spanish was examined. As will be seen in the review of the literature, not many studies have been conducted examining the use of these technologies in FLES instruction. Indeed, Richard Johnstone (2000), referring to videoconferencing, e-mail, and the Internet, has written:

The impact of these new technologies, not only on children’s early learning of another language, including the particular language skills and information handling strategies they will need, but also on the culture of their schools, is a major area for future research investigation. (p. 192)

The importance of conducting research on the use of videoconferencing and videos in elementary language instruction was recognized by Dr. Joyce Nutta and Dr. Carol Mullen, both from the University of South Florida, who entered into a research partnership with Dolphin Point Elementary, whose principal and World Languages Curriculum Coordinator (also referred to as the FLES or Spanish teacher in this document) both supported this research. I have benefited from this partnership that enabled me to conduct case studies of four fifth-grade students, focusing on their interaction and output in the different contexts in which Spanish is taught, patterns of change in their language production during the period under study, their preferences and perceptions concerning different aspect of the Spanish program, and individual learner factors.

Although the primary consideration in the selection of Dolphin Point Elementary as a research site was its use of videoconferencing and video-based Spanish lessons, the demographic characteristics of its students show that this is an example of a FLES program in a situation that differs from the “elitist” image associated with foreign language study during much of the last century (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. 265). The new emphasis of the national standards for foreign language learning is on helping all students develop proficiency in a foreign language (National Standards in Foreign Language Education Project, 1996). As
Met and Rhodes (1990) write, it is important to ensure that “all students regardless of learning style, achievement level, race/ethnic origin, socioeconomic status, home language or future academic goals” be given the opportunity to “begin language learning early” (p. 438).

The racial composition of the student body at Dolphin Point Elementary differs from the overall racial composition of the school district in which it is located. The 2004–2005 No Child Left Behind (NCLB) School Public Accountability Report (Florida Department of Education, 2005b) for Dolphin Point lists the percentages by racial and ethnic group for the 495 students who were enrolled at the school in October 2004: 42.8% White, 34.7% Black, 11.3% Multiracial, 6.1% Hispanic, 4.2% Asian, and 0.8% American Indian. The percentages for the school district at that time were as follows: 66.8% White, 18.8% Black, 3.4% Multiracial, 7.3% Hispanic, 3.4% Asian, and 0.3% American Indian.

There is also a contrast between the socioeconomic status of students attending Dolphin Point and the average socioeconomic status of students enrolled in all public elementary schools in the district. According to the 2004–2005 NCLB School Public Accountability Report (Florida Department of Education, 2005b), 72.3% of the students enrolled at Dolphin Point in October 2004 were economically disadvantaged, whereas 41.4% of the students in the district were economically disadvantaged. The designation of students as economically disadvantaged is based on their participation in the federal free and reduced-price lunch program (Florida Department of Education, Education Accountability Reports Services, 2005. “Although not the best indicator of socioeconomic status, [participation in the federal meal program] is typically the only one available to school districts,” P. Smith, 2001, p. 1.) Dolphin Point offered a research setting that differs from that of traditional FLES programs but that reflects new priorities in foreign language instruction.

The importance of context in case study research is signaled by Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996, p. 545), who identify “the study of a phenomenon in its natural context” as one of the main characteristics of this type of research. Not only did this research study allow for the selection of participants who are members of groups that have been underrepresented in FLES research in the past, along with a participant more typical of those in traditional FLES programs, it involved their study in the context that has just been described.

Case study research involves seeking “both what is common and what is particular about the case” (Stake, 2000, p. 438). In this research study, each participant and his or her interaction and output in different instructional settings were studied in depth. Including four cases provided a broader view and allowed for comparisons among the cases. Categories and themes that were shared emerged. It was also possible to highlight the “variability of development” among second language (L2) learners that has been noted in the literature (Donato, Antonek, & Tucker, 1996, p. 516; Garrett, 1991; Slimani, 1992).

The contributions of this study lie in several areas. It resulted in detailed descriptions of the language learning experiences of four students who received
instruction through interactive videoconferencing and video-based lessons. It is possible that these descriptions could provide teachers with insight into the learning of a foreign language by students in similar instructional settings. This, in turn, could assist in developing more effective teaching strategies. It is also possible that accumulated data of this type may lead to more definitive, structured studies useful to administrators in making policy decisions regarding technology-mediated FLES programs. The study was carried out within the framework of SLA theory, specifically in the areas of interaction and output, and adds to knowledge in the latter area through providing description and analysis of the second language output of the four case study participants.

Limitations

In this study, data collection and analysis centered on four fifth-grade students. The context in which these students were learning Spanish is important to the study; videoconferencing sessions and video-based lessons were examined and described. The points of focus for this research are concerned with the students’ interaction and output in Spanish, patterns of change in their language production during the period under study, their preferences and perceptions regarding different aspects of the Spanish program, and individual learner factors. In this study, conclusions were reached inductively, allowing themes and patterns to arise from the data. Neither the school nor the four students were selected randomly; the conclusions reached apply to them and are not necessarily generalizable to others. The thick descriptions provided should aid an interested reader of this research in deciding whether the findings are applicable to other students or to another specific situation. Further discussion of issues involving ‘generalizability,’ or more appropriately applicability, of qualitative research outcomes will occur in Chapter 3. One possibility that may also arise from this study is that of using its findings in a future experiment that could examine their broader generalizability.

Organization of the Dissertation

In this first chapter, the study is introduced. Background is given on elementary school foreign language instruction and the types of programs that are offered. The topic of this study is explained and the points of focus presented. Next, a rationale for the research is given and its significance is considered. The limitations of the study are also addressed.

In Chapter 2, there is a review of literature that has a bearing on this study of a technology-mediated FLES program. A historical context is provided through a look at the origins and periods of growth and decline of FLES instruction in this country. The beginnings of the field of second language acquisition are also set in their historical context, and an overview of SLA theories is provided. Theoretical and empirical work in the areas of input, interaction, and output is covered in the next section. The learner characteristic of age and its relationship to SLA is the subject of the following section. Finally,
issues in the areas of video, videoconferencing, and distance learning are presented, along with associated research.

The Design and Methodology chapter first locates the research as an interpretive qualitative study, involving case studies of four fifth-grade learners. Following this, I describe my background and perspectives in relationship to the proposed research. A description is provided of my initial contact with the research setting. The basis for the selection of participants is explained, and the process of making the selections is described. The next section is devoted to data collection and analysis. Finally, ethical considerations are presented.

In Chapter 4, the research setting, the on-site Spanish teacher, and the classroom teacher are presented. A detailed description of the *Español para ti* video-based language program is provided. I then present information on the implementation of the video component of the Spanish program. Spanish lessons in the Tele Café are covered next, both those that are taught through videoconferencing and those that are taught by the school’s Spanish teacher without videoconferencing.

Chapter 5 addresses the first two points of focus of the research. The greatest part of the chapter is devoted to the first: What instances of interaction and output are observed in the different instructional settings? The oral output of each participant is carefully analyzed, and examples of interactions in which they took part and of their written output are provided. Findings are also presented concerning the second point of focus: Are patterns of change observed in learners’ language production during the period under study?

In Chapter 6, explanations are sought for the differences in interaction and output that were presented in the previous chapter. The point of focus around which this discussion is organized is: What individual learner factors help to explain differences in the participants' Spanish output? The participants’ preferences and perceptions are brought together in the following section, addressing the following point of focus: What are the participants’ preferences and perceptions concerning different aspects of the Spanish program?

Themes that emerged during the course of this research, along with supporting evidence, are presented in Chapter 7. These themes are (a) the importance of the on-site Spanish teacher, (b) contributions of the video lessons, and (c) limitations in interaction and output.

In Chapter 8, I review the methods that were used in this study and reflect on the quantity and quality of the data. I explain the evolution of the points of focus and summarize the findings associated with them. I also explain how the points of focus relate to the themes presented in Chapter 7. A final discussion is offered.

**Definition of Terms**

**Classroom teacher.** The classroom teacher is responsible for teaching subjects other than Spanish to students in his or her class and also facilitates Spanish instruction based on *Español para ti* video lessons and supplemental videos. In this study, the classroom teacher is not a native speaker of Spanish.
Content-based FLES. An elementary school foreign language program model in which from 15 to nearly 50% of the total time in school is spent in language instruction and in using the language to teach subject content from the general curriculum. The study of subject content in the foreign language is a means to gain skills in the foreign language, and the mastery of this subject content is a program goal. Although not aiming for the development of the functional proficiency that is possible in the immersion models, proficiency in the foreign language is an important goal of content-based FLES. Understanding of the foreign language culture or cultures is another program goal (Curtain & Dahlberg, 2004; Gilzow & Rhodes, 2000).

Distant teacher. The distant teacher is a FLES teacher who is responsible for offering Spanish instruction through videoconferencing to both students at the site where this teacher is located and to the students at Dolphin Point Elementary School.

FLES (foreign language in the elementary school). An elementary school foreign language program model in which from 5 to 15% of the total time in school is spent in language instruction. Like content-based FLES, this program model promotes understanding of the foreign language culture or cultures, as well as fostering the development of foreign language proficiency, though in the FLES model, listening and speaking are usually emphasized to a greater extent than reading and writing (Curtain & Dahlberg, 2004). Many FLES programs are content related, meaning that subject content is used to enrich the program but that mastery of this content is not a program goal (as distinguished from content-based FLES; Curtain & Dahlberg, 2004). In general usage, FLES has at times been used as an overall term, referring to any type of foreign language program in an elementary school setting. However, as Curtain and Dahlberg (2004, p. 423) point out, the term “is most appropriately used to describe a particular type of elementary school language program.”

FLES teacher. FLES teachers have specialized training in teaching foreign language in the elementary school. In this study, the term FLES teacher refers to the teacher who is with the students at Dolphin Point Elementary School, offering Spanish instruction to them and to the students at another site through videoconferencing. The term also refers to the distant teacher.

FLEX (foreign language exploratory or experience). Elementary school programs of this type take up as little as 1 to 5% of time in school. According to Curtain and Dahlberg (2004), some of the most common FLEX goals are “introduction to language learning, awareness and appreciation of foreign culture, appreciation of the value of communicating in another language, enhanced understanding of English, [and] motivation for further language study” (p. 426).

Foreign language. A foreign language is one that is learned in a place where that language is not the native language, for example, Spanish learned by speakers of English in the United States of America.

Immersion. This term encompasses elementary school foreign language program models in which 50 to 100% of the total time in school is spent using the foreign language, mostly as a means of instruction. Total immersion, the most
time-intensive program model, has the most ambitious goals for the development of functional language proficiency, as well as mastery of subject content and understanding of the foreign language culture or cultures (Curtain & Dahlberg, 2004; Gilzow & Rhodes, 2000). *Partial immersion* and *two-way immersion*, in which approximately 50% of time in school is spent using the foreign language, are very similar to total immersion but have somewhat less ambitious goals, especially in regard to developing functional language proficiency. *Two-way immersion* (also known as dual language, two-way bilingual, or developmental bilingual education) involves both native speakers of English who are learning the foreign language and native speakers of that language who are learning English as a second language (Curtain & Dahlberg, 2004; Gilzow & Rhodes, 2000).

**Second language (L2).** This is a language learned after the first language, regardless of whether it is learned directly after the first language or with one or several other languages intervening. The term *second language* is also used to refer to a language that is learned in a place where that language is spoken as the native language, for example, English learned by a native speaker of Spanish in the United States of America.

**Total Physical Response.** This language teaching method was developed by James Asher (1977). Based on the period in first language acquisition of listening and physically responding prior to producing language, this method involves learners listening and physically responding to commands.

**Videoconferencing.** In this study, *videoconferencing* refers to the process through which Spanish instruction is offered to students at Dolphin Point and at another school, using Polycom videoconferencing equipment. This two-way interactive system is ISDN based, not Internet based.
Chapter 2. Review of Related Literature

This chapter will provide a review of literature related to a technology-mediated FLES program. The sections that are included cover the history of FLES; the beginnings of the field of second language acquisition and an overview of its theories; theoretical and empirical work done in the areas of input, interaction, and output; age, as it relates to second language acquisition; and video, videoconferencing, and distance learning.

The History of FLES

The teaching of foreign languages to young children has a long history in the United States. In the American Colonies, the earliest recorded teaching of a modern foreign language to children in a school setting took place in 1702 in Germantown and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In those towns, the children of immigrants were taught German (Andersson, 1969; Zeydel, 1961).

The first program of "foreign-language instruction in the public elementary schools of the United States" was begun in 1840 in Cincinnati (Andersson, 1969, p. 60). In the second half of the 19th century, Cincinnati’s example was followed by some 15 other cities that began to offer instruction in German in the public elementary schools. In New York, Boston, and San Francisco, French was offered as well. By 1913, instruction in Polish and Italian had been added to that in German in Milwaukee (Andersson, 1969). The teaching of Spanish in elementary schools in the 19th century was extremely limited, taking place almost solely in the area that was to become New Mexico (Andersson, 1969; Leavitt, 1961). Although not all of the FLES programs mentioned above were of long duration, a number of them continued into the second decade of the 20th century.

The entry of the United States into World War I in the spring of 1917 and the prevailing national sentiment of antipathy toward foreign languages, especially German (Heining-Boynton, 1987, 1990), had disastrous pedagogic consequences (Zeydel, 1961) for FLES. According to Theodore Andersson (1969, p. 64), “The hysteria of World War I not only relegated German language study to limbo but momentarily terminated all FLES programs.”

In the decades following the First World War, a limited number of FLES programs were established in this country. These included “the first major FLES program in the United States” (Cowell, 1990, p. 16; Heining-Boynton, 1987, p. 10). Begun in 1921 in the Cleveland Public Schools under the direction of Emile de Sauzé, this program offered French instruction to gifted children in grades one through six. In the early 1940s, Spanish FLES programs were begun in dozens of communities as a result of 1938’s Good Neighbor Policy and its elaboration in the Hemispheric Solidarity Policy (Andersson, 1969).
The participation of the United States in World War II in the 1940s was a major event that exerted an influence on foreign language instruction. Unlike America’s turning away from such instruction in World War I, with the Second World War came an appreciation of the need for the development of foreign language skills and the application of considerable effort and resources toward that end (Andersson, 1969; Thompson, Christian, Stansfield, & Rhodes, 1990; Zeydel, 1961). While the immediate need for skill development was addressed through intensive military training, the change in attitude toward language learning was of benefit to FLES (Andersson, 1969). Public interest in and enthusiasm for FLES programs grew stronger in the 1950s and reached their height in the early 1960s (McLaughlin, 1978b).

An important stimulus for growth in foreign language study in the United States was provided by the launch and orbit in 1957 of Sputnik I, the Soviet satellite (Andersson, 1969; Curtain & Dahlberg, 2004; Thompson et al., 1990), taking the American people by surprise as it did and throwing an unfavorable light on our educational system. The following year, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) was passed, providing funding for educational programs in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages in elementary and secondary schools (Lipton, 1998). Funds were made available for the training of teachers through Title VI of the NDEA. Gladys Lipton (1990, p. 255) names the resulting NDEA institutes “for elementary school foreign language teachers around the country” as one of the “important landmark events” for elementary foreign language instruction that took place in the 1960s.

The outpouring of funds and energies into the training or retraining of foreign language teachers reflected a commitment to a particular approach to language teaching, the audio-lingual method (ALM). As Curtain and Dahlberg (2004, p. 407) write, “These NDEA institutes marked the first time in the United States that there had been a concentrated effort centered on the development of an approach to language teaching.” Also known as the army method, the aural-oral method, or the New Key (McLaughlin, 1978b), ALM had its roots in work done by American linguists to address the language training demands of World War II (Andersson, 1969; Thompson et al., 1990). Developing further with contributions from the areas of both structural linguistics and Skinnerian (behaviorist) psychology, ALM “emphasized the primacy of listening and speaking skills, along with drills and exercises to develop proper speech habits” (Thompson et al., 1990, p. 26). Due to its energetic promotion, it came to be “the dominant method of language instruction in FLES programs” (McLaughlin, 1978b, p. 135).

Neither the ascendancy of ALM nor the enthusiasm for FLES continued without challenge, however. The last NDEA institute for FLES teachers took place in 1965 (Cowell, 1990; Curtain & Dahlberg, 2004). It was around this time that the efficacy of ALM began to be questioned, as actual results did not meet expectations (Curtain & Pesola, 1994; McLaughlin, 1978b). There was disillusionment concerning FLES programs as well. In the mid-1960s, FLES programs entered a period of decline (Curtain & Pesola, 1994) that continued
into the 1970s, with many programs being eliminated in the second half of the decade (Lipton, 1998).

As the 1970s ended and a new decade began, however, there was a growing awareness of the importance of the ability to communicate in foreign languages. Recommendations were made for beginning foreign language study in elementary school (Curtain & Pesola, 1994). The 1980s were a decade of rapid expansion for FLES programs (Heining-Boynton, 1990). As evidenced by the CAL 1987 and 1997 surveys (Rhodes & Branaman, 1999), the growth of FLES continued into the 1990s. Although many FLES programs are currently facing various threats, including elimination (Rosenbusch, 2004), new programs continue to be established, some of them taking advantage of technological innovations.

The focus in the next section will shift to the field of second language acquisition. The historical stance of this section will continue, as the beginnings of the field are examined. An overview of second language acquisition theories will also be provided.

Second Language Acquisition: Its Beginnings and Theories

The field of second language acquisition (SLA) had its beginnings in the late-1960s. More specifically, 1967, the year of the publication of Corder’s “The Significance of Learners’ Errors,” is usually given as the date of the field’s inception (Pica, 2003; VanPatten, 2003). Selinker’s “Interlanguage” (1972) is another work from the early years of SLA that is considered seminal (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Pica, 2003). In order to understand the contribution of these works, as well as other aspects of the beginnings SLA, it is helpful to go back about a decade and consider developments in the field of linguistics.

The decline in the popularity of the audio-lingual method (ALM) in the mid-1960s, mentioned in the previous section, was not only caused by the method’s failure to meet expectations but also by challenges made by Noam Chomsky to its theoretical foundations: structural linguistics and Skinnerian psychology. Chomsky expounded his position in *Syntactic Structures* (1957) and in his review (1959) of Skinner’s book, *Verbal Behavior* (1957). In the latter, Chomsky sought “to show that the principal concepts of a behaviourist approach to language are totally inadequate to account for language behaviour” (Stern, 1983, p. 299).

In *Syntactic Structures* (1957) not only did Chomsky criticize structural linguistics, he also outlined his own grammar model, transformational-generative grammar (LaPalombara, 1976, p. 215). This was a theory that Chomsky continued to develop. In 1966, he stated his thinking in this way: “Language is not a habit structure. Ordinary linguistic behavior characteristically involves innovation, formation of new sentences and patterns in accordance with rules of great abstraction and intricacy” (p. 153). Chomsky (1965, 1972) posited a complex innate ability or mental organ possessed by the human infant that is designed specifically for language acquisition: the Language Acquisition Device (LAD). The LAD takes advantage of “the abstract knowledge of language” (Ellis, 1994, p. 727) with which the infant is born. Chomsky (1976) refers to this
abstract knowledge as Universal Grammar (UG), which he defines as “the system of principles, conditions and rules that are elements or properties of all human languages” (p. 29). Through the LAD and knowledge of UG, children are able to acquire their native language, in spite of input that Chomsky (1965) characterizes as degenerate or inadequate for the task of language acquisition. In this view, input only serves as “a trigger for innate properties” (Gass, 1997, p. 93).

Chomsky’s influential theoretical writings, as well as child first language acquisition research that was being carried out in the 1960s (VanPatten, 2003), prepared the way for writings associated with the inception of the field of second language acquisition. In “The Significance of Learners' Errors,” Corder (1967) rejected the behaviorist idea of second language learning as habit formation in which errors are to be avoided. Instead, he argued that by studying errors for what these reveal about a learner’s developing language system, it would be possible to take advantage of the learner’s “built-in syllabus” to provide more efficient instruction. The term interlanguage was first used by Selinker (1972) to describe the L2 learner’s language system, a system that differs from both the learner’s L1 and the target language (Ellis, 1994). According to Pica (2003), the concepts presented in Corder’s (1967) and Selinker’s (1972) seminal articles, along with Richards’ (1974) error analysis, made possible early SLA studies and have had an impact that continues to be felt.

The field of second language acquisition has undergone tremendous growth and development since its beginnings some three and a half decades ago. This development has included contributions from linguistics, applied linguistics, psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology, sociolinguistics, and neurolinguistics. Reflecting the diverse traditions and trends of SLA, there are various ways in which to characterize its theories and areas of interest.


Environmentalist theories are distinguished from nativist theories in that the former discount the contribution of learner-internal factors to language acquisition and instead emphasize the importance of external, environmental factors. The behaviorist learning theory of Skinnerian psychology that was opposed by Chomsky is an example of an environmentalist theory. Other examples provided by Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) are connectionist models, such as Parallel Distributed Processing (McClelland, Rumelhart, & the PDP Research Group, 1986), and Schumann’s Acculturation Model (1978).
Larsen-Freeman and Long’s designation of another group of theories as interactionist is based on the fact that these theories “invoke both innate and environmental factors to explain language learning” (1991, p. 266). In other words, these theories involve the interaction of learner-internal and learner-external factors. According to Larsen-Freeman and Long, “interactionist theories of SLA differ greatly from one another” (1991, p. 266). Some of these theories draw their inspiration from research in the area of psycholinguistics and cognitive psychology (e.g., McLaughlin, 1987, 1990).

Although the brief overview provided here does not include a detailed discussion of other ways in which SLA theories have been classified, recognition should be made of two theoretical categories emphasized by other authors. Cognitive theories of SLA are given special treatment by both Ellis (1994) and Pica (2003). The growing prominence of another type of theory is signaled by Ellis (1999): those theories “that view acquisition as essentially a social or socio-psychological process” (p. 17), sociocultural theory being an example.

This section on the beginnings of the field of second language acquisition and overview of some of its theories provides a context for the following discussion of input, interaction, and output. These areas of interest are integral but limited parts of the field as a whole.

**Input, Interaction, and Output**

In the acquisition of a second language, the necessity of input, “the language to which a learner is exposed” (Gass, 1997, p. 28), is recognized by all SLA theories, which nonetheless differ in their treatment of its role (Ellis, 1994, p. 243). An emphasis on the importance of input that is comprehensible was provided by Stephen Krashen, whose Monitor Model (which became the Monitor Theory), along with his Input Hypothesis (1976, 1977, 1978, 1981, 1982, 1985), gained wide recognition and exerted much influence “in the 1970s and early 1980s” (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991, p. 240). Because of this influence, a brief overview of Krashen’s work in this area will be presented.

The basic premise of the Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1985) is that there is only one way in which humans acquire language and that this is by receiving messages in the form of ‘comprehensible input,’ which may be either aural or written (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). This formulation rejects the contribution of language production to second language acquisition (Krashen, 1982).

Krashen (1985) hypothesizes that the structures of a language are acquired in a predictable order when those that are to be acquired next, which are just beyond the current level of the acquirer, are included in input that is comprehensible to him or her (Natural Order Hypothesis). In this hypothesis, the current level of the acquirer is expressed as \( i \), and the next level is expressed as \( i + 1 \). Language containing structures at the level of \( i + 1 \) is understood “with the help of context, which includes extra-linguistic information, our knowledge of the world, and previously acquired linguistic competence” (Krashen, 1985, p. 2).

Krashen (1985, p. 2) maintains that the only mechanism through which acquisition takes place is the *internal language processor*, the internal
component of the learner that works with the comprehensible input presented to him or her. Krashen’s conception of the internal language processor draws on Chomsky’s work (1965, 1972) on the Language Acquisition Device. Unlike Chomsky, however, Krashen specifies comprehensible input as the type that is utilized in acquisition. Krashen goes on to assert that when a person is open to input and is focused on its meaning, the internal language processor works to acquire those structures that are next in the natural order.

In Krashen’s view, the subconscious process of language acquisition is not the only way a student deals with a second or foreign language, however. According to his Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis (1982), there is also a conscious process of language learning that involves areas of the brain that are not specifically designed to deal with language. Whereas only acquired language can be spontaneously produced and is responsible for fluency, learned language can be utilized to edit this production, correcting output before it is spoken or written, or changing it afterwards through self-correction. The Monitor Hypothesis explains these differences in the ways acquired and learned language are utilized and states, “Learning has only one function, and that is as a Monitor, or editor” (1982, p. 15).

Although Krashen believes that the role of ‘learning’ is limited, he does affirm the value of formal instruction, as opposed to informal environments, in certain circumstances. These include the situation of a beginning second language learner who cannot understand ‘real world’ input because it is too complex. Foreign language learners who do not have other sources of input available to them certainly also benefit from the input received in formal classroom instruction (Krashen, 1985).

Krashen’s theory of second language acquisition has impacted the SLA field in various ways. His writings, through which the theory was presented, exerted influence among practitioners, to whom his ideas were readily understandable (McLaughlin, 1987). His writings also prompted studies investigating comprehensible input (Ellis, 1994, p. 27). His theory, however, has attracted criticism (McLaughlin, 1978a, 1987), particularly because of its unfalsifiable nature (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991) and the non-interface position (associated with nativist theories in general; see Pica, 2003), in which acquisition and learning are viewed as entirely separate systems (Ellis, 1985; McLaughlin, 1978a, 1987; Rivers, 1980).

One researcher who studied linguistic input to second language learners was Michael H. Long, who not only investigated the characteristics of input to nonnative speakers (NNSs), as compared with that to native speakers (NSs), but also looked at differences in interaction, comparing pairs made up of an NS and an NNS and pairs made up of two NSs (1980). Based upon the work of others, including Hatch’s (1978a, 1978b) seminal papers on interaction, and upon his own research, Long (1983a; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991) came to believe that interactional modifications in the structure of conversations in which NNSs participate are more important than are input modifications in making input comprehensible, and thus that interactional modifications have a greater role in
language acquisition. In this formulation of his Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1981, 1983a) with its emphasis on interactional modifications, Long continued to stress the necessity of comprehensible input. As Ellis (1999, p. 5) has pointed out, this early version of the Interaction Hypothesis “was closely associated with the Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1985).”

A review of work conducted through the early 1990s in the area of interaction, or more specifically negotiation, is provided by Teresa Pica (1994), herself a researcher in this area (Pica, 1992, 1993; Pica, Doughty, & Young, 1986; Pica, Young, & Doughty, 1987). As Pica (1994) explains, although Long used the term interactional modification in his early writings (e.g., 1980, 1981) to describe “the work that the NS and NNS do to avoid and repair impasses in their conversational discourse” (Pica, 1994, p. 497), he and others (e.g., Gass & Varonis, 1986; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Varonis & Gass, 1985) later came to use the term negotiation in addition to the earlier one. In the conclusion to her review, Pica (1994) describes some of the benefits of negotiation that research has demonstrated: “It can help make input comprehensible to learners, help them modify their own output, and provide opportunities for them to access L2 form and meaning” (p. 520).

In 1996, Long modified the early version of his Interaction Hypothesis (1981, 1983a) to address criticisms that it received (see Ellis, 1999) and to incorporate subsequent work in the field of second language acquisition. Interestingly, in Long’s 1996 formulation, he makes explicit a theoretical stance that Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991) would describe as interactionist:

Few aspects of human development have turned out to be explicable solely as a function of either innate or environmental variables acting separately. . . . In an updated version of the so-called Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1981a, 1983c), it is proposed that environmental contributions to acquisition are mediated by selective attention and the learner’s developing L2 processing capacity, and that these resources are brought together most usefully, although not exclusively, during negotiation for meaning. (Long, 1996, p. 414)

According to Ellis (1999, p. 8), one important change from the earlier version is “a much richer view of how negotiation can assist language learning.” Thus, the later version of the Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996) includes an acknowledgment of the roles of negative evidence (“direct or indirect information about what is ungrammatical,” Long, 1996, p. 413), focus on form, and modified output in SLA. As Long (1996, p. 453) points out, however, his proposal is not meant to be “a complete theory of language learning.”

The observation made by Pica (1994, p. 499) that “negotiation research has focused primarily on language learning conditions rather than outcomes” was met by a study by Alison Mackey (1999), who asserts, “This study provides direct empirical support for the claims of the interaction hypothesis (Long, 1996)” (p. 583). Second language development in the area of question formation was examined in this study, which used a pretest-posttest design. The first posttest
was given a day after the final treatment, the second posttest a week after the first, and the third posttest three weeks after the second.

The participants in Mackey’s study (1999) were 34 adult learners of English as a second language, who were divided into five groups. One group, the Interactor Unreadies, was composed of the 7 learners who were classified as beginners. The members of this group received interactionally modified input as each carried out tasks in pairings with native speakers. The remaining 27 learners, who were lower intermediate in developmental level, were randomly assigned to one of four groups. The Interactors received the same treatment as the Interactor Unreadies. The Observers watched the interactionally modified input that the Interactors received. The Scripteds carried out the same tasks as the Interactors and Interactor Unreadies in pairings with the native speakers, but instead of interactionally modified input, they received premodified input, defined as “input that has been carefully targeted at the level of the learner in order to facilitate learner comprehension” (Mackey, 1999). The Control group was given the pretest and the three posttests but did not receive any treatment.

Analysis of the results of the tests for all groups led Mackey (1999, p. 575) to conclude, “only the groups that actively participated in the interaction [the Interactor Unreadies and the Interactors] demonstrated clear-cut evidence of development.” She notes with interest that, although none of the participants received formal instruction during the period of treatment and testing, it was in the second and third posttests (given approximately 1 week and 1 month after treatment) that there was an increase in the production of higher level questions for the Interactors. The Interactor Unreadies demonstrated a marked increase in the production of such questions in the third posttest. Mackey believes it is plausible “that the effects of treatment on development may be delayed” (p. 580), as some researchers have proposed. She presents possibilities for future research, concluding her paper by enumerating some of the questions that could be addressed by what she terms an “exciting interactional research agenda” (p. 584).

Although the updated version of the Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996) includes a consideration of the role of output, it was Merrill Swain, a researcher in the field of French immersion education, who did pioneering work in this area, her theoretical formulation coming to be known as the Output Hypothesis. Swain was an early advocate (1985) of a shift from an exclusive focus on comprehensible input in language acquisition to a broader perspective that includes comprehensible output. As she argued, comprehensible input may have an essential role in SLA, but “it is not enough to ensure that the outcome will be nativelike performance” (1985, p. 236).

Swain (1985) presented data from a study in which the communicative competence of 69 French immersion students in the sixth grade (nonnative speakers) was assessed and compared to that of 10 native speakers of French who were also in the sixth grade. The former group of students had been enrolled in the immersion program since kindergarten. In kindergarten and first grade, they had received 100% of their instruction through the French language
and had continued to receive the majority of their instruction in French until the sixth grade, when they were taught in French 50% of the time. The grammatical, discourse, and sociolinguistic competence (components of communicative competence; Canale & Swain, 1980) of both groups of students were assessed by means of oral production tasks, multiple-choice tests, and written production tasks.

The most consistent differences between the two groups of students in this study were found in grammatical competence, where “with the exception of correct use of homophous verb forms, the native speakers score significantly higher (p < .01) than the immersion students” (Swain, 1985, p. 238). Not many differences in discourse competence in French were revealed for the native and nonnative speakers. Considering the results for sociolinguistic competence, Swain concluded that it is “in those categories where grammatical knowledge inevitably plays a role in the production of the appropriate form, [that] immersion students’ performance is inferior to that of native speakers” (p. 244).

Swain (1985) pointed to the input the immersion students had received through the years, which though limited in a few respects had otherwise been ample, and to their performance that failed to match that of native speakers, especially in grammatical aspects, and suggested that “the notion of comprehensible input needs refinement” (p. 246). She recounted the suggestion of Long (1983b) and others that the input that is important is the kind that arises through negotiation of meaning in interaction, but she cast doubt on the adequacy of this ‘interaction input hypothesis.’ She turned instead to output for an explanation of the findings on immersion students. These students, she noted, are only given limited opportunities to produce output and are not ‘pushed’ “to be more comprehensible than they already are” (p. 249). She enumerated reasons for the beneficial quality of output and its key role in SLA: It provides learners with opportunities to use the language purposefully, to engage in the testing of hypotheses about the language, and to analyze the language syntactically, rather than merely semantically. Swain found in comprehensible output “a necessary mechanism of acquisition independent of the role of comprehensible input” (p. 252).

Swain has continued to develop the Output Hypothesis. In 1993, she explained a fourth way in which output may contribute to the process of second language learning. Besides providing opportunities for learners to practice using the language, “to move from semantic processing to syntactic processing” (1993, p. 159), and to engage in hypothesis testing, learner output “may generate responses from speakers of the language which can provide learners with information about the comprehensibility and well-formedness of their utterances” (1993, p. 160). In “Focus on Form Through Conscious Reflection,” Swain (1998) included noticing and metatalk, along with hypothesis formulation and testing, as functions of output. Through noticing, which occurs during an attempt “to produce the target language (vocally or subvocally)” (1998, p. 67), a learner may realize that his or her interlanguage is inadequate for expressing a desired message or that there is a difference between the interlanguage and a target

In "Focus on Form Through Conscious Reflection," Swain (1998) also reported on the results of a study on whether the modeling of metatalk encourages its use and on the relationship of metatalk to second language learning. The study participants were 48 eighth-grade French immersion students in two classes. Metatalk, including metalinguistic terminology and rules, was modeled for one class, the metalinguistic group. Metatalk was also modeled for the comparison group but without the use of metalinguistic terminology and rules.

Swain’s study (1998) involved the use of dictoglosses. This procedure involves a brief passage that is read to students twice. After the second reading, during which students take notes, they work in pairs to reconstruct the dictogloss. Following a modeling and practice session and another practice session, there was a data collection session in which pairs of students were recorded as they worked on dictogloss reconstruction. A posttest was designed for each pair in the hopes of measuring “the learning of the exact aspect of language about which students had metatalked” (p. 76). The design of each posttest was based on the language-related episodes (LREs) produced by a pair of students. For the purposes of this research, Swain (1998, p. 70) defined an LRE as “any part of a dialogue in which students talk about the language they are producing, question their language use,” or correct each other.

One of the findings of this study is that the use of metatalk by students was encouraged by the modeling of metatalk that included metalinguistic terminology and rules. The pairs of students in the metalinguistic group produced an average of 14.8 LREs, whereas the pairs in the comparison group produced 5.8. In order to examine the relationship of metatalk to second language learning, the two groups were combined, their LREs were categorized, and the percentage of posttest questions answered correctly for each type of LRE was calculated. On average, for “Type I: problem solved correctly,” 79% of the posttest responses were correct; for “Type II: problem not solved or disagreement about problem solution,” 40% were correct; and for “Type III: problem solved incorrectly or disagreement about problem solution,” 29% were correct (Swain, 1998, pp. 77-78). Swain concludes, “This means that when students, through dialogue, reached a correct solution (Type I), there was a strong tendency for them to perform accurately on the relevant posttest item 1 week later” (p. 78).

This section has covered the areas of input, interaction, and output. The research that is reported in this dissertation focuses on instances of interaction and output, while also taking into account the input that the students receive. This research is supported by Ellis’ observation that “there is an obvious need for more qualitative studies of interaction . . .” (1999, p. 238). It also provides additional evidence on the role of output in second language acquisition.
Age and Second Language Acquisition

A shift away from an almost exclusive emphasis on input in SLA is in keeping with the recommendations of various researchers to concentrate on the role of the learner (Ervin-Tripp, 1970; White, 1987). Besides differences in opportunities for learning, individuals vary in personality, preferences and beliefs, motivation and attitudes, intelligence, aptitude, and age (Clark, 2002; Lightbown & Spada, 1999). Whereas each of these learner characteristics has been studied, often with inconclusive or contradictory results, in discussions of children acquiring a second language, the characteristic of age has received the most attention. The Critical Period Hypothesis (CPH) for Second Language Acquisition has a fundamental place in these discussions and will be considered next.

Penfield and Roberts (1959) offered the earliest proposal of the existence of a critical period for the acquisition of language. Based on studies of aphasic children and adults, the proposal explained differences in language performance between these two groups through the process of lateralization of functions within the brain in the first decade of life and a corresponding loss of brain plasticity. This proposal was popularized by Lenneberg (1967; Birdsong, 1999), who set the end of the critical period at around the age of puberty and who, like Penfield and Roberts (1959), expanded his discussion beyond acquisition of a first language with comments on second language learning.

Through the years, the CPH has stirred debate and has found expression in a number of versions. Recognizing its varied formulations, David Birdsong (1999) offers the following general definition:

. . . the CPH states that there is a limited developmental period during which it is possible to acquire a language, be it L1 or L2, to normal, nativelike levels. Once this window of opportunity is passed, however, the ability to learn language declines. (p. 1)

Mention should be made here of one well-known version of the CPH that refers to a sensitive period rather than a critical period, thus making somewhat weaker claims. Yet whatever its formulation, the CPH for SLA touches on important issues in language acquisition and has inspired much research on the relationship of age to language acquisition.

Individuals engaged in acquiring or learning a new language in a second language setting, as opposed to those in a foreign language setting, are the usual participants in CPH-related research, since in the former setting there is a greater chance of reaching levels of nativelike proficiency. Age of arrival of the individuals in the second language setting is normally an independent variable in such research. This was the case in studies by Patkowski (1982) and by Johnson and Newport (1989) that are often cited as lending strong support to the CPH for SLA.

The 67 participants in Patkowski’s study (1982) were immigrants who had lived in the United States for at least five years, who came from a variety of first language backgrounds, and who were well educated. He used an age of arrival of 15 years to divide the participants into two groups. (33 had arrived before this
age and were designated as the prepuberty group; 34 had arrived after and were designated as the postpuberty group.) This division was made in order to test the following hypothesis: “Full nativelike acquisition of syntax in a nonnative language can be achieved only if learning begins before the age of 15 years” (p. 53). Also included as control subjects were 15 native speakers of English who had been born in the United States. All participants were interviewed and transcripts of these interviews were prepared from tape recordings. Samples from the transcripts, in which there were no clues as to the participants’ backgrounds, were rated by two judges, trained in the rating system.

Besides age at the beginning of second language acquisition (age of arrival in the United States), three practice variables (years in the United States, informal exposure to English, and formal instruction in English) were used in analyses of the data. The results of these analyses showed that “the only factor which was highly associated with the level of syntactic proficiency attained by learners was the age at which acquisition of English began” (p. 59). Of the prepuberty group, only 1 of the 33 participants did not receive one of the two highest scores (4+ or 5) out of 11 possible ratings. This produced a distribution curve that was strongly skewed to the left (mean = 4.8, mode = 5). The distribution curve for the postpuberty group was more normal (mean = 3.6, SD = .6). Based on the results, Patkowski concluded that “the hypothesis of an age-related limitation on the ability to acquire full command of a second language” (p. 59) had been strongly supported.

Patkowski (1982) also based the preceding conclusion on ratings of degree of foreign accent. These ratings were made by the two judges, who listened to a brief segment of each of the interviews after having completed the syntactical evaluation of the transcripts. A strong main effect for age of arrival was revealed. As in a study by Oyama (1976), Patkowski found that those learners who arrived in the United States at a younger age had most fully acquired the English phonological system. Indeed, arguments in favor of the CPH for SLA are often made on the basis of such phonological studies.

The support for the CPH for SLA that is offered by Johnson and Newport’s (1989) study is based on outcomes of grammaticality judgment tasks. The 46 native speakers of Chinese and Korean in this study, all of whom had spent at least 5 years in the United States, were divided into equal groups, according to an age of arrival in this country of 3 to 15 years old or 17 to 39 years old. Twenty-three control subjects whose first language was English also took part. Participants judged the grammaticality of sentences recorded on audiotape, only about half of which conformed to rules of English syntax and morphology. The results showed that the participants who had arrived early performed significantly better and were more similar in their performance than those who had arrived late.

Not only the positive outcomes for the early learners but the discontinuity in the pattern of results between the early and the late learners in the studies by Patkowski (1982) and Johnson and Newport (1989) provided support for the CPH for SLA. Evidence against this hypothesis could be provided by
documentation of adult second language learners who have achieved nativelike competence and by finding patterns of age effects that persist past the supposed close of the critical period. Both of these types of evidence were obtained in a study by Birdsong (1992).

The participants in Birdsong’s study (1992) included 20 native speakers of French and “20 native speakers of English who were near-native speakers of French” (p. 717). None of the English native speakers (ENS) had been exposed to French or had begun their study of the language prior to the onset of puberty (“average = 14.9 years; range = 11 - 28 years,” p. 717). Their “average age of arrival in France was 28.5 years” (p. 717). On a French grammaticality judgment task, 15 of the ENS performed at a level that was within the range of French native-speaker (FNS) performance, and of these 15 ENS, the results of 5 were comparable to those of the better performing FNS participants. A correlation was found between overall scores and age of arrival in France, with participants who had arrived earlier performing better. Signaling the significance of these results in relation to the CPH for SLA, Birdsong (1999, p. 9) asks, “Why should age effects continue to be found after the end of the presumed critical period?”

In addition to the question of ultimate performance that is central to discussions of the CPH for SLA, another important comparison among learners of different ages is that of rate of short-term learning. Krashen, Scarcella, and Long in their book, Child-Adult Differences in Second Language Acquisition (1982), bring together a number of short-term, as well as long-term studies. They summarize the conclusions that they reached on the basis of these studies as follows:

1. Adults proceed through early stages of syntactic and morphological development faster than children (where time and exposure are held constant).
2. Older children acquire faster than younger children (again, in early stages of morphological and syntactic development where time and exposure are held constant).
3. Acquirers who begin natural exposure to second languages during childhood generally achieve higher levels of second language proficiency than those beginning as adults. (p. 159)

Ellis (1994) in a later survey of age-related SLA literature likewise notes the initial advantage enjoyed by adults in rate of learning, especially in the area of grammar, but also concludes, “They will eventually be overtaken by child learners who receive enough exposure to the L2” (p. 491). He points out that the amount of exposure is more likely to be sufficient in naturalistic than in instructional settings.

Considerations of rate of acquisition and of ultimate attainment come into play in discussions of when to begin foreign language instruction in a school setting. The results of some studies of attainment have favored a later start (e.g., Burstall, 1975), whereas the results of other studies have favored an early start (e.g., Lipton, Morgan, & Reed, 1996). Donato, Antonek, and Tucker (1996), who conducted an evaluation of a K-5 Japanese FLES program, present the following
findings concerning student achievement: “The data . . . indicate that older students outperformed younger ones on some tasks but that the younger ones were no less able to acquire language and vocabulary at comparable rates and with similar patterns of growth” (p. 524).

In the midst of this presentation of varied research findings on child second language acquisition, it is well to point out that the process of second language learning is far from effortless for children and to again mention the advantage of older learners in rate of learning. Primarily addressing teachers of children learning English as a second language, Barry McLaughlin (1992) presents *Myths and Misconceptions About Second Language Learning*. Two of the assertions McLaughlin treats as myths, presenting evidence to refute them, are “children learn languages quickly and easily” and “the younger the child, the more skilled in acquiring a second language” (Myth 1: Children Learn Second Languages Quickly and Easily section & Myth 2: The Younger the Child, the More Skilled in Acquiring a Second Language section).

Notwithstanding the preceding caveat against assuming that child second language learning is effortless, the desirability of a long sequence of language instruction in the area of foreign language learning should not be discounted. The foreign language education and FLES literature frequently contains recommendations for starting instruction early and continuing it in a well articulated sequence, such as the following statement: “In order for students to reach a confident level of second language proficiency, they will most likely need to follow a sequentially articulated program that extends over the K-12 continuum” (Florida Department of Education, 1996, p. 32). These recommendations may be made on the basis of increased time and opportunities for learning (Swain, 1981) or on the basis of the cognitive, academic, and attitudinal benefits that are associated with early language learning (Met, 1991). Met (1991) not only cites research demonstrating benefits for immersion students and those with a high level of proficiency but also research showing benefits achieved by students in FLES programs and those with lower levels of proficiency in comparison to monolingual students and those who had not studied a foreign language. Cognitive benefits include greater metalinguistic awareness and mental flexibility (Hakuta, 1984), high scores on a measure of divergent thinking (Landry, 1974), and higher levels of cognitive and metalinguistic processing (Foster & Reeves, 1989). Academic benefits of early language study may be seen in higher scores on standardized tests, including those covering the areas of reading and mathematics (Rafferty, 1986), verbal ability (Cooper, 1987), and English language arts, science, social studies, and again mathematics (Taylor Ward, 2004). In regard to attitudinal benefits, Met (1991, p. 68) cites research that indicates the greater receptivity of younger children “to learning about and accepting other peoples and cultures (Lambert and Klineberg, 1967; Carpenter and Torney, 1973; Torney, 1979).”

This section has focused on the learner characteristic of age and its relationship to second language acquisition, certainly a consideration in case studies of individual fifth graders acquiring Spanish. The means of delivery of the
Spanish lessons is another important consideration. Literature relating to this delivery will be covered in the following section on video, videoconferencing, and distance learning.

**Video, Videoconferencing, and Distance Learning**

Through the years, developments in technology have had an impact on the field of foreign language education, as possibilities for the utilization of the technologies have been recognized and as their use has been incorporated into practice. Various technologies have been used to support both teaching and learning (Garrett, 1991). They have been used to expand and enhance learning activities in classrooms led by foreign language teachers, and, in the case of distance learning, they have been the means by which instruction has been offered to learners physically separated from the foreign language teacher.

In an overview of the history of distance learning, Shelley (2000) presents three major stages of its development and the technologies associated with each. In the current third stage, distinctions of the past have become less clear, as different types of distance learning and their associated technologies are “being used in a variety of combinations with traditional face-to-face teaching” (p. 184). This blurring of distinctions may serve as a reference point in the following review of literature on video, videoconferencing, and distance learning, as these relate to foreign language education and, specifically, to FLES.

**Videotapes.** Although the use of videotapes in language teaching had become a common practice in the 1980s (Hill, 2000), as late as 1991 Garrett was able to comment that there was “little hard research” on the use of video (p. 77). This observation still holds true in the area of FLES and extends to the use of videodiscs as well. Among the limited number of studies that have been carried out are the evaluations by the World-Wide Education and Research Institute of the elementary-school-level videodisc programs, *Hablar et Parler*, used in teaching Spanish and French, and *Konichi-Wa*, used in teaching Japanese (J. N. Eastmond, et al., 1993; N. Eastmond, et al., 1994). In addition to making suggestions for improvements, these evaluations relate the positive reception that the videodisc programs received.

A report by Louton (1995) describes the implementation of *Content-Related FLES Through Distance Learning*, a German FLES program that uses video lessons and additional activities facilitated by classroom teachers, as well as sessions with a fluent speaker of German (a telelinguist) who communicates with each class by telephone. Evaluation forms filled out by the teachers and the telelinguist indicate progress by the students in acquiring German.

The use of a series of videotapes, the *Elementary Spanish Program*, with children in the third and fourth grades, was examined by Morris (2000), who conducted interviews and observations at three schools. Investigating how teachers defined a successful program, Morris found that of the 12 teachers he interviewed, 6 focused on instructional considerations, such as the program’s ease of use, incorporation of sound goals and techniques, and provision of
adequate supporting materials. The other 6 teachers focused on students’ involvement in and satisfaction with the program as basic to its success (p. 166).

Morris (2000) also examined and compared “how the program was implemented at each school” (p. 164). At Appleton, a small elementary school in which third and fourth grade students are combined in one class, the classroom teacher is able to begin instruction and pause the videotape at her own discretion, taking advantage of the television monitor and videocassette recorder in her room. At Booker, a medium-sized elementary school, a foreign language specialist goes from classroom to classroom to facilitate instruction. This teacher is also able to “control the tape and pause or turn it off where desired” (p. 169). Such control of the videotape is not available to the five third-grade and five fourth-grade teachers at Clark Elementary School. At Clark, a large school, videotaped lessons for each grade level are sent to the classrooms over an intraschool network.

Morris (2000) went on to examine the relationship between program implementation and success. Although teachers and administrators at each of the three schools described the Elementary Spanish Program in positive terms, Morris reached conclusions on the best way to implement the program. He found that the advantages of an individual teacher being able to control the presentation of the video lessons outweighed the disadvantages of the teacher’s responsibility for dealing with technical problems and for making sure that a lesson was not missed. He also concluded that classroom teachers’ knowledge of and rapport with their own students, along with their ability to decorate their classrooms and to integrate Spanish with other instruction, outweighed the disadvantages of possibly having a limited knowledge of Spanish and of possibly becoming preoccupied with other school demands, to the detriment of Spanish instruction.

Examining characteristics of schools and teachers that might influence program success, Morris (2000) found that teachers who had experience in using the program described changes and adjustments they had made over time. Although no differences in program success were noted for teachers who spoke or did not speak a foreign language, the former “tended to use Spanish throughout the day during instruction” (p. 177). This was especially true for one teacher who had a bachelor’s degree in French. No differences in program success were associated with other characteristics that were examined.

Aspects of the program that were associated with greater student learning included songs, activity sheets, tests, and Total Physical Response activities. The use of repetition and of humor were also mentioned as having produced positive results. The use of choral reading was suggested. It was noted that oral story reading had been less effective.

The Center for Applied Linguistics has also investigated the use of video-based programs in FLES (Rhodes & Pufahl, 2003), reviewing the five that are used most frequently in Spanish instruction: Elementary Spanish, Español para ti, Saludos, Muzzy, and Salsa. Based on the findings, it is recommended that videos be used as a supplement to “provide much-needed interactive listening
activities, introduce children to cultural aspects . . ., [and] expose children to language models other than the teacher . . .” (Videos Are Best Used as a Supplement section). It is recognized that a video program may be used as the basis of language instruction, especially when the classroom teacher is not a proficient speaker. In such a case, support for the program should be provided through bringing in native speakers as resources, through using classroom follow-up activities, and through involving the whole school in foreign language activities. More detailed information and recommendations from the study are provided in the book, Language by Video: An Overview of Foreign Language Instructional Videos for Children (Rhodes & Pufahl, 2004).

A belief in the efficacy of certain patterns of interaction in increasing student participation and facilitating L2 learning prompted a descriptive study by Lopes (1996) that examined interaction behaviors in both a language video program and in elementary school classes using that program as the basis of Spanish instruction. The Observational System for Instructional Analysis (OSIA; Hough & Duncan, 1970), which consists of a set of categories into which classroom verbal and nonverbal behaviors are classified at 5-second intervals, was used by Lopes to address research questions on the types of interaction behaviors and on the amount of teacher talk versus student talk in the two settings. In addition, Lopes sought to provide a broader perspective to her study through “a descriptive analysis of instruction in the video program and in the classroom settings” (p. 63).

Lopes (1996) analyzed all 25 lessons of the Spanish version of the Elementary Language Fundamentals (ELF) program. This program, created in 1988, features a teacher who is shown instructing approximately eight students in the studio. Of the OSIA’s 11 categories for both teacher and student instructional behaviors, coding of the ELF lessons revealed that the most frequent teacher behavior was initiation of information, which accounted for 39% of all behaviors (those displayed by both the teacher and the studio students). The next most frequent teacher behaviors were solicitation of response (33%) and response to solicitation (9.3%). The latter category includes the teacher’s responses to her own solicitations (64% of the total occurrences of this teacher behavior) and her repetition of her own responses and of student responses (the remaining 36%). All studio student behavior could be accounted for by a single OSIA category: response to solicitation (9.8% of the total number of teacher and student behaviors). An analysis of the amount of classroom talk time taken up by the teacher and by the students revealed that 86.71% of this time was used by the teacher and 9.8% by the students. Instructional songs also took up part (3.49%) of the total talk time.

Interaction behaviors in 24 different classes that used the ELF program for Spanish instruction were also analyzed by Lopes (1996) using the OSIA. There were four classes each from kindergarten and grades 1 through 5 that were videotaped on one occasion per class, subsequent to videotaping for purposes of desensitization. The most frequent teacher behavior displayed by the two language consultants who led the classes was solicitation of response (33% of
the total of their behaviors and student behaviors). This was followed by *initiation of information* (9.3%) and *positive personal judgment* (4.3%). The most frequent student behavior was *response to solicitation* (28%). Among the other behaviors displayed by the classroom students was *solicitation of response*. The frequency of this student behavior (2%) was mirrored by the frequency of the teacher behavior *response to solicitation* (2.2%). When the ELF videos were not in use, 54.33% of the total classroom talk time was taken up by the language consultants, and 37.53% was used by the students. Based on the contrast between the amount of student talk time in the video lessons and in the classrooms using them, Lopes (1996) concluded that instruction in the ELF program itself was basically teacher centered, with the studio students becoming passive learners, but that instruction in the classrooms was more learner centered.

Lopes (1996) also examined strategies used by the language consultants to encourage interaction during viewing of the videos and found differences in the amount of encouragement the consultants offered. Lopes’ analysis of instruction led her to conclude: “to assure more frequent instances of interaction between students and the video program, classroom strategies designed to encourage participation must be sustained throughout the video viewing period” (p. 98).

**Videoconferencing.** The need to provide for interactivity or interaction is a frequent theme among those who have written about distance learning and videoconferencing (Cavanaugh, 1998; Clifford, 1990; Henrichsen, 2001; Nielsen & Hoffman, 1996). Cavanaugh (1998), whose meta-analysis focuses on the interactive distance education technologies of videoconferencing and online telecommunications, points out that interactivity allows for individualized instruction and is highly motivating. The argument in favor of interaction takes on even more force when second language acquisition through distance learning is considered (Gilzow & Rhodes, 2000; Warriner-Burke, 1990).

In the case of videoconferencing, the potential for interactivity is combined with a visual interface through which important information may be transmitted. In spite of the promise that videoconferencing holds for foreign language learning, at this time there is not a sufficient research base from which to draw firm conclusions on its use, and more studies are needed, especially in the area of FLES. As Ford-Guerrera (1997) points out, concerning research on the use of technology in elementary school foreign language instruction, “Currently, research focuses on older learners and the use of computer software programs” (p. 17).

Catherine Cavanaugh (1998), after conducting an extensive search for studies of interactive distance education technologies in the K-12 setting, was only able to locate 13 studies of videoconferencing that met the inclusion criteria for her meta-analysis. These studies all involved learners at the high school level. In making the general comparison “between the achievement of students learning with distance education systems as the primary or supplementary means of instruction, and the achievement of students learning with traditional
means” (p. 45), Cavanaugh’s calculation of average effect size for these 13 studies yielded a small negative effect size of –0.016. Three foreign language studies (Gray, 1996; R. E. Smith, 1990; Wick, 1997) were included. Their average effect size was –0.801, a large negative effect size. Taking into consideration both the “great potential [that] exists theoretically for linking students with native speakers and writers” and the “demonstrably lower” performance of the distance learning students in comparison to that of foreign language students in traditional classrooms, Cavanaugh recommends very careful study of “distance education courses for foreign language instruction” (p. 77).

Although not based on rigorous and exhaustive research, two descriptions of programs that incorporate videoconferencing in FLES instruction both report an “overwhelmingly positive” response (Brooks & Fernández, 2001, p. 24; Trayer & Knoche, 2002, p. 17). In one program, Japanese was taught to children 2 hours a day over a period of 2 weeks in the summer, using videoconferencing “based on fiber optic technology” that provided “broadcast-quality real-time audio and video signals” (Brooks & Fernández, 2001, p. 23). Evaluation of the program was based on responses to student, parent, and facilitator surveys. The other program, which provided for “K-12 Spanish and technology use in rural schools” (Trayer & Knoche, 2002, p. 16), incorporated videoconferencing via the Internet, through which students and teachers interacted with native speakers of Spanish in other countries. The technology was also utilized for the periodic presentation of Spanish lessons to the students.

Robert Baker and his colleagues report on an evaluation of different elementary school language classes taught through videoconferencing (Baker, et al., 1992). Three classes received simultaneous instruction in Japanese through two-way audio and one-way video, and one class was taught French through two-way audio and video. Interviews with students and teachers revealed a preference for two-way audio and video. In general, students in both groups had a positive reaction to learning through videoconferencing, but most expressed a preference for face-to-face instruction.

Live instruction provided through one-way video and two-way audio and the same instruction provided in a taped format were compared in a study that included an Elementary German program (Boverie, et al., 1997). Of the students and teachers who responded to a mailed survey, 82% watched the German program taped rather than live. Analyses of the student and teacher responses showed no significant difference for either group in satisfaction with the program according to its presentation format. However, through the qualitative data that were collected for this study, it was revealed that “teachers preferred watching the program on tape because it gave them more control over the lesson” (p. 10).

This chapter has provided a review of the literature that is most pertinent to this study.
Chapter 3. Design and Methodology

Introduction

As Robert Stake (2000) has observed, “As a form of research, case study is defined by interest in individual cases, not by the methods of inquiry used” (p. 435). The research that is reported here involves case studies, the in-depth examination of the language learning experiences of four fifth-grade students of Spanish. Videoconferencing sessions taught by the Spanish teacher at Dolphin Point and a Spanish teacher at another school, other lessons taught by Dolphin Point’s Spanish teacher, and video-based lessons facilitated by the classroom teacher are the contexts in which language instruction occurs, contexts that have been carefully examined and described. The emic perspectives of the participants were sought, looking for meanings they ascribe to their learning of Spanish. The design of the study was emergent; additional design decisions were made as data from multiple sources were collected and analyzed. In the later stages of analysis, etic categories have been used (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001) to facilitate the communication of results without distorting the meaning of original emic perspectives. Conclusions have been grounded in the data; they were reached inductively.

This is an interpretive qualitative study. It incorporates the five features of qualitative research, as this is defined by Bogdan and Biklen (1998, pp. 4-7): a naturalistic setting, descriptive data, a concern with process, inductive analysis, and a concern with meaning. It incorporates the focus on “the construction or coconstruction of meaning within a particular setting” (Davis, 1995, p. 433) that Davis signals as the distinguishing characteristic of interpretive qualitative studies.

A strong argument that may be made in favor of qualitative research in the area of SLA is that it is based in the classroom and seeks to discover classroom processes not fully known previously. The relevance of this argument may be seen in the inconclusive results produced by the large-scale global studies that compared different language-teaching methods in the 1960s and early 1970s (Ellis, 1994). These studies categorized groups according to method of language instruction and failed to account for what was actually happening in the classroom. As Ellis (1994) explains, “language classes tend to offer very similar opportunities for learning irrespective of their methodological orientation” (p. 572). Also referring to the failure of the comparative method studies, Gaies (1983) puts forward classroom process research, which “rejects as simplistic any univariate classification of the second language instructional experience” (p. 206).
Inconclusive results have also been obtained in studies comparing distance education and traditional classroom learning. Thomas L. Russell’s book, *The No Significant Difference Phenomenon* (1999), provides a compilation of 355 such studies conducted between 1928 and 1998. Although no advantage is shown for either distance or traditional education, questions concerning particular aspects of distance education are left unanswered (J. R. Young, 2000). Here again an argument in favor of qualitative research could be made.

A number of studies in the area of FLES have incorporated a qualitative approach or have used it exclusively. “Exploring New Frontiers: What Do Computers Contribute to Teaching Foreign Languages in Elementary School?” (Nutta et al., 2002) presents the findings from a study that included both experimental and qualitative portions. The experimental portion involved the comparison of the achievement of FLES students in computer-enhanced and text-based classes. The qualitative portion focused on the second language behavior of students in the two classes. An argument is made in favor of carrying out the qualitative study to complement the experimental research, “because comparative experimental studies ignore numerous aspects of instruction that could provide crucial insights into L2 instructional theory and practice (Dunkel, 1991; Chapelle & Jamieson, 1991)” (Nutta et al., 2002, p. 295).

Among the other studies in the area of elementary school foreign language instruction that incorporate both qualitative and quantitative methods are two that examine a FLEX program, one study focusing on raising students’ cultural awareness and “developing [their] readiness for and interest in learning foreign languages” (Pagcaliwagan, 1997, p. 6), and the other focusing on the impact of the program on the students’ attitudes toward foreign languages and cultures (Chambless, 2003).

In some FLES research, a qualitative approach by itself has been appropriate for examining the topic under study. Bueno (1991), for example, carried out *An Ethnographic Study of the Introduction of a Contextualized Computer Environment in an Elementary School Spanish Classroom*. Steves (1998) conducted 13 case studies of students learning Spanish in a FLEX program, concentrating on “several areas of individual variety, including motivation, learning style, approach to vocabulary learning, classroom behavior, expectations, and listening and pronunciation skills” (p. iii), and also examining issues of age, gender, and basic skills.

**Researcher Background and Perspectives**

In this section, I will describe some of the experiences I have had that have brought about my interest in elementary school foreign language instruction. One reason I am including them is to show how they have prepared me to conduct this research. Another reason for describing my experiences, along with my perspectives, is to expose possible sources of bias. This lays the foundation for the self-monitoring that was carried out during the course of the research. Every effort was made to minimize the effects of any of my preconceptions on this study, especially during the early stages, when openness
to emerging themes and patterns embedded in the phenomena is crucial. An important first step is to recognize the existence and something of the nature of my perspectives.

After observing several exemplary FLES classes, I had my first experience with elementary school children learning a foreign language when I began to teach Spanish in an after-school program in October 1997. By then I had developed a high level of proficiency in Spanish, my middle school foreign language experience having been followed by the study of Spanish in high school and college. I was confident in the quality of the Spanish I was using to communicate with the children, but there were other aspects of the teaching that I wished were different. I was an outsider, not a teacher at the school. I wondered what could be accomplished in an elementary school foreign language class that was part of the school’s curriculum.

I pursued my new interest in FLES through studying on my own, attending a summer institute on methods of teaching foreign languages in the elementary school, becoming a member of the National Network for Early Language Learning, attending FLES sessions at yearly conferences of the Florida Foreign Language Association, observing more FLES classes, and talking to FLES teachers and foreign language supervisors from different counties.

I was invited to do research in a school with a FLEX program, Central Elementary (a pseudonym), where I had become a member of the School Advisory Council in the 1998–1999 school year. I conducted the research while taking a class on Qualitative Methods. The main part of my study began on February 21, 2000, and continued with observations of an intermediate class carried out on a regular basis for the next 2 months (Norwood, 2000). The teacher of this class of fifth graders and a few fourth graders, Lisa Lukowski (a pseudonym), had made a 3-year commitment in 1998 to study Spanish and to teach it to her students. The training Lisa received included the same summer FLES methods institute I attended in 1998; Spanish lessons that the lead teacher of her team (The Winners) offered throughout the 1998–1999 and 1999–2000 school years; study of Spanish in Mexico from June 19 to July 3, 1999; and study through a Spanish class that started on March 25, 2000. Lisa also practiced Spanish with her daughter, who had first taken a Spanish class in middle school in the 1998–1999 school year and had continued her study of Spanish.

The research that I carried out (Norwood, 2000) resulted in a description of Central Elementary School and its FLEX program. I examined Lisa’s experiences as a learner of Spanish, her attitude toward the language and teaching it, and the activities and strategies she used in her Spanish teaching. The focus I had maintained on Spanish interactions allowed me to provide evidence of Lisa’s ability in speaking Spanish, to examine student participation and production of Spanish, and to take a closer look at two students as language learners. In my report, I also included sections on student attitudes toward learning Spanish and on the correction of errors by students. In my analyses, I relied on field notes from my observations of Lisa’s Spanish classes, from conversations I had had with Lisa and with other Central FLEX teachers, and
from previous visits to Central. In addition, I made use of school documents, including surveys concerning FLEX that had been distributed to Winners Team students, parents, and teachers in 1999.

Analysis of the data from this study (Norwood, 2000) revealed that the FLEX program at Central had been met with a positive response on the part of Lisa and her students. Only one student, who was new to the school, expressed the opinion that Spanish was hard. In terms of language use, it appeared that “the input received by the students from [Lisa] was limited in terms of syntax, with only a few types of sentences used. As would be expected, student output was also of a limited syntactic nature” (p. 17). The students, however, did learn “much vocabulary and were able to understand a series of commands that Lisa presented to them” (pp. 18-19).

In my research interests, I have moved from an examination of the role of input alone in language acquisition (Norwood, 1994) to a broader focus that acknowledges the role of input but focuses on interaction and output. The current research study is framed within this broader perspective. My interpretations have been influenced by my knowledge of SLA theory and by my knowledge of and experiences with the study of foreign language in the elementary school as it has been carried out in various contexts and at different times.

**Initial Contact with Dolphin Point Elementary and the FLETT Model**

Due to the issues examined in this study, there were only three schools that could be considered to serve as a research setting. These schools have the Polycom videoconferencing equipment and follow the FLETT model, with videoconferencing occupying a position of central importance. Three other schools in the same school district owned the videoconferencing equipment, but their Spanish instruction had a different thrust.

In the spring of 2003, at the urging of World Languages Curriculum Coordinator Lissette Ford (a pseudonym, as are the names of the other school teachers involved in this research), Dr. Joyce Nutta established a relationship with Dolphin Point Elementary School in view of the possibility of doing research there. Because of my potential involvement in this research and because of my own interest in pursuing research in the area of technology-mediated FLES, I contacted Mrs. Ford and made arrangements to observe videoconferencing classes on May 6 and 7, 2003. Mrs. Ford expressed a belief in doing research on the FLETT program and has facilitated such research.

My discussion of Dolphin Point Elementary and the FLETT model continues below with a description of a Spanish summer institute for teachers from schools with FLES or FLETT programs that was offered by the school district in which Dolphin Point is located. Next I cover the move of Dolphin Point from temporary quarters to a newly constructed facility on its own campus and how this is related to a district-level agreement that provided for the end of court-ordered busing. The final subsection is devoted to a longer discussion of my
preliminary observations at Dolphin Point in the 2003–2004 school year and what I learned from these.

*Spanish Summer Institute.* It was from Mrs. Ford that I learned about a Spanish summer institute, led by a nationally recognized foreign language education consultant with expertise in the area of early language learning, to be held June 23-26, 2003. This institute was for classroom teachers from schools that had FLES programs or that had or would be beginning FLETT programs and for the schools’ FLES/FLETT teachers, who helped to facilitate it, as well. Having received permission from the school district’s World Languages Supervisor to attend, I was present for the first 3 days of the institute.

Several things stand out to me from that Spanish summer institute and have a bearing on the research that I later conducted at Dolphin Point Elementary. One was meeting the school’s principal, who was briefly in attendance, and meeting some of the school’s classroom teachers, including Lloyd Baxter. I had a chance to visit with Mr. Baxter during the institute and found him receptive to the idea of facilitating research on Dolphin Point’s Spanish program. Besides these contacts, I feel that some of the institute’s content is worth noting here.

The questions “Why are classroom teachers ‘experts’?” and “Why are FLES teachers experts?” were addressed on the first day of the institute. The expertise and potential contributions of classroom teachers were described in these terms:

- You understand children’s developmental stages.
- By learning Spanish, you are a role model for lifelong learning.
- You know how to make connections with academic disciplines and the overall school day.
- You and your class have developed a special trusting relationship that contributes to successfully learning a foreign language together.
- You make it possible for many more children to begin a foreign language learning experience.
- You are a resource to the Spanish teacher.
- You will plant the seeds of how important it is to become bilingual and biliterate. (Field notes, 6/23/03)

The expertise and potential contributions of FLES/FLETT teachers were described in terms of their high proficiency in the language, their cultural understanding and ability to make cultural connections, their ability to make connections with academic subjects, their preparation in the area of SLA, and their status as the Spanish teacher, as a resource to classroom teachers, and as a living role model (Field notes, 6/23/03).

Something else that I noted at the institute was the prominence accorded to the Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) to the teaching of foreign languages. One of the general principles of this approach is that students’ production of the new language should be “allowed to emerge in stages . . . : (1) response by nonverbal communication, (2) response with a single word . . . ,
(3) combinations of two or three words . . . , (4) phrases . . . , (5) sentences, and finally (6) more complex discourse” (p. 20). At the institute, the principle of stages in students’ language development was presented in a somewhat modified form: from the point of view of the ways in which teachers should prompt students, as the latter move through their language development. With this progression in mind, teachers were advised to (a) elicit nonverbal responses and student names, (b) ask yes/no [sí/no] questions, (c) ask either/or questions, and (d) ask questions that would prompt students to produce language on their own, such as the question, “¿Qué es esto?” [What is this?] (Field notes, 6/23/03).

Dolphin Point and the Choice Agreement. Following the Spanish summer institute, my next contact with Dolphin Point Elementary and the FLETT model was when I returned to school in September to carry out more observations. When I had first visited the school in the spring of 2003, it was in session on another campus, the future home of Floyd P. Lacy Elementary, which was used by Dolphin Point during the 2002–2003 school year. During that time, a new facility was being built for Dolphin Point on its own campus, considerations of cost-effectiveness having caused the school district to opt for this new construction instead of renovation. At the beginning of the 2003–2004 school year, Dolphin Point’s newly constructed facility was opened to its students. It was also at this time that Lacy Elementary was first opened to its own students.

Located in a predominantly Black neighborhood, Lacy Elementary was built by the school district as part of an agreement with the Legal Defense Fund of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) to end the court-ordered busing that had been used in the district since 1971 for purposes of desegregation. The agreement, designed to allow parents more choice as to where their children attend school, set a cap of 42% Black students at any one school in the first 4 years of the agreement’s implementation (2003–2004 through 2006–2007).

In February 2003, a local newspaper reported that in the fall of that year some schools in predominantly Black neighborhoods, including Floyd P. Lacy and Dolphin Point, would have enrollments far below their true capacity in order to facilitate the achievement of the racial ratios required by the choice agreement. (To protect the identity of Dolphin Point, no citation is provided here.) The article stated that the superintendent of the school district was not happy that newly constructed schools would not be full initially, but he remained optimistic about the schools’ future, saying that over time they would “fill up because of the programs that are there.” (It is through one such program that Spanish is offered at Dolphin Point.)

When I first visited Dolphin Point in May 2003, there were approximately equal numbers of White and Black students attending the school. According to the 2002–2003 NCLB School Public Accountability Report (Florida Department of Education, 2004a), in October 2002, of the 395 students enrolled at the school, 170 were White and 169 were Black. The percentages of students in attendance at the time, listed by racial and ethnic group, were as follows: 43.0% White,
42.8% Black, 5.8% Multiracial, 4.8% Hispanic, 3.3% Asian, and 0.3% American Indian. Comparison data given for the previous school year show an even higher percentage of Black students, 52.6%.

In keeping with the cap of 42% Black students set by the choice agreement, in the 2003–2004 school year the percentage of Black students at Dolphin Point had been reduced. The *NCLB School Public Accountability Report* (Florida Department of Education, 2004b) for that year states that in October 2003, there were 170 White students and 150 Black students enrolled at Dolphin Point. The following percentages of students, listed by racial and ethnic group, are given: 40.7% White, 35.9% Black, 10.0% Multiracial, 7.7% Hispanic, 4.1% Asian, and 1.7% American Indian. Additional demographic information on Dolphin Point will be provided in the next chapter in relation to my study carried out in the 2004–2005 school year.

*My Preliminary Observations at Dolphin Point Elementary.* It was on September 16, 2003, that I returned to Dolphin Point to carry out observations as part of my work under a USF Community Partnership Faculty Grant awarded to Dr. Joyce Nutta and Dr. Carol Mullen. The purpose of these early observations was to gain a better understanding of Dolphin Point’s FLETT program. During the 4-month period from mid-September 2003 to mid-January 2004, I observed 25 Spanish class sessions and also joined students from Dolphin Point on a field trip to see a special Spanish presentation. Because the Community Partnership Grant provided for case studies to be conducted of a first- and a fifth-grade class, the majority of my observations during the 4-month period involved classes at these levels. I observed 10 Spanish sessions involving first-grade classes (9 of these with the class of Mrs. Cartwright) and 12 sessions involving fifth-grade classes. I also had the opportunity to observe a second-grade and two third-grade classes on one occasion apiece.

I continued observing Spanish class sessions, as well as a special Spanish presentation, at Dolphin Point from mid-January to mid-March 2004 with the purpose of better preparing myself to conduct the research study that forms the main body of this dissertation. Having already observed Mr. Baxter’s fifth-grade class in Spanish sessions on nine occasions, I observed it on another three occasions. I did this because I planned on working with Mr. Baxter the following school year, drawing case study participants from the class he would have at that time. I also observed Spanish sessions involving the fourth-grade class of Mrs. Miller on five occasions in order to become familiar with some of the students I might consider as case study participants the following school year.

During the period of my preliminary observations in the 2003–2004 school year, all videoconferencing sessions at Dolphin Point took place in a special classroom, the Tele Café, where the Polycom videoconferencing equipment was located. Two large television monitors were the most obvious components of this equipment. Sometimes each class appeared on a monitor. At other times, the class at the distant school appeared on one and written text or a small object, such as a miniature piece of furniture, appeared on the other.
was providing the instruction, she stood at the front of the class, to the side of the equipment. Students were supposed to sit on a special rug depicting the Spanish alphabet and Spanish words and their English equivalents, but not all of the students in large classes were able to fit on this rug. The classroom teacher would stay in the Tele Café with his or her class during Spanish instruction, sitting in a chair behind the students. When the FLES teacher in the distant site was teaching, the classroom teacher would help in the selection of his or her students to respond to questions and prompts and sometimes provided behavioral correction for students who weren’t focused on the lesson. The videoconferencing sessions were scheduled to last for 20 minutes but often lasted longer.

The Tele Café served not only as the setting for videoconferencing sessions but also for Spanish instruction offered by Mrs. Ford without videoconferencing. For example, on September 16, 2003, one of Dolphin Point’s two fifth-grade classes (that of Mrs. Jackson) received instruction through videoconferencing, having been paired for the school year with a fifth-grade class at Greenwood Park Elementary, but Dolphin Point’s other fifth-grade class (that of Mr. Baxter) was taught by Mrs. Ford without videoconferencing, because it had not yet been paired with a fifth-grade class at another school (Field notes, 9/16/03). (By October 21, 2003, the next time I observed Mr. Baxter’s class in the Tele Café, it had been paired with a fifth-grade class at Wallenmaier Elementary and was receiving Spanish instruction through videoconferencing.)

Whether Mrs. Ford was teaching with or without videoconferencing, the arrangement of people in the Tele Café was basically the same. When she was teaching without videoconferencing, she still stood at the front of the class, to the side of the equipment, using the document camera in the same way she might have used an overhead projector, but instead of projecting images onto a hanging screen, she projected them onto one of the television monitors.

It happened that on September 16, 2003 (when I observed four videoconferencing sessions, as well as one class session without videoconferencing) Mrs. Ford was the FLES teacher who was responsible for the Spanish instruction through videoconferencing, teaching both a given class at Dolphin Point and the class with which it had been matched at Greenwood Park. Mrs. Ford mentioned to me that the following week Mr. Straten (the FLES teacher at Greenwood Park) would be responsible for the videoconferencing sessions. She also mentioned that Spanish instruction had just started on September 2 (Field notes, 9/16/03).

I noticed that on September 16, Mr. Straten remained with the classes at Greenwood Park during Mrs. Ford’s lessons (Field notes, 9/16/03). However, on October 9 when I was at Dolphin Point, observing two videoconferencing sessions led by Mr. Straten, I didn’t see Mrs. Ford at all (Field notes, 10/9/03). From October 9 onward, any given class receiving instruction from a FLES teacher at a distant site no longer had the FLES teacher at their site stay with them on a regular basis.
During my observations in the 2003–2004 school year, the topics that were covered in the Tele Café, in sessions taught both with and without videoconferencing, included numbers, the date, the seasons, vocabulary associated with different holidays, the weather, colors, parts of the body, rooms of the house and furniture, land and sea animals, the continents, Spanish-speaking countries and their capitals, and vocabulary and facts from the Muzzy video-based language program (developed by the British Broadcasting Corporation).

On the six occasions I observed classes from different grade levels being taught on the same day, I noticed that it wasn't unusual for the same topics to be covered regardless of the grade level of a given class. For example, on September 16, 2003, the first, second, third, and fifth grade classes that I observed each took part in an activity in which, given a range of numbers, students guessed the price of a piece of furniture. There was, however, a difference in the number ranges given to classes at the different grade levels, with progressively higher numbers and more extensive ranges being offered to classes in higher grades.

Many songs were used in teaching Spanish in the Tele Café, including a song to begin class (Hola, mis niños [Hello, my children]), a song about Spanish being “neat” (¡Español es chévere!), a number song, a song about the days of the week, a song for each month, a song about the seasons, songs associated with different holidays, a weather song, a song about sea animals, a chant about the continents, a song about the characters in Muzzy, and a song to end class (Tic tac, tic tac, el reloj [Tick-tock, tick-tock, the clock]).

The main part of each class session in the Tele Café was conducted exclusively in Spanish. The change from speaking English to speaking Spanish would occur when the class said, “Adiós, inglés. Hola, español.” [Goodbye, English. Hello, Spanish.”] Sometimes Hola, mis niños was sung after that. There was always a calendar segment in each class session. This included the song about the month (e.g., Octubre) and questions about the date. There might also be a song about the days of the week, a song about the seasons, a song about the weather, a song about an upcoming holiday, and questions related to topics that had been covered.

Different lessons included different activities, such as the one in which the price of a piece of furniture was guessed (Field notes, 9/16/03). Among the other activities were games, such as hangman and a modified version of jeopardy in which students answered questions instead of responding with a question (Field notes, 12/2/03, 1/13/04, 2/5/04, 2/26/04). In another activity, the names of different types of animals were placed in a Venn diagram, according to whether the animal had appeared in a story about La señora Lávalotodo [Mrs. Wash-it-all], in a story about El concierto de los animales [The concert of the animals], or in both (Field notes, 12/9/03).

Several interesting activities were used to reinforce vocabulary and facts from Muzzy. In one, Mrs. Ford, who was responsible for the instruction that week, had a bag with pictures and objects depicting vocabulary from Muzzy.
These were drawn out of the bag one by one, and questions were asked about them (Field notes, 1/27/04, 1/29/04). Another activity was based on the questioning of one of the protagonists in *Muzzy*, Juan, about his name, age, and profession. On February 19, 2004, for example, when Alyssa (a pseudonym, as are the names of the other students involved in this research) from Mrs. Miller’s class had a turn and Mr. Straten called out, “Nombre,” she answered, “Alyssa.” When he called out, “Edad,” she said, “Nueve” [Nine], and when he said, “Profesión,” she responded, “Estudiante” [Student]. Many students were able to respond individually in this activity (Field notes, 2/10/04, 2/19/04).

An activity that was modeled by Mrs. Ford on January 13, 2004, in a videoconferencing session with Mr. Baxter’s fifth-grade class and its matched class at Wallenmaier Elementary seemed to have the potential for eliciting individual output from any students willing to volunteer. Mrs. Ford projected a photograph of her dining room on one of the television monitors, describing its colors and furniture, and subsequently did the same with photographs of other rooms in her house. After the videoconferencing session had ended and she had switched to using English, Mrs. Ford encouraged Mr. Baxter’s students to bring in photographs of their rooms and talk about them in Spanish (Field notes, 1/13/04). Unfortunately, I was only with Mr. Baxter’s class on three more occasions that school year, during which there was no further mention of the activity.

My observations at Dolphin Point in the 2003–2004 school year included three Spanish lessons in Mr. Baxter’s fifth-grade classroom, two in Mrs. Cartwright’s first-grade classroom, and one in Mrs. Miller’s fourth-grade classroom. For the most part, these consisted of the students watching episodes of the *Español para ti* video-based language program. This wasn’t the case, however, on November 20, 2003, when Mrs. Cartwright led her class in an activity about body parts, using Mr. Potatohead. A native speaker of English, Mrs. Cartwright seemed ill at ease, and I noted that she made three unsuccessful attempts to pronounce *orejas* [ears]. But in spite of her limitations, she was making an effort to carry out an activity to reinforce what her students had been learning. She also played Simon Says in Spanish with her students that day (Field notes, 11/20/03).

Before moving on, I would like to mention a few of the students I observed during the 2003–2004 school year. One was Stacey in Mr. Baxter’s class. She was one of three girls in that class who often participated in Spanish lessons. I will mention Stacey again in the next chapter as the older sister of Claire, one of my case study participants. Claire was in Mrs. Miller’s fourth-grade class when I first observed her in the winter of 2004, as was Edward, who was to become another of my participants. I noted that Claire answered a question related to *Muzzy*, following a game of hangman (Field notes, 1/29/04), and Edward participated in the activity related to *Muzzy* in which he gave his name, age, and profession (Field notes, 2/19/04), but neither student made a strong impression on me at the time.
Selection of Participants

In this section, I first lay out the reasoning behind the purposeful sampling that I undertook in this research, including why I considered certain factors important in potential participants. I then move on to a discussion of my reentry into the research setting at the beginning of the 2004–2005 school year and an explanation of how I came to know and select certain students as case study participants.

Preliminary Considerations. In arriving at a decision on the number of case studies to conduct, I took several factors into consideration. Case study research is characterized by an “in-depth study of each case” (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996, p. 545). Although the attention that can be focused on a given case decreases as the number of cases increases, there are advantages in including multiple cases in research. This approach allows for comparisons among the cases and provides a broader view. Conducting four case studies (or put another way, a multi-case study involving four participants) capitalizes on these advantages, while allowing for intensive study of each case. With this number of cases, there is also a higher likelihood of being able to complete the research in the event of participant attrition.

My selection of participants for the case studies involved purposeful sampling: I took into consideration certain characteristics of possible participants in order to choose those who potentially could reveal the most in regard to the points of focus of this research. One basic consideration in selection was that no participant could be a native speaker of Spanish or live in an environment in which he or she is exposed to Spanish on a regular basis. On the other hand, I looked for fifth-grade students who had been in the FLETT program for at least a year and ideally since the second grade. Following these criteria provided the best chance of examining the language that had been and was being acquired through videoconferencing and video-based lessons.

Another important consideration for inclusion in the case studies was students’ amount of participation and language output in Spanish lessons. I sought participants for whom these ranged from average to high in comparison to other students in their class in order to have sufficient data for analysis and to allow for the emergence of themes and patterns inherent in the instructional process. Recommendations of students by the Dolphin Point FLES teacher were taken into account.

Gender and race are other factors that I considered in the selection of participants. I believed that even if I did not end up with two male and two female participants, it was important have each sex represented in the case studies because of differences between the sexes in second language acquisition and associated attitudes that have been revealed by research (e.g., Baker & MacIntyre, 2003; Burstall, 1975; Gardner & Lambert, 1972). In order to reflect the racial composition of the school, my goal was for the case studies to include at least one Black and one White participant.
Finally, I wanted to choose students with whom I believed I would be able to establish rapport. This is especially important for interviews and conversations with students that follow earlier stages of data collection and analysis.

The students whom I selected as case study participants were Ciara Nivea, a Black boy who was 11 years old when I began observing him in Mr. Baxter’s class in August 2004; Edward Jones, a Black boy who was 10 years old; Claire Montgomery, a White girl who was 9 years old; and Brittany Johnson, a Black girl who was 10 years old. (My four case study participants, as well as three of the teachers involved in this research, were invited to select their own pseudonyms.) Ciara, Claire, and Brittany had been in the Spanish program at Dolphin Point since it had started in the 2001–2002 school year. Edward had enrolled at Dolphin Point and begun Spanish instruction at the beginning of the 2003–2004 school year. I discuss how I came to select these particular students below.

**Selecting Ciara, Claire, Edward, and Brittany.** When I again returned to Dolphin Point Elementary in August 2004, just prior to conducting the research study that forms the main body of this dissertation, it was with the intention of quietly observing Spanish instruction for several weeks in order to become familiar enough with the students who were then in Mr. Baxter’s fifth-grade class to enable me to select case study participants who could provide rich data. I discovered, however, that I needed varying amounts of time to come to decisions about the inclusion of each of the different participants. I will explain the process that I followed below and will introduce each of my four participants in turn.

On August 9, 2004, I met with Lloyd Baxter, the classroom teacher who had previously agreed to let me observe the students in his class during the 2004–2005 school year. At that meeting, he invited me to come back on Thursday morning, August 12, to observe the first *Español para ti* lesson (Level 5, Lesson 1), which I did. However, due to a scheduling problem, Mr. Baxter ended up presenting the lesson to Dolphin Point’s other fifth-grade class. I returned the following Thursday afternoon (8/19/04), for my first observation of Mr. Baxter’s own class, as he presented Lesson 2 of *Español para ti* to them. Among the students I noticed that day were Claire, a White girl with blond hair who had been in Mrs. Miller’s class the year before, and Ciara, a thin Black boy (Field notes, 8/19/04).

I noticed Ciara Nivea again the following Wednesday (8/25/04), as I observed his class for the third time. After class, he came up to me and engaged me in conversation, asking me if I lived on the south side of town. When I said that I lived on the north side, he exclaimed with regret that “nobody” lives on the south side. He named the south-side neighborhood where he lives, stated that that’s where people get shot (of which I was already aware), and went on to say in a cavalier manner that he wasn’t worried (Field notes, 8/25/04).

From that time on, Ciara, who had been in the Spanish program the previous 3 years, impressed me as a good potential case study participant because of his friendliness, openness, and the ways in which he naturally
seemed to attract my attention. On September 29, when the video lesson was over (*Español para ti*, Lesson 11), Ciara took the initiative to show me his written work (his “Saber es poder” [Knowledge Is Power] card; Field notes, 9/29/04). Two days later when Mrs. Ford was teaching Spanish to Mr. Baxter’s class, I noticed Ciara directing the attention of his classmate, Laurie, to the lesson on two separate occasions. The first time, I saw Ciara put his finger up to his lips. The second time, he whispered, “*No inglés*” [No English] to Laurie (Field notes, 10/1/04). The next week when I talked to Ciara about interviewing him for my research, he replied, “You know I love to be interviewed” (Field notes, 10/7/04).

The second student on whom I began to focus as a possible case study participant was Claire Montgomery. My initial interest was prompted by Mrs. Ford’s recommendation of her as a student whose parents would be supportive of the research. Another factor that influenced my decision to include her was the fact that she was one of only three girls in Mr. Baxter’s class who had indicated in an activity in the Tele Café that they had started Spanish in the second grade. I also noted that Claire’s level of participation in the Spanish classes I had observed was equal to or greater than that of the other girls, with the exception of Elena, a native speaker of Spanish.

In spite of the positive factors that favored my selection of Claire as a research participant, I was initially concerned about whether I would be able to establish rapport with her. In addition to my first impressions of her as a small White girl with blond hair, I noted her quiet demeanor. One day early in the 2004–2005 school year, I saw her in the school office and ventured to ask her if she liked Spanish. She seemed to indicate that she only liked it so-so. I wondered if this attitude would be associated with a lack of interest in taking part in the research. Nevertheless, because Claire met most of my selection criteria so well, I later decided to ask her if she would be willing to let me ask her questions about Spanish and see her written work. She quietly indicated that she would be willing, and I recruited her as one of my participants (Field notes, 10/7/04).

The other two students who became case study participants, Edward Jones (who had been in Mrs. Miller’s class the year before) and Brittany Johnson, didn’t immediately attract my attention in the 2004–2005 school year. At the beginning of the school year, there were 27 students in Mr. Baxter’s class. I tried to become familiar with them by making a note whenever either Mr. Baxter or Mrs. Ford called a student by name. I also copied student names from the list of the nine who had signed a poster under the heading, “Started *Español*: Grade 2,” and from the list of the three who had indicated that they spoke Spanish at home.

My first notation on Brittany, a Black girl with straight hair in a ponytail, occurred on September 22, 2004, my sixth observation of Mr. Baxter’s class. I sat on the floor that day to watch the *Español para ti* lesson, and Brittany sat fairly close to me, so that I ended up not taking as many notes on the students as I would have otherwise (Field notes, 9/22/04).
The following day in the Tele Café (the second time I had observed there), I noticed Brittany again and also made my first notation on Edward, a Black boy with a small scar on his head. Before the videoconferencing connection was established, Mrs. Ford was asking questions about the date. Brittany provided the day of the week, “Jueves” [Thursday], and Edward provided the date, “Veintitrés” [23] (Field notes, 9/23/04).

I was pleased when class sessions in the Tele Café began to take place on a regular basis, because these provided a language-rich setting in which to observe the participation of Mr. Baxter’s students. I noted that some of the Black boys took a much more active part in these classes than did the White boys. Besides Ciara, I was particularly interested in Willie, who had dark skin, very short hair, and a small dimple. He did quite well in a time-telling activity the first time I observed his class in the Tele Café (Field notes, 9/16/04). During my third observation there on October 1, I noted that he answered a calendar question and seemed very animated in another part of the lesson (Field notes, 10/1/04).

After class that day, Mrs. Ford and I had a chance to visit. I told her that I’d like to use Ciara and Claire in my case studies and was thinking of including another Black boy. She immediately suggested Edward, even though he had only entered the program the previous year. She affectionately said that he loves everything that has to do with Spanish (Field notes, 10/1/04). I took Mrs. Ford’s suggestion seriously and selected Edward as the second boy for my case studies.

I didn’t decide to invite Brittany to participate in my research until the following week. On that Wednesday, I arrived at Dolphin Point at 11:55, joined Mr. Baxter’s students in the central courtyard outside of the cafeteria, in which they had just eaten lunch, and went up the stairs and down the second-floor hall with them. When they got closer to their classroom, they stopped to wait for Mr. Baxter, who was following them down the hall. Ciara and Brittany started talking together in something that sounded like Spanish. I couldn’t really hear what they were saying, but I got the impression that they were just using some words in Spanish (Field notes, 10/6/04).

Once we were in the classroom, I went over to Brittany (whose name I didn’t know yet) and asked, “¿Cómo te llamas?” She just looked at me, so I translated, “What’s your name?” She replied shyly, “Brit, Brittany.” I said, “Mucho gusto. Nice to meet you,” and told her I was Annette Norwood (Field notes, 10/6/04).

During the Español para ti lesson that day, I consulted my list of students who had started Spanish in the second grade to verify that Brittany was on it, which she was, along with Claire and Jane, a very quiet Asian girl.

From my observations up to that time, I had concluded that the girls in Mr. Baxter’s class were generally quiet during Spanish instruction. However, I had noted Brittany’s participation, answering calendar questions, on the two previous occasions the class had been in the Tele Café. Because of Brittany’s participation in the Spanish lessons, the length of time she had been in the program, and her friendship with Ciara, whom I had already chosen as a
participant, I decided to ask her to help me with my research. When I talked to
her about this the following day, like Claire, she quietly agreed to take part in my
study (Field notes, 10/7/04).

I obtained informed consent for participation in this research from a parent
of each of the four case study participants whom I selected, as well as the assent
of each child. I also obtained parental consent to videotape and audiotape Ciara,
Claire, Edward, and Brittany. All documents used to obtain parental informed
consent and child assent were approved by both the Institutional Review Board
of the University of South Florida and the Department of Research and
Accountability of the school district in which this study was conducted.

Data Collection and Analysis

In order to address the points of focus of this research (see next
paragraph), I collected data through observations, videotaping and audiotaping of
lessons, and interviews of the case study participants and their teachers. My role
was that of a participant observer. Brief notes were made during observations,
and more extensive field notes were written soon thereafter. Reflex records were
also written. Transcripts of the audio recordings were prepared, concentrating on
the verbal output of the case study participants and on the interactions in which
they were involved. The videotapes were reviewed, paying special attention to
the nonverbal cues of the participants. Written work in Spanish produced by the
participants that became available was also analyzed. Public documents that
provided information on the school were consulted.

The points of focus with which I entered the research setting are
presented in Chapters 1 and 8, along with an explanation for their modification.
Below I present the modified points of focus that guided this research. For the
purposes of this study, the term learners is being applied to the four case study
students.

1. What instances of interaction and output are observed in the different
   instructional settings?
2. Are patterns of change observed in learners' language production
during the period under study?
3. What individual learner factors help to explain differences in the
   participants' Spanish output?
4. What are the participants' preferences and perceptions concerning
different aspects of the Spanish program?

I reentered the research site toward the beginning of the 2004–2005
school year, as soon as the teachers had resumed offering Spanish lessons and
felt comfortable having me observe. Building on knowledge I had gained of the
research setting, I completed selection of the four case study participants at the
beginning of October. Once all necessary permissions were secured, I began
the intensive data collection that continued until the end of the school year. I
observed one videoconferencing session or one class facilitated by the Spanish
teacher per week, except when no class was held. I observed from one to three
video-based Spanish lessons per week, except toward the end of data collection.
I also audio recorded and videotaped the lessons that I observed and prepared transcripts, as previously noted. The videocassette and CD recorders were only a transitory distraction for one of my participants. The advantages of the use of recording devices far outweighed their possible disadvantages. As McMillan and Schumacher (2001, p. 271) note, “A tape recorder will obviously collect the information more completely and objectively than notes.” The audio recordings and videotapes may be “replayed several times for careful study” (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996, p. 337), allowing for transcription and giving me the opportunity to supplement my field notes whenever I noticed anything that I wanted to add. This careful study also informed subsequent observations, interviews, and document collection.

As the study proceeded, I regularly reviewed my field notes and transcripts and used what I learned to focus my attention during subsequent observations and interviews (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). I also used what I discovered to help me determine points of focus for my first interviews, which I conducted in January 2005. As the study continued to progress, based on additional accumulated data and insights, I was able to plan and ask more specific questions in another interview of the students selected for the case studies. All interviews were recorded and transcribed.

The on-site FLES teacher and the classroom teacher were also interviewed about the instruction and any insights they had into the students’ output in Spanish and their possible growth. Informal, research-related conversations with the teachers took place during the course of the study, as well.

The development of a system to organize the data is of primary importance in qualitative data analysis (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). As data began to accumulate, I tried to get an overall sense of the case study participants’ use of Spanish in the different instructional contexts and then tried to identify topics in the data. Data collection and data analysis proceeded in an alternating and iterative fashion. As this process continued and topics emerged, these were grouped into categories, and the resulting classification system was evaluated and refined. The refinement involved the modification of categories, as well as the emergence of new ones. Patterns among the categories were sought. I also looked for and tried to explain instances of divergence.

I continued to collect and analyze data until May 2005, decreasing the frequency of my observations of video-based lessons toward the end. Ideally the continuing interaction of data collection and analysis is terminated when the categories or patterns that have emerged appear to account for virtually all of the activities being studied, as happened with the video-based lessons, so that subsequent observations were fully classifiable within the categories already identified. It was then that more definitive analysis became possible, suggesting meaningful interpretations and conclusions grounded in the data.

The grounding of conclusions in the data of this study, along with the thick descriptions that are offered, provide a basis for the extension of its findings. Whereas it is inappropriate to offer generalizations based on qualitative research
findings, the applicability of findings to similar situations, or the possibility of extending them, is both appropriate and desirable. As McMillan and Schumacher note (2001, p. 414), the extension of findings “enables others to understand similar situations and apply these findings in subsequent research or practical situations.” Each new situation must be thoroughly examined on an individual basis to ascertain if it is similar enough to the original situation that was studied to justify the extension of findings. David Lancy (1993, p. 165) has likened this to “the law where the applicability of a particular precedent case must be argued in each subsequent case.”

**Ethical Considerations**

This study did not involve deception of any kind. As I have already explained, parents of the students who were asked to participate were informed of the nature of the study, as were the students who participated. No videotaping or audiotaping was carried out until parental consent and student assent were secured. The informed consent of the teachers who participated in this study (Mr. Baxter, Mrs. Ford, and Mr. Straten) was also sought and obtained.

The documents that I used to obtain adult informed consent and child assent were approved by both the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of South Florida and the Department of Research and Accountability of the school district in which this study was conducted. I completed the IRB-required foundation course in human participant protections and fulfilled the IRB continuing education requirement.

This study was funded in part by the USF Community Partnership Faculty Grant awarded to Dr. Joyce Nutta and Dr. Carol Mullen, whose research in the 2004–2005 school year involved a case study of Mr. Baxter’s fifth-grade class. Dr. Nutta and Dr. Mullen were able to obtain informed consent for participation in their research from a parent of each child in Mr. Baxter’s class, as well as parental consent for each child to be videotaped and audiotaped.

I will share the results of my research with Dolphin Point’s principal and Spanish teacher. I will also share the results with participating students and their parents if their contact information is still valid.
Chapter 4. Research Setting, Teachers, and Program

In this chapter, I describe the research setting, Dolphin Point Elementary School. Reflections on changes at the school over 35 years are offered and a description of the school at the time of this study is presented, as are school demographics. There is also a description of key school programs. I introduce Mrs. Ford, the Spanish teacher at Dolphin Point, and Mr. Baxter, the classroom teacher who facilitated the video-based lessons for the fifth-grade class from which I drew my participants. A detailed description of the Español para ti video-based language program is provided. I then present information on the implementation of the video component of the Spanish program. Spanish lessons in the Tele Café are covered next, including information on the relocation of the Tele Café, the frequency of the Spanish instructional sessions that took place there, and a description of the instructional sessions themselves.

Dolphin Point Elementary School

As I mentioned in describing my initial contact with Dolphin Point and the FLETT model in the previous chapter, this elementary school is located in a predominantly Black neighborhood. Although in a newspaper article the school district facilities director framed the construction of a new school facility on the Dolphin Point campus in terms of “rebuilding a lot of schools that are old and tired” (to protect the identity of Dolphin Point, no citation is provided), it is notable that the new facility was opened to its students at the beginning of the 2003–2004 school year, a time that coincided with the first year of the choice agreement that ended more than 3 decades of court-ordered busing in the district. In that year and the 3 following years, no more than 42% of the students enrolled in any district school were to be Black. (See “Dolphin Point and the Choice Agreement” in the previous chapter.) In fact, many of the changes in Dolphin Point’s facilities over the years can be understood in terms of changes in its student population. This section includes descriptions of Dolphin Point when it was an all-Black school, when racial integration went into effect, and before and after the construction of its new facility. I then describe the part of this facility that I passed through while conducting this study in the 2004–2005 school year. The section concludes with school demographics and an introduction to some of the school’s key programs.

Changes at Dolphin Point Over 35 Years of Its History. Perspective on Dolphin Point’s history was provided to me by Mr. Baxter, a White teacher who had spent his whole career at the school. He told me in an interview, “When I came here 35 years ago, it was an all-Black school with an all-Black faculty.” At
that time, the school “looked like a prison,” with broken windows and concrete floors. He described both the upheaval that took place in the school the following year with racial integration and the positive changes that had occurred in the old school building, such as the installation of carpeting, new windows, and air conditioning (Interview, 2/17/05).

Mr. Baxter also shared one problem that he saw in the education received by Black children at Dolphin Point in the years since racial integration had been instituted. Perhaps these reflections reveal as much, if not more, about Mr. Baxter and his caring attitude as they do about the school:

[Since integration] the Black kids have always been in the minority in the classroom, and a lot of times White teachers seem to ignore the Black children and seem to, uh, the Black children don’t seem to get as good an education as they did when it was an all-Black school. (Interview, 2/17/05)

Clearly, Mr. Baxter was concerned about the quality of the education received by Black students.

I specifically asked Mr. Baxter about changes he had seen at Dolphin Point over the years, because I had heard him describe some of them one day when I had stayed to observe his students watching a Martin Luther King, Jr., video at a time when a Spanish video had originally been scheduled. After the video, he talked to his students about integration, racial relations, and changes at the school. Among his comments was a description of Dolphin Point as a prison when he first got there. He told how the old Dolphin Point had gotten fixed up and went on to say, “Now you have this palace.” He maintained that there’s not another school in the County that’s as nice, and clean, and bright, and cheerful. He said that one reason for this is that there are still problems getting White children to come to Dolphin Point (Field notes, 1/14/05).

I unexpectedly was given another description of Dolphin Point’s old building in an interview with one of my case study participants, Ciara Nivea. He had taken Spanish during the 3 years prior to entering the fifth grade, and I asked him what it was like when he first started learning Spanish and what some differences were “in what the class is like now compared to when you first started.” Instead of talking about Spanish class, he told me about the school:

Oh, well, I first started, it was in the old building. It was the old building, a real, real old building. Now they just tore it down. This the second year we been in this school, this new school. Well, that other school was much smaller. It was just like a tall, straight-up school. . . . It was full of bricks. (Interview, 1/21/05)

Another perspective on Dolphin Point was provided to me by its principal, Dennis Newberry. At the end of the 2004–2005 school year, I asked him how long he had been principal of Dolphin Point. He told me he had been there from 1983 to 1988. Then he had gone to another County elementary school. Because of the way that school was set up, he had had less contact with the children, and he hadn’t liked it. He had asked to transfer back to Dolphin Point, where he had been from January of 1995 onward. He said that people had thought he was crazy to go back to an inner city school. As if to show how wrong
they had been, he concluded with pride and admiration, “Look at it now” (Field notes, 5/12/05).

A Description of Dolphin Point at the Time of This Study. As Ciara Nivea pointed out above, the 2004–2005 school year was Dolphin Point’s second year in a new facility. In order to provide a sense of the school’s physical environment at the time of this study, I will describe the parts of the school that I often passed through in the course of conducting this research.

Approaching the office of Dolphin Point in August 2004 from its spacious parking lot, I noticed that there were many new metal benches set along the sidewalk that runs in front of the school. These benches weren’t the only new things that I spotted during the course of this research. As time went by, I noticed new sculptures placed along the inside halls in areas with plants and small ponds with flowing water, and for a brief period, I followed the progress of a new mosaic being installed on one of the walls.

Passing the new benches at the front of Dolphin Point, I would enter the school through its front office, where I would sign in. Leaving the office area, the central courtyard, with a large sculpture of a whale’s tail and some low cement steps, was in front of me and to the left. On some days when there were Español para ti lessons, I met Mr. Baxter’s students in this central courtyard at about 11:55 a.m., after they had eaten lunch in the nearby cafeteria. If I joined them, we went up the uncovered stairs in this area together. Once we were upstairs, the students would line up along the railing by the library.

Sometimes I went ahead of the rest of the class with students who helped me carry my recording equipment and bag. We went along the upstairs hall, turned right, and passed through a vestibule, one wall of which was glass. Opposite the entry to this vestibule was the door to a classroom that was as yet unoccupied. To the right of this door was a cabinet and display area, often containing student work related to Marine Science. Past the display area was the door to Mr. Baxter’s classroom, which the students and I would enter.

On days when I wanted to get my equipment set up in Mr. Baxter’s classroom before his students returned from lunch or when I came for Spanish in the Tele Café, instead of going up the stairs in the central courtyard after having left the school office, I turned right and went along the downstairs hall, where the mosaic was eventually installed. Through August 2004, the Tele Café was almost at the end of this hall and to the left, but at the beginning of that September it was moved upstairs, close to Mr. Baxter’s room.

To get to Mr. Baxter’s classroom and the Tele Café in its new location, I would turn right, instead of left, toward the end of the downstairs hall. I went up a flight of stairs there, at the base of which was a small pond with flowing water. Upstairs I went into the vestibule I have already mentioned. To the left of the vestibule entry was the door to the Tele Café, and opposite this was the door to Mrs. Jackson’s fifth-grade classroom. If I were on my way to a lesson in the Tele Café, I would often put my equipment down on a table to the right and wait for the previous lesson with a first-grade class to near its end. I could see into the
Tele Café through a rectangular window in its door, except before the Winter Holidays, when a poster was placed on top of the window.

School Demographics and Key School Programs. In the same way that no well-balanced review of a theatrical production would concentrate only on a description of the stage settings but would also need to cover the cast and play, this overview of Dolphin Point needs to turn now to the characteristics of its students and teachers at the time of this study, as well as to a consideration of some of the programs offered at the school. More detailed consideration of the Spanish FLETT program, the four case participants, and their teachers, Mrs. Ford and Mr. Baxter, will be offered later.

Some demographic information for Dolphin Point in the 2004–2005 school year was supplied in Chapter 1, and demographic information for the 2003–2004 school year was given in Chapter 3. In order to provide a clearer understanding of the school, that information will be brought together here and additional information will be presented.

In 2004–2005, the school district in which Dolphin Point is located managed to add more than 75 students to the enrollment at this school, while taking into account parental preferences for school of attendance and maintaining percentages of the different racial and ethnic groups that were similar to those of the previous school year. The shifts in these percentages from October 2003 to October 2004 were as follows: from 40.7% to 42.8% White students, from 35.9% to 34.7% Black students, from 10.0% to 11.3% Multiracial students, from 7.7% to 6.1% Hispanic students, from 4.1% to 4.2% Asian students, and from 1.7% to 0.8% American Indian students (Florida Department of Education, 2005b). Whereas there were 418 students enrolled at Dolphin Point in October 2003, there were 495 students in attendance in October 2004 (Florida Department of Education, 2004b, 2005b). However, this was still well below the capacity for the school’s new facilities that Principal Newberry had estimated at 684 students in February 2003 (to protect the identity of Dolphin Point, no citation is provided).

Additional demographic information on Dolphin Point is provided by the 2003–2004 Florida School Indicators Report (Florida Department of Education, 2003). According to this report, the teachers at Dolphin Point in the 2003–2004 school year had an average of 13.1 years of experience, and 36.4% of the teachers had advanced degrees. (The 2004–2005 NCLB report indicates that these were master’s degrees and that in 2004–2005 36.7% of the teachers had this type of degree, Florida Department of Education, 2005b). A student stability rate of 94.3% (Florida Department of Education, 2003) was given for 2003–2004, based on “the percentage of students from the October membership count who [were] still present” at the time of the February count (Florida Department of Education, 2005a, “Stability Rate” section). The Florida School Indicators Report also shows that Dolphin Point was assigned a grade of C for the 2003–2004 school year. By the following school year, Dolphin Point’s School Performance Grade had risen to a B (Florida Department of Education, 2005b).
In Chapter 1, I mentioned the high percentage of economically disadvantaged students enrolled at Dolphin Point in October 2004: 72.3%, compared to 41.4% in the school district. Because of this characteristic of its student population, Dolphin Point received funds through the federal education program, “Title I – Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged,” being designated a schoolwide Title I program. The Dolphin Point Newsletter for August 3, 2004, explains how Title I funds are used to enhance the school:

With these funds we are able to purchase more instructional materials and hire teaching partners and hourly teachers to work with our students. At Dolphin Point Elementary, Title I plans family nights throughout the year, purchases agenda books for communication and promotes highest achievement for all students.

Besides being a schoolwide Title I program, Dolphin Point Elementary is an attendance area magnet school. With the institution of the choice agreement (described in the previous chapter), large attendance areas replaced neighborhood zoning, allowing parents more choices “in selecting a school for their child” (to protect the identity of Dolphin Point, no citation is provided). Dolphin Point and some other schools in the attendance area where it is located received federal funding for the development of specialized attractor programs. Students who reside in the attendance area apply to these schools through the regular choice application process. (A distinct application process is in place for the countywide magnet programs that accept students who reside in any part of the County.)

The success of Dolphin Point as a magnet school was recognized in the spring of 2005 when the school received a national Magnet School of Excellence award. A local newspaper reported that the criteria used in selecting schools to receive this award “included desegregation and diversity goals, innovative instructional strategies, student achievement and parent and community involvement” (to protect the identity of Dolphin Point, no citation is provided).

The main attractor program at Dolphin Point is Marine Science. Spanish is another attractor program and figures prominently in the school’s 2004–2005 “Attractor Statement,” which reads in part, “Students study local habitats from ponds to the open oceans, Spanish and technology, integrating all subject areas in a custom-designed curriculum aligned to the Florida Sunshine State Standards.”

**Mrs. Ford**

As I wrote in the previous chapter, Lissette Ford sought to have research conducted on the Spanish program at her school. When I became involved in the research, she welcomed me into her classroom, shared her insights with me, and helped me in many ways.

A native speaker of Spanish, Mrs. Ford came to the United States when she was 3 years old. I had known her professionally even before she had come to Dolphin Point Elementary, and I respected her abilities as a foreign language teacher and her professional involvement in this area. For these reasons, I was
surprised to learn that she had begun her teaching career as an elementary school classroom teacher rather than as a Spanish teacher.

As Mrs. Ford explained to me in an interview on April 21, 2005, she had been teaching for 32 years. Her first position was as a second-grade teacher. She hadn’t been at her first school for long when it was closed because of highway construction. She explained to me what happened when she was transferred from that school and how she later became a teacher of English as a Second Language (ESOL):

The teachers who had a lot of seniority got the first pick of schools, where they could go. By the time it got to me, I had like [a] couple of picks, but one was a school that was open space. And of course, the teachers with a lot experience didn’t want to try that, so I chose that. I chose the open space, and it was the best experience of my life, ‘cause I got in; I was very lucky; I got into a very nice team, and I was there, as a classroom teacher, like for about 6 years. I loved it. I really enjoyed it.

I don’t think I woulda left that school or left that team, but one summer, the supervisor at that time called me, ‘cause they needed an E-S-O-L [she spells it out] teacher during the summer. And she called me to see if I wanted to do it, and I said yes. Now, my experience was very limited with that, just my own personal experience, but never to teach E-S-O-L. And I loved it. I had students from, um, at the time, it was in the 80s, and I had students from Cambodia, and Laos, and Vietnam. And I loved it. We had [a] lot of field trips during the summer, and then we would come back to the classroom and talk about it, and write about it, and read about it. And it was just wonderful.

So apparently they liked what I did, because they called me in the fall and offered me a job as an E-S-O-L teacher. And, of course, I had to go in and get certified, but I accepted. I did, and I did that for 4 or 5 years: E-S-O-L. (Interview, 4/21/05)

I asked Mrs. Ford if her experience as an ESOL teacher had been at the elementary school level, and she told me that all of her teaching experience had been at that level.

Mrs. Ford went on to relate how one summer she had attended a Spanish institute for ESOL and Spanish-speaking teachers. The participants in this institute were asked what they would like to do if they weren’t teaching what they were currently teaching. Mrs. Ford had responded, “I would love to teach Spanish to elementary children.” Her supervisor at the time wrote and secured a grant through which a Spanish program was begun in the County in 1986, and Mrs. Ford and Nick Straten were hired (Interview, 4/21/05).

Mrs. Ford described the success and expansion of the Spanish FLES program, which had continued until one year when funding was cut. During that year, she became a second-grade classroom teacher again. She characterized that experience in positive terms: “It was a great year. It was [unintelligible] fun, goin’ back. I enjoyed it. And yeah, ‘cause a lot of things had changed, and it was good; it was good that I went back” (Interview, 4/21/05).
After Mrs. Ford’s year back in a primary classroom, two magnet elementary schools with Spanish programs were opened in the County. She was hired to teach Spanish at one of them and remained there for almost 10 years, before coming to Dolphin Point (Interview, 4/21/05). Her teaching responsibilities at that school were as follows: “It was just eight classes, and you saw those eight classes every day, the same classes” (Interview, 3/8/05).

Mrs. Ford remained active professionally during her time at Dolphin Point, gaining National Board Certification, presenting at conferences and teacher training institutes, and teaching a Spanish class to elementary school teachers.

Mr. Baxter talked about Mrs. Ford in glowing terms, saying how much he and the students loved her. He praised her in this way: “Miss Ford is a fantastic teacher. She just has all this energy, and, you know, she loves the language, and the kids can see this” (Interview, 2/17/05).

Mr. Baxter

To me, Lloyd Baxter was an imposing figure, and I felt a bit intimidated by him at first. This was in spite of the way in which he welcomed me into his classroom, telling me, “Make yourself at home. This is your room too” (Field note, 9/15/04). As I got to know him, I felt more at ease and enjoyed the time I spent with him. He was genuinely interested in this research and told me repeatedly that he would like to see the results. I was looking forward to sharing them with him but will never have that opportunity, because he died the month following the end of data collection.

In thinking about Mr. Baxter now, I am reminded of something told to me by Sarah Montgomery, the mother of Claire, one of my case study participants. Claire’s sister, Stacey, is one year ahead of her in school. When Stacey had heard that she was going to be in Mr. Baxter’s class in the fifth grade, she had told her mother she didn’t want to be, because he yells at the children. However, as Sarah told me, when Stacey got in his class, she really liked him and found out that he was like a big teddy bear (Field notes, 2/26/05).

During the time that I knew Mr. Baxter, he was very supportive of the Spanish program at Dolphin Point, but this wasn’t always the case. Mrs. Ford told me that his attitude toward Spanish had changed tremendously over the 4 years of the program, and she characterized the change as being “as drastic as from night [to] day, salt and pepper.” She described to me his attitude in the first year of the program:

His attitude was I don’t have time for this. I’m too old to learn this. I don’t know Spanish; how can I teach something I do not know? Oh, very negative. Um, was very verbal about it. It wasn’t like he was even sayin’ it behind my back. He was very verbal, very verbal in faculty meetings about it. (Interview, 4/21/05)

She attributed the change in him over the preceding 4 years to seeing the progress of the program, seeing how much the students had learned, and attending two Spanish summer institutes (see “Spanish Summer Institute” in
Chapter 3), at which “he learned the value of foreign language in the elementary school” (Interviews, 3/8/05, 4/21/05).

Mr. Baxter also talked to me about his change in attitude when I asked him, “Has your attitude toward Spanish or toward the Spanish program changed over the past 4 years?” He answered that his attitude had changed greatly, and he explained:

When Miss Ford first came . . . , I was kind of apprehensive, didn’t want to do it, didn’t have any background in it. After fighting many battles with Miss Ford and talking to her for a whole entire year, I finally bought into the program and was able to handle the classes and the program, and I enjoy it now, you know, but it was kind of frightening at the beginning, because I hadn’t done it for 30 years and hadn’t been responsible for a Spanish program. So it took me a while to finally buy into it and quit arguing with Miss Ford and different things like that. And she can tell you the same thing that I was a hard person to sell the program to, but once I got into it, it’s been very enjoyable. (Interview, 3/16/05)

Unlike Mrs. Ford, who believed that greater initial comfort and slightly greater ease in embedding Spanish in the curriculum were the main differences between teachers with some knowledge of Spanish from previous schooling and those with none (Interview, 3/8/05), Mr. Baxter emphasized how important having a background in Spanish was to the success of the Spanish program at Dolphin Point. After talking about the importance of Mrs. Ford to the success of the program, he continued:

I’ve always felt that if your teachers that come to Dolphin Point have a background in Spanish, that the Spanish program would be great in the classroom, with a background. I think the teachers here, like myself, without a background in Spanish, I think it’s frustrating and rough sometimes to try to work with Español para ti and do lessons in the classroom when you don’t have a background in Spanish. I would like to see Mr. Newberry, when he’s hiring people, make sure that they have some kind of background in Spanish. I think that would help a great deal. (Interview, 2/17/05)

Mr. Baxter told me about how he had tried to avoid studying foreign languages when he was in school, because he never thought he would be successful at them, and he talked about how he believed this had affected the Spanish program in his classroom: “I think that that has hurt the Spanish program in this classroom, but I’ve tried to learn it along with the children and allow them to teach it to me, so that’s helped also” (Interview, 2/17/05).

In the next section, I will begin an examination of the video component of the Spanish program at Dolphin Point by discussing the characteristics of Español para ti, Level 5, including its components, its approach to language teaching, its goals, and its topics.
The Español para ti Video-Based Language Program

As I have previously stated, the Español para ti video-based language program (developed by the Clark County Elementary School Divisions, Nevada, in collaboration with KLVX, Communication Group, Channel 10) forms the foundation of the video component of Spanish instruction at Dolphin Point. Español para ti consists of five levels, created for use in the first through fifth grades (Steele & Johnson, 1999, 2000). (In the 2004–2005 school year, kindergarten students at Dolphin Point viewed the SALSA video program [developed by PeachStar Education Services] and were taught by Mrs. Ford without videoconferencing.) In this section, I will discuss the characteristics of Español para ti, concentrating specifically on Level 5, the level used for fifth-grade Spanish instruction during the year of this study.

The Español para ti language program includes a number of components for Level 5 that are meant to provide for two video lessons and two related activity lessons per week (Steele & Johnson, 1999, p. xxvi). The video component is described in the Teacher’s Manual for this level as consisting of “20 videocassettes containing 60 twenty-minute video lessons” (Steele & Johnson, 1999, p. vii). However, the usual running time of these video lessons, as they were shown to Mr. Baxter’s class (without credits), was from 14 to 15 minutes apiece. Besides the videocassettes and the Teacher’s Manual (containing information for facilitating each video lesson and associated activity lesson), the program includes a teacher’s resource book, two audiocassettes with listening and speaking activities, a song audiocassette, and an assessment audiocassette. Spanish readers, containing the stories about the adventures of Fredo that are included in some video lessons, and a set of flashcards may be purchased separately.

The approach to language teaching used in Español para ti was “shaped by the Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) and Total Physical Response (Asher, 2000),” as Rhodes and Pufahl point out in Language by Video (2004, p. 11). The Español para ti Teacher’s Manual explains how TPR is used throughout the program: The video teacher first states a command and models the proper response and then repeats the command and “has the children respond as a group”; next the video teacher “gives commands to individuals who respond, and finally, children give commands to classmates” (Steele & Johnson, 1999, p. xi). (It is in some of the activity lessons that students are provided with an opportunity to give commands to their classmates.)

Evidence of the influence of the Natural Approach on the Español para ti program can be seen in several areas, but areas in which Español para ti diverges from this approach can also be noted. One area of influence is in the promotion of high-interest activities in a low-anxiety environment. This is based on the Natural Approach principle that “the activities done in the classroom aimed

---

at acquisition must foster a lowering of the affective filter of the students” (Krashen & Terrell, 1983, p. 21). As Krashen and Terrell (1983) explain, Activities in the classroom focus at all times on topics which are interesting and relevant to the students and encourage them to express their ideas, opinions, desires, emotions and feelings. An environment which is conducive to acquisition must be created by the instructor – low anxiety level, good rapport with the teacher, friendly relationship with other students; otherwise acquisition will be impossible. (p. 21)

Steele and Johnson (2000), elsewhere identified as the authors of Español para ti (Steele & Johnson, 1999), cast a similar vision for the introduction of foreign language in elementary school:

[Our children] will learn a new language in a relaxed and non-threatening atmosphere in which their oral/aural abilities can be easily enhanced. In this setting the new language is learned through songs, games, physical activities, attractive visual aids, and hand puppets. These materials and strategies provide a stimulating language learning environment that promotes enthusiasm and a desire to learn more. (p. 4)

Steele and Johnson (2000) also assert that Español para ti “provides children with immediately applicable language related to the people, places, and things around them, thus motivating their desire to learn and giving them the confidence and willingness to use the Spanish language” (p. 6).

Two other principles of the Natural Approach also seem to influence Español para ti. These principles are that “comprehension precedes production” and that “production is allowed to emerge in stages” (Krashen & Terrell, 1983, p. 20). The implication of both is that there is a silent period before students begin to produce language. This leads to the caution after the second principle that “the students are not forced to speak before they are ready” (p. 20). Similar advice is given to classroom teachers by Steele and Johnson (1999): “Also bear in mind that some children need to listen for a longer time before they start talking. Do not force a child to speak Spanish” (p. xiv).

Although there is evidence that the Natural Approach principle “comprehension precedes production” influenced Español para ti in several ways, it is also possible to see how the video-based language program diverges from one of the three implications for the furtherance of language acquisition that are derived from this principle. The three implications are stated by Krashen and Terrell (1983) as follows: “(1) the instructor always uses the target language, (2) the focus of the communication will be on a topic of interest for the student, (3) the instructor will strive at all times to help the student understand” (p. 20). Evidence of the influence of the second implication on Español para ti was provided above. Evidence of the influence of the third implication may be seen in Steele and Johnson’s statement that the video teacher “frequently uses a gesture, a picture, or an object to help the children, and you [the classroom teacher], understand what is being said” (1999, p. xi). However, the use of English in Español para ti is clearly contrary to the first implication. As Steele
and Johnson (1999) write, “Explanations are always given in English so no one is ever lost” (p. xi).

In the Español para ti video lessons, the use of English is not confined to isolated explanations, however. Sometimes English and Spanish are used together in the same sentence. For example, in Lesson 21, following a story about Fredo that is entirely in Spanish, there is an exchange between the video teacher (la maestra) and Winston (a puppet) that incorporates both English and Spanish. The transcript of this exchange is provided below. Italics are used for the Spanish words and phrases in an attempt to increase readability.

Maestra: Oh, it’s good to see Fredo again. Me gusta Fredo. [I like Fredo.]
¿Sí?
Winston: Sí, Maestra. [Yes, Teacher.]
Maestra: Now what did Fredo say en la clase de historia [in history class]?
Winston: Estudio historia. [I study history.]
Maestra: He could say, “Estudio historia.” He could say, “Escribo [I write].”
¿Sí?
Winston: Sí.
Maestra: Aha. What did he say en la clase de arte [in art class]?
Winston: Uh, pinto. [I paint.]
Maestra: Pinto. Or he could say, “coloreo [I color],” ¿sí?
Winston: O dibujo. [Or I draw.]
Maestra: Dibujo. Right, all of those things en la clase de arte. And what could he say en la clase de matemáticas [in math class]?
Winston: Oh, he didn’t go to that class in the book.
Maestra: Oh, he could say, uh, “Estudio los números.” [I study numbers.]
Winston: Y pequeños. [And small ones.]
Maestra: Y pequeños. Sí. Well, it’s time for you to come up with some números grandes. Vamos a contar. [Let’s count.] (Español para ti: Level 5, 1996; Transcript, 11/10/04)

The “frequent mixing of Spanish and English, sometimes within the same sentence” in Español para ti is cited by Rhodes and Pufahl (2004, p. 72) as one of the things that teachers and parents didn’t like about this video-based language program. Rhodes and Pufahl also point out that the “large percentage of instruction” that is in English greatly limits “the amount of Spanish to which the students are exposed” (p. 76).

A concern in the development of the Español para ti program was the key role played in its facilitation by classroom teachers, many of whom do not speak Spanish, and this concern may in part account for the frequent use of English. Steele and Johnson (2000) highlight the challenge, there from the outset, “of helping classroom teachers facilitate language acquisition even though the teachers lack knowledge of the target language” (p. 6). In the Español para ti

---

2 From the SRA/McGraw-Hill work, Español para ti: Level 5 [Video series], 1996, Lincolnwood, IL: NTC/Contemporary Publishing Group & KLVX TV. The previous quote and subsequent ones from this work are reproduced with permission of The McGraw-Hill Companies.
Teacher’s Manual, Steele and Johnson (1999, p. xii) encourage classroom teachers to think of themselves as team teaching with the video teacher, and they offer them the following encouragement:

You, the classroom teacher, are the facilitator who watches the video with the children and responds along with them. And don’t worry if you don’t speak Spanish. The on-screen video teacher (la maestra in Spanish) introduces small amounts of information at a time, and she explains in English what is happening or what is going to happen. (1999, p. xi)

Moving on to a continuation and conclusion of the discussion of the relationship between the Natural Approach and Español para ti, there is one other principle of the former that hasn’t yet been mentioned. It is the principle that “the course syllabus consists of communicative goals” (Krashen & Terrell, 1983, p. 20). As Krashen and Terrell (1983) explain, “this means that the focus of each classroom activity is organized by topic, not grammatical structure” (p. 20). The clearest evidence of divergence from this principle of the Natural Approach by Español para ti can be seen in learning objectives from individual lessons that are stated in grammatical terms (e.g., “Form the first person singular [I-form] of several verbs,” Steele & Johnson, 1999, p. 74). These, however, are accompanied by learning objectives stated in the topical terms advocated by the Natural Approach (e.g., “Identify and name additional school subjects,” Steele & Johnson, 1999, p. 68).

I began the discussion of relationship between the Natural Approach and Español para ti with Rhodes and Pufahl’s (2004) observation that the approach to language teaching used in Español para ti was “shaped by the Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) and Total Physical Response (Asher, 2000),” (p. 11). In Language by Video, Rhodes and Pufahl (2004) go on to place the original date of development of Español para ti in 1992, prior to the “1996 publication of the national foreign language standards,” and they express concern that this video-based language program (along with others developed before 1996) was “not designed in alignment with the goals of the standards” (p. 11). It is true that Level 1 of Español para ti was developed in 1992–1993, but Level 5 was created in 1996–1997 (Steele & Johnson, 2000). And although Level 5 does not address the national foreign language standards in each lesson, it does make reference in several places to the “five C’s of language learning” around which the standards are organized (Communication, Cultures, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities; see “Standards for Foreign Language Learning,” 1996). For example, in Lesson 41 after explaining how Comparisons and Communities are related to various jobs, and before highlighting the importance of Connections in all jobs, the video teacher states:

Comunicaciones are important to anybody in any job. And that’s what language is all about is about communicating with one another and understanding one another. Cultura, the knowledge of someone’s culture is so important in every job, because when we understand each other’s cultures, we’re able to get along in the world together. (Español para ti: Level 5, 1996; Transcript, 2/16/05)

There are various ways in which the topics in Español para ti, Level 5, may be summarized. From my own experience with the program, I offer the following summary of topics. Greetings and introductions are covered, as are the date, the seasons, the weather, family relationships, and school subjects. Numbers are used in addition, subtraction, and multiplication problems; to give prices; to give street addresses; and to tell time. Commands are taught, as are the first-person singular forms of various verbs, and the latter are associated with times, so that students are encouraged to say the time at which they do different things. Cultural information about mealtimes and food origins is presented, as is vocabulary related to food, grocery shopping, picnics, and setting the table. Vocabulary is also presented for rooms of the house, furnishings, kitchen appliances, and entertainment appliances. Students are taught how to express their feelings and how to express their likes and dislikes. Polite phrases are introduced and discussed, as are ways of asking for help. The importance of language learning is emphasized. The names of the Spanish-speaking countries and of some of the continents are given; and directions, geographical features, and geographical locations are covered. Cultural information is given about cities in the United States that have Spanish names and areas in the United States with many Spanish speakers. Dances from Spanish-speaking countries are presented. There is vocabulary for use in a doctor’s office, including vocabulary for different parts of the body and for expressing pain. Students also practice vocabulary for farm animals, zoo animals, and marine animals.

Language, culture, and review objectives are specified for almost every lesson of Español para ti, Level 5. (The exceptions are Lesson 1, which has no review objectives, and Lesson 49, which has no language objectives, because “no new concepts are introduced in this lesson”; Steele & Johnson, 1999, p. 290). The inclusion of the review objectives is indicative of the spiral method of teaching utilized in Español para ti: “Material is usually introduced in one lesson, practiced in several succeeding lessons, dropped for a while, and then practiced again” (Steele & Johnson, 1999, p. xi). Steele and Johnson (2000) describe the form that a typical lesson takes: “[It] consists of an opening conversation, a review and reinforcement of previous knowledge, presentation of new material, reinforcing activities, a music segment, and an appropriate closing” (p. 6).
The next section will deal with the implementation of the video component of the Spanish program in Mr. Baxter’s classroom. The main part of the discussion will be devoted to the implementation of Español para ti, but the implementation of supplemental video lessons will also be included.

Implementation of the Video Component

With its 60 lessons for Level 5, the level that Mr. Baxter’s fifth-grade class was viewing during the period of this research study, the Español para ti video-based language program was used for Spanish instruction on a consistent basis throughout the 2004–2005 school year. In addition, supplemental videos or video segments were shown on Fridays during the months of January through April. These videos were from the Muzzy (developed by the British Broadcasting Corporation) and La Familia Contenta series (developed by the Pinellas County [Florida] FLES Team). Classroom teachers received a calendar from Mrs. Ford each month, indicating which Español para ti lessons should be shown in a given week and, in some cases, when classes could watch videos broadcast from the library on Fridays.

At the beginning of the 2004–2005 school year, Dolphin Point’s classroom teachers were only asked to show one Español para ti video lesson per week. A schedule of two lessons per week was not instituted in the fifth grade until the week of October 18. Had it not been for the disruption of the school schedule caused by hurricanes during the months of August and September, the frequency of video lessons would have been increased somewhat sooner but not by more than a few weeks. As Mrs. Ford explained to me, she believed in “taking baby steps and starting slowly” (Interview, 3/8/05). This was because of the changes in students and teachers that might occur during the first 10 days of classes and the importance to teachers of having time to build a community within their classrooms. Mrs. Ford also expressed a desire to allow the teachers sufficient time to “reacclimate themselves to the second language,” and she shared with me her idea of having students new to Dolphin Point, especially those in the fifth grade, come to the Tele Café for basic lessons in the first 2 weeks of the following school year. She concluded, “Those are the reasons I really don’t start with two videos a week, and there’s no need to, because there’s only 60 lessons, so we can really start slowly and still finish the whole kit” (Interview, 3/8/05).

Mrs. Ford’s addition in the 2004–2005 school year of a writing assignment for fourth- and fifth-grade classes had a substantial effect on what happened during Español para ti video lessons. As implemented in Mr. Baxter’s class, the assignment involved students writing Spanish vocabulary words from a given lesson, along with a statement of the lesson’s main idea, on an index card known as a Saber es poder [Knowledge is Power] card. Selected cards were subsequently featured in lessons in the Tele Café, after which they were placed on a bulletin board used as a Knowledge Wall. As Mrs. Ford explained (Interview, 3/8/05), she had learned about the concept of a Knowledge Wall, where students are to place material that is important to them, from Spence
Rogers of PEAK Learning Systems in intensive training that he had delivered to the County’s teachers. (Information on how teachers from different places have implemented the Knowledge Wall is available from PEAK Learning Systems’ forum at http://www.peaklearn.com/forum_messages.asp [retrieved December 29, 2005].)

Later I will provide a more detailed examination of the “life cycle” of a Saber es poder card, using one produced by Claire Montgomery, when I discuss her language output. At this time, I will merely observe that Español para ti lessons began in Mr. Baxter’s class with blank index cards being passed out and with Mr. Baxter giving directions for the lesson, such as,

Remember, we want to participate and also write. We only need the main idea and two or three vocabulary words to go along with the main lesson. And when she asks you to participate, you’re supposed to be practicing verbally the Spanish words that she’s doing. (Transcript, 10/26/04)

Next Mr. Baxter would show the Español para ti video lessons, usually without pausing the videotape. Sometimes during the first half of the school year, he would ask his students questions and talk to them about a lesson after it was over. Several of the postvideo sessions, including the only one that occurred during my observations in the second half of the school year, were more extensive.

I should note here that Mr. Baxter never facilitated any of the 60 activity lessons that are described in the Español para ti Teacher’s Manual for Level 5 (Steele & Johnson, 1999) and that are meant to last approximately 20 minutes apiece, and I never observed him utilizing any of the Español para ti audiotapes or any materials from the teacher’s resource book. I know that he did have the Teacher’s Manual, which he handed to me on May 4, 2005, before I led his class in a review (Field notes, 5/4/05).

Occasionally, there were a few similarities between activities that Mr. Baxter used after particular video lessons and activities described in corresponding activity lessons, but this was probably due to the fact that both were based on the same material. For example, after Lesson 25, Mr. Baxter asked students to share “a dance, an español dance that we went over today” (Transcript, 12/7/04). In the Teacher’s Manual for this lesson, there is an activity in which teachers are to pass out copies of a worksheet about Puerto Rico and are to “begin the study of Puerto Rico by asking children to name the dances they saw in the Video Lesson that come from the area in which Puerto Rico is located” (Steele & Johnson, 1999, p. 151). (Because many students were taking part in a Chorus road trip on the day of this lesson, on the following day Mr. Baxter again asked the students who had been there to share the name of “a dance that comes from one of the español countries”; Transcript, 12/8/04).

After other lessons, Mr. Baxter asked his students for examples of Spanish words that are similar to English words (Lesson 10), for differences between the students shown on the video and them (Lesson 11), and for the main idea (Lessons 12, 14, and 26). He asked his students what culture means and what the video had been about (Lesson 11) and asked them to name the
subjects students on the video were taking that they were also taking (Lesson 12). He asked for Spanish words that go along with actions (Lesson 14), asked his students to “share an action word with us and ask a person in the classroom to do that action” (Transcript, 10/26/04, Lesson 16), and asked visiting fourth-grade students to name one thing they had learned (Lesson 24). The time spent on most of these activities in postvideo sessions was between 2.5 and 4.5 minutes. The postvideo session following Lesson 26 (in which Mr. Baxter asked for the main idea, talked about music as a part of culture, and asked for the names of dances) was of slightly longer duration, lasting 6 minutes.

There were two postvideo sessions based on number activities that lasted even longer (13 and 10 minutes, respectively). After Lesson 23, which had included addition, subtraction, and multiplication problems, Mr. Baxter asked his students to write a math problem in Spanish that they would share with the class. Unlike the other postvideo activities that I have mentioned, in which only some of the students participated, in this activity Mr. Baxter called on and got a reply from each student (Field notes, 11/30/04). This was also the case for an activity that followed Lesson 34. Before showing the video lesson, which includes a review of large numbers, Mr. Baxter had let his students know that they would be practicing counting up to 100 because of a game Mrs. Ford would be playing with them the next day. After the video was over, he told them that he was going to give them numbers and asked them to find out how to say the Spanish names of the numbers correctly. He assigned numbers from 1 to 98 to the students, one by one, so that most of them had four numbers, and after giving them time to come up with what they would say, called on them in the same order (Field notes, 1/19/05).

The activity on January 19 that I have just described was the only one that occurred after any of the Español para ti lessons that I observed in 2005. (For a schedule of my observations, interviews, and other activities related to this research, please see the Appendix.) On other occasions in the winter and spring of 2005, I would wait around after Español para ti videos but never observed Mr. Baxter lead his class in a postvideo activity again.

Because of the familiarity I had gained with the behaviors of my case study participants during Español para ti video lessons by January 2005 and because of the apparent lack of postvideo activities, I decreased the frequency with which I observed these lessons, asking Mr. Baxter to let me know if his class would be doing any special activities in Spanish. He never informed me of any such activities associated with video lessons. However, at the end of a cooking session in the Tele Café on April 21, he told Mrs. Ford that she could give his students the names of Spanish-speaking countries and ask them for the names of the corresponding capitals, because, as he maintained, “We spent the whole entire week, 5 hours a day, 5 days a week, studyin’ these capitals” (Transcript, 4/21/05).

The extra practice with countries and capitals that Mr. Baxter told Mrs. Ford about is in keeping with his response to a question I had posed to him: “Are there certain things in Spanish you like going over with the class more than
others?” In reply, he had talked about doing things with which he felt at ease and that he liked, and he had continued, “The countries and the capitals were always favorites of mine, so I probably find that we do more math activities in here in Spanish and more geography in Spanish” than activities that stress proper Spanish pronunciation (Interview, 2/17/05).

At the end of the school year, I was curious about what Spanish lessons were like in Mr. Baxter’s classroom when I wasn’t there and whether I had missed anything besides the practice with countries and capitals, and because of this, I asked my participants, “Are things different when you watch Español para ti on days when I’m not here?” Three of the students told me that it was different, because I wasn’t there videorecording the class, but none said that anything else was different about the lessons (Interviews, 5/2/05).

It is possible that Mr. Baxter did not facilitate any more activities for the students because of his lack of a background in Spanish. As he explained to me, A lot of times I won’t do activities like that [activities that reinforce what is being done in class] from the teacher’s edition, because I don’t have a background, and I get caught into situations where I don’t feel at ease, and then I’ll just skip it. (Interview, 2/17/05)

Although this lack of a background in Spanish and Mr. Baxter’s resultant discomfort doubtless had a bearing on how he implemented the video component of Dolphin Point’s Spanish program, I feel that there are other factors that also influenced what he did or didn’t do with his class.

In his interview on February 17, 2005, Mr. Baxter expressed not only a desire to avoid activities that made him feel uneasy but also talked to me about his plans to do more Spanish activities that would be different and fun after the completion of the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). He brought this idea up again the next month. When I complimented him on a Spanish jeopardy game that he had put together before the Thanksgiving Break and asked him if he thought there would be another before the end of the school year, he said, “Yeah, we’ll probably have lots of ‘em, because now that FCAT testing is over, we’ll have more time for Spanish, more time for other enjoyable activities, things like that” (Interview, 3/16/05). (Because of the administration of the FCAT and the Spring Holiday that took place in the month of March, the schedule for the month that Mrs. Ford prepared included only four Español para ti lessons and two supplemental La Familia Contenta videos.) But even with such good intentions, the only Spanish activity that I am aware of Mr. Baxter facilitating in his classroom after the number-naming activity in January was the review of Spanish-speaking countries and capitals in April.

There is another aspect of Mr. Baxter’s implementation of the video component of the Spanish program that is worth noting. As I have already pointed out, the Español para ti Teacher’s Manual (Steele & Johnson, 1999) describes the classroom teacher’s role in this way: “You . . . are the facilitator who watches the video with the children and responds along with them” (p. xi). In earlier Español para ti lessons, Mr. Baxter took a much more active part in Spanish responses than he did in later lessons. For example, during Lesson 16
Mr. Baxter produced 22 Spanish utterances (Transcript, 10/26/04). (I define a Spanish utterance as anything said in Spanish that ranges in length from a word to a sentence.) In contrast, during Lesson 44 Mr. Baxter produced no Spanish utterances (Transcript, 3/2/05), and during Lesson 49 he produced 2 Spanish utterances (Transcript, 4/6/05).

Several factors may have contributed to Mr. Baxter’s taking a less active role in the facilitation of video lessons in the second half of the school year: personal health concerns, the illness and subsequent death of his mother, and his upcoming retirement. In relation to personal health concerns and his mother’s worsening condition, I noted that the first time Mr. Baxter was absent from school because of both chest pains he was experiencing and his mother’s illness was on December 14, six days after the last postvideo activity that I observed, with the exception of the number practice in January. An insight into Mr. Baxter’s possible disposition toward schoolwork as his retirement approached came to me from Sarah Montgomery, the mother of Claire, one of my participants. Sarah told me that Mr. Baxter had given the class of her older daughter piles of homework the previous school year but that Claire hadn’t gotten much that year (Field notes, 4/30/05).

The *Español para ti* video lessons that I have been discussing were supplemented in the months of January and February by segments of *Muzzy* videos (the Spanish-language version) that were approximately 10 minutes in length. These animated, all-Spanish videos present the experiences of Muzzy, a monster from outer space who is visiting the kingdom of Gondolandia, and also follow the experiences of some of the characters who live in the kingdom. Like *Español para ti*, *Muzzy* is a video-based language program, but I never saw evidence of the use of any of its materials other than the videos.

In the months of March and April, the *Español para ti* video lessons were supplemented by videos from the *La Familia Contenta* series. This series was created by FLES educators from Pinellas County, Florida, who play the parts of the members of a family. The name of the series comes from the frequent refrain, “Mi familia siempre está contenta” [My family is always happy], of the senile grandmother, who is oblivious to the family conflicts that often take place around her. The two episodes of *La Familia Contenta* that I observed in April were 9 and 7.5 minutes long.

The supplemental videos were broadcast from the school library on Fridays at three different times, giving teachers the option of letting their classes watch them at 9:00, 12:15, or 2:00. Perhaps because of Mr. Baxter’s absences and his personal concerns, there were three occasions on which he told me ahead of time that his class would be watching *Muzzy* at 9:00, but when I arrived slightly before that time, I was told the class would be watching it at 2:00 instead. On two of these occasions, I came back in the afternoon to observe (Field notes, 1/14/05, 1/21/05). On the third occasion, when a substitute teacher, who had been told the video would be at 2:00, apologized to me profusely about the mix-up, I said it was all right and decided not to come back that afternoon (Field notes, 2/4/05).
Besides these scheduling difficulties, there was a problem with the broadcast of a *La Familia Contenta* video that occurred on the afternoon of March 18. Because of this, Mrs. Ford told Mrs. Stephens, the substitute teacher I just mentioned, and me that she would let Mr. Baxter have a copy of the video to show to his class after the Spring Holiday (Field notes, 3/18/05).

The purpose of this section has been to discuss the implementation of the video component of the Spanish program in Mr. Baxter’s classroom, including the frequency of video lessons, the types of activities that were carried out in conjunction with *Español para ti*, and the role Mr. Baxter played in the implementation of the lessons. The next section covers Spanish lessons in the Tele Café, including information on the relocation of the Tele Café, the frequency of the Spanish instructional sessions that took place there, and a description of the instructional sessions themselves.

**Spanish Lessons in the Tele Café**

I have already described the videoconferencing component of the Spanish program at Dolphin Point Elementary in the 2003–2004 school year and have mentioned two changes related to this component that took place in the following school year, the year in which the present study was conducted. One change was in the physical location of the Tele Café. The other change involved the distribution of teaching responsibilities among FLES teachers. In the 2003–2004 school year, once a class at Dolphin Point had been paired with a class of the same grade level at another school and videoconferencing had been introduced, the FLES teachers at the two schools would alternate on a weekly basis in assuming sole teaching responsibility for the matched classes. In 2004–2005, almost without exception, team teaching replaced the alternation of teaching responsibility for the FLES teachers.

**The Tele Café in Its New Setting.** The change in location of the Tele Café, accomplished at the end of August and beginning of September 2004, was for the purpose of grouping primary classrooms in the first-floor area where the Tele Café had been. At the time, Mrs. Ford told me that she found the move quite stressful (Field notes, 9/1/04).

Although the Tele Café’s new room lacked a stove, an asset of the former room, and had a different orientation, with the front of the class to the south rather than to the north, once it was set up for videoconferencing, the similarities seemed to outweigh the differences. As Edward, a Dolphin Point student who experienced videoconferencing sessions with classes at Greenwood Park Elementary in both the fourth and fifth grades, explained,

In Tele Café, I don’t think it really has changed, ‘cause we call up the same people [to establish the videoconferencing connection]. It’s the same person, the same rug. Only thing that really changed from this year and last year in Tele Café is the room, and I like [this] room better, even though it doesn’t have a stove, but it’s much closer and less walk. (Interview, 1/21/05)
The first class session I observed in the Tele Café in the 2004–2005 school year took place in the new location on September 16. Before class started, Mrs. Ford told me that an ISDN line to the present room had been installed, making possible a videoconferencing connection. However, because Mr. Straten (the FLES teacher at Greenwood Park) was sick, there would be no videoconferencing that day. In spite of this, Mrs. Ford planned on going through the motions of putting in a videoconferencing call to Greenwood Park (Field notes, 9/16/04).

After Mr. Baxter and his class had entered the room at 1:30 p.m., Mrs. Ford began the class session with the two signs that indicated which language should be spoken turned to their English side. She talked to the students in English, saying that even though they were in a different room, it was still the Tele Café and saying that they should sit with their “pompis en el piso” [bottoms on the floor]. She mentioned two other classes that had been very good. She told the students that they would be talking about calendars and clocks. Then she asked one of the students to change the language signs to their Spanish side, and the class said, “Uno, dos, tres. Adiós, inglés. Hola, español.” [One, two, three. Goodbye, English. Hello, Spanish.] When Mrs. Ford tried calling Greenwood Park, and no one was there, she talked to the students in Spanish, wondering where Señor Straten was (Field notes, 9/16/04).

The preceding scene is not only pertinent to the transition in location of the Tele Café but is illustrative of the way in which lessons in there began, whether videoconferencing was to follow or not. Mrs. Ford would speak English, sometimes engaging Mr. Baxter or the students in casual conversation about a field trip, a special event, or common concerns. She would make sure the students were seated properly and often mentioned class rules, such as, “So you guys really need to do it all in Spanish. You need to sit correctly. You need to sit on the rug. And you need to be focused” (Transcript, 1/13/05). This was in the context of her comments about earning a star, four of which brought the reward of a cooking session. She would talk to the students about how other classes were doing and how many stars they had earned. Sometimes she would tell the students what they were going to do that day. If she hadn’t finished this part of the lesson when the videoconferencing connection was made, she would let Mr. Straten know, as she did on February 3: “We’re not ready. Señor Straten, we’re not ready. Give us another 30 seconds” (Transcript, 2/3/05).

Before continuing with a description of class sessions that took place in the Tele Café, including both videoconferencing sessions and those without videoconferencing, I would like to discuss the distribution of these two types of class session and some reasons why videoconferencing, one of the foundations of the FLETT program, was sometimes not used.

The Frequency of Spanish Instructional Sessions in the Tele Café. From September 16, 2004, through April 28, 2005, I observed 15 videoconferencing sessions and 8 class sessions that were carried out without videoconferencing in the Tele Café. During this time span, Mr. Baxter’s class had no other sessions
there, with the exception of cooking sessions (which I treat as distinct from the Spanish instructional sessions). Prior to September 16, I am aware of Mr. Baxter’s class having met with Mrs. Ford on only one occasion (August 17, 2004; Field notes, 8/20/04). Subsequent to April 28, there was one additional class session in the Tele Café on May 12 that did not involve videoconferencing (Field notes, 5/12/05). Table 1 summarizes the numbers of Spanish instructional sessions and cancellations in the Tele Café, beginning with the first session that I observed there on September 16 and ending with the class session on May 12, about which I was fully informed. A chronological account of these sessions and cancellations may be found in the Appendix.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of instructional session or cancellation</th>
<th>Number of occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VC sessions</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions without VC because of teacher absence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions without VC because of special activities at Greenwood Park Elementary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions without VC because of combined classes at Dolphin Point Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellations because of teacher absence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellations because of cooking sessions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancellation because of a Spanish play</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. VC = videoconferencing.

A partial explanation for the relatively high number of class sessions taught without videoconferencing, as well as instances of canceled classes, may be found in the change to a reliance on team teaching for videoconferencing in the year of this study. A consequence of this change was that if Mr. Straten was absent from Greenwood Park, Mrs. Ford did not conduct a videoconferencing session, through which she might have taught both Mr. Allen’s class at that school and Mr. Baxter’s class at Dolphin Point. Besides September 16, illness on the part of Mr. Straten accounted for the lack of a videoconferencing session on November 11, when Mrs. Ford again taught Mr. Baxter’s class in the Tele Café without videoconferencing. Conversely, when Mrs. Ford was absent from Dolphin Point on September 30, October 21, and February 10, Mr. Straten did
not conduct videoconferencing sessions with both Mr. Allen’s class and Mr. Baxter’s class, so that the latter received no Spanish instruction on those days. (However, because Mrs. Ford did make up the September 30 class session, teaching Mr. Baxter’s students without videoconferencing at a special time the following day, I classify this as another instance of teacher absence leading to a class session at Dolphin Point without videoconferencing). Another day on which Mr. Baxter’s class received no Spanish instruction was October 14, when Mrs. Ford was away from Dolphin Point because of involvement in a professional conference, in which Mr. Straten might also have been participating.

An additional instance of the cancellation of a Spanish instructional session in the Tele Café occurred on a day (10/28/04) when fourth- and fifth-grade students from Dolphin Point and other schools went on a fieldtrip to see a Spanish play that was put on by FLES teachers.

Special activities at both Greenwood Park and Dolphin Point impacted the frequency of videoconferencing sessions. On four occasions when Mr. Allen’s class was involved in special activities at Greenwood Park (12/9/04, 12/16/04, 1/20/05, and 4/14/05), Mrs. Ford taught Mr. Baxter’s class without videoconferencing. At Dolphin Point, where the first three cooking sessions of Mr. Baxter’s class had occurred at times other than that of the regularly scheduled videoconferencing sessions, the last three cooking sessions (on 3/10/05, 4/21/05, and 5/5/05) took the place of videoconferencing sessions. Because of other special activities at Dolphin Point, on April 28 and May 12 Mr. Baxter’s class met with Dolphin Point’s other fifth-grade class in the Tele Café at the regularly scheduled videoconferencing time of the latter class. However, instead of having a videoconferencing session that included the two classes at Dolphin Point and a class at another school (in this case, a class at Wallenmaier Elementary), as had happened when a fourth grade class had joined Mr. Baxter’s class for a videoconferencing session with Greenwood Park on April 7, Mrs. Ford conducted the class sessions without videoconferencing.

Before leaving this discussion of the types of Spanish instructional sessions in the Tele Café, I should mention that Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten taught 13 of the 15 videoconferencing sessions together and that Mr. Straten assumed teaching responsibility for the other 2 (on 3/17/05 and 3/31/05). On those two occasions, in contrast to the typical procedure of the previous year in which the FLES instructor who was not teaching did not stay with the class at his or her site, Mrs. Ford remained in the Tele Café, at times prompting students or quietly taking part in the lessons herself. As usual, the classroom teacher sat at the back of the Tele Café throughout the sessions. (On March 17, this was Mrs. Stephens, who was substituting for Mr. Baxter, and on March 31, it was Mr. Baxter.) In fact, prior to these sessions, Mrs. Ford had told me that the purpose of her staying in the room was to help the classroom teacher feel more comfortable with Mr. Straten teaching the classes at both sites, in preparation for some future time when Mrs. Ford would no longer remain in the room (Interview, 3/8/05).
Now that it has been established that both videoconferencing sessions and instructional sessions without videoconferencing occurred in the Tele Café and an explanation of their respective frequencies has been provided, I would like to turn to a description of the components of both types of session, pointing out the differences between the types of session wherever these are notable.

A Description of Instructional Sessions in the Tele Café. I have already provided a description of how class sessions in the Tele Café were begun with English being spoken and of their inclusion of such components as casual conversation, the arrangement of seating, a reminder of class rules, discussion about earning stars and about the progress of other classes, and an indication of topics that would be covered. When the classroom signs were turned from their English to Spanish side, the class would say, “Uno, dos, tres. Adiós, inglés. Hola, español,” and everyone would be expected to speak Spanish until the signs were turned to their English side again.

Once the Spanish portion of the class had begun, the Buenas tardes [Good Afternoon] song would usually be sung. This occurred on days when there was videoconferencing, as well as on days when there wasn’t. In the first half of the school year when Mr. Allen’s class wasn’t ready for videoconferencing quite as soon as Mr. Baxter’s class was, Mrs. Ford started leading the latter in this song before the videoconferencing connection was made. After the Winter Holidays, the classes sang the song together more often, and there were several occasions on which individual students got to play the role of the teacher, singing each line, which was then echoed by the rest of the class. On one day when there was no videoconferencing, Mrs. Ford went over what some of the words of the song mean in English. (As she switched to English during the Spanish portion of the lesson and began talking about word meanings, she said, “I never do this, but I want to do it today for this word”; Transcript, 1/20/05.)

If a videoconferencing connection was made while Buenas tardes was being sung, the song would be finished and then greetings would be exchanged between Mr. Straten, Mrs. Ford and the two classes. At other times, greetings would be exchanged immediately. In the following excerpt, Mrs. Ford is praising students in Mr. Baxter’s class for a correct answer to a question about Muzzy when the sound of a ringing phone indicates that Mr. Straten is making a videoconferencing connection with them. Greetings are then exchanged, and Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten go on to talk about their own health. Sounds, comments on the dialogue, and overlapping speech are provided in brackets. Where necessary, translations are also provided in brackets located at the ends of lines.

Mrs. Ford and children’s voices: ¡Hola, Greenwood Park!
Mr. Straten and children’s voices: Hola, Dolphin Point.
Mr. Straten: ¿Cómo están? [How are you (plural)?]
Mrs. Ford and children’s voices: Muy bien, gracias. [Very well, thank you.]
Mrs. Ford and a child’s voice: ¿Y usted? [And you (singular)?]
Mr. Straten: ¿Cómo estamos? [How are we?]
Child’s voice: Muy bien, gracias.
Children’s voices: [Unintelligible.]
Mr. Straten: Parece que estamos aquí así bien, señora. [It seems like we’re pretty well here, ma’am.]
Mrs. Ford: ¿Sí? [Yes?]
Mr. Straten: Ninguna queja. [No complaints.]
Mr. Straten: Yo también estoy bien. Andaba mal, pero hoy estoy mucho mejor. [I’m well, too. I was doing badly, but today I’m much better.]
Mrs. Ford: Muy bien. Con medicina, ¿sí? Con [Mr. Straten: Sí, medi, medicina.] medicina. [Very good. With medicine, right? With medicine.]
Mr. Straten: Exacto. [Exactly.]

The preceding excerpt illustrates not only the exchange of greetings between classes but also some characteristics of other interchanges during videoconferencing and of the speech of Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten. For example, Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten would prompt the students who were with them to answer, sometimes restating a question that the other had asked. They would use repetitions and would sometimes act out what they were saying [e.g., coughing after “tos”] to make their speech more comprehensible. They addressed each other as señor and señora and sometimes talked about themselves in the third person.

The calendar segment of Spanish instructional sessions in the Tele Café, referred to by Mrs. Ford at the end of the excerpt, occurred without exception in the classes I observed during the 2004–2005 school year, whether there was videoconferencing or not. This segment included questions about the date and a song about the month. As was the case the previous year, there might also be a song about the days of the week, a song about the seasons, a song about the weather, a song about an upcoming holiday, and questions related to topics that had been covered.
Until the last few months of the school year, the next segment of both videoconferencing sessions and those without videoconferencing was usually Saber es poder [Knowledge is Power]. (The last time I observed this segment was on March 3, 2005, although it would have taken place on April 7 if Mr. Baxter’s class had brought any Saber es poder cards to the Tele Café on that day.) In this segment, from one to three index cards per class would be used. These cards were from individual students, who had written vocabulary and the main idea of an Español para ti lesson on them. If the class session didn’t involve videoconferencing, Mrs. Ford would project cards from Mr. Baxter’s class on one of the television monitors and would read and expand on the Spanish vocabulary, saying how good the cards were and sometimes writing corrections on them. If the Saber es poder segment was part of a videoconferencing session, cards from Mr. Allen’s class would be projected on the other television monitor, and Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten would take turns going over cards. Sometimes Mr. Straten would act out what was written on a card and would have both classes repeat the words. Sometimes Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten would briefly converse about topics covered on the cards and would say how good the cards were. At the end of the Saber es poder segment, Mrs. Ford would have the students from Mr. Baxter’s class whose cards had been used put the cards on the Knowledge Wall.

Another segment of the Spanish instructional sessions in the Tele Café involved activities through which material was presented and reviewed. The following topics were covered in the 2004–2005 school year: telling time; vocabulary for ordering a pizza; numbers; vocabulary and facts from the two Spanish plays the students attended; the continents; Spanish-speaking countries and their capitals; facts about Florida; vocabulary associated with Christmas as a holiday; likes and dislikes associated with school subjects, Muzzy, movies, and food; vocabulary and facts from Muzzy; vocabulary for members of a family; different kinds of fruit and whether they float or sink; vocabulary and facts from La Familia Contenta; and vocabulary for sea animals. The activities that were used included questions and answers, songs and chants, an activity with small clock faces, a pizza-ordering activity, a fill-in-the-blank activity, map activities, an activity in which students named what they liked and didn’t like, and an activity in which students predicted whether different kinds of fruit would float or sink. Games were sometimes used in this part of class, including concentration, a modified version of jeopardy, bingo, ticktacktoe, and a variation of baseball that involved answering questions.

A few of the activities were only used in sessions that didn’t involve videoconferencing. This was the case for the baseball games in which bases were placed around the Tele Café and students answered Spanish questions in different categories for going to different bases (Field notes, 4/14/05, 4/28/05). Another activity that was only used in a session without videoconferencing was the one in which students were given small clock faces and moved the hands around to indicate the times that Mrs. Ford called out (Field notes, 9/16/04). A pizza-ordering activity was used in both types of session, but in the
videoconferencing session when the classes were coming up with their orders prior to sharing them, the audio component of the videoconferencing connection was turned off (Field notes, 10/1/04, 10/7/04).

The segment of lessons described above, in which material was presented and reviewed, was usually followed by the singing of *Tic tac, tic tac, el reloj* [Tick-tock, tick-tock, the clock] in sessions in which there was no videoconferencing. The singing of *Tic tac* also occurred at the end of videoconferencing sessions, except on several occasions when the class at Greenwood Park ran out of time, and the usual farewells were exchanged without the singing of this song by both classes. On these occasions, Mrs. Ford and Mr. Baxter’s class went on to sing it on their own. (Sometimes students in Mr. Baxter’s class who took part in Chorus were dismissed before and sometimes after the singing of *Tic tac*.)

Mrs. Ford would spend additional time (ranging from 2 to 10.5 minutes) with Mr. Baxter’s class after videoconferencing connections had been ended. On four occasions, part of this time was spent on a continuation of the activity that had been in progress prior to the end of the videoconferencing connection.

After activities had ended, both on days when there was videoconferencing and on days when there was not, Mrs. Ford switched to English to evaluate Mr. Baxter’s class in terms of whether they deserved a star. She often received input on this subject from Mr. Baxter and from the students themselves. (The main criterion for earning a star was not speaking English during the Spanish-only portion of instructional sessions in the Tele Café.) Sometimes there would also be discussion about some aspect of Spanish instruction or about an upcoming event.

Instructional sessions in the Tele Café ended with a final activity for lining up to leave the room. Sometimes these activities involved students understanding what Mrs. Ford said and reacting accordingly. This was the case when Mrs. Ford called out the name of a color in Spanish, the students wearing the color got in line, and the activity continued with more colors being called. Students also lined up when a description of their clothing was given in Spanish or when the name of the month in which they were born was called. Some line-up activities reinforced geography-related lessons: Students were given the name of a country and pointed to it on a map, said the name of a country when given its capital, or said the name of the capital of a given country. In other activities, students lined up after saying the name of a number to which Mrs. Ford had pointed, saying what they liked, or naming a member of *La Familia Contenta* and giving an adjective to describe that person. On two occasions, different students got to play the part of the teacher and call colors for the other students to line up.

On average, Spanish instructional sessions in the Tele Café lasted more than half an hour (ranging from 26.5 to 45.5 minutes in length). As Mrs. Ford explained to me, the official length of fifth-grade sessions was 20 minutes, but, as was her desire, they usually lasted longer (Interview, 3/8/05).
Chapter 5. Oral and Written Spanish Output, Interactions, and Patterns of Change

The purpose of the previous chapter was to carefully describe the setting in which the case study participants were taught Spanish, the program through which they received this instruction, and the teachers who were responsible for implementing the program. In human and physical terms, this is the context in which the participants’ acquisition of Spanish took place. The detailed description of this context was meant to lay the groundwork for the discussion of the participants' language that will be offered in this chapter.

As I have already explained, when I entered the research setting at the beginning of the 2004–2005 school year, it was with the intent of concentrating on what four participants said in Spanish, specifically on instances of interaction and output in different instructional settings over time. The points of focus with which I began are presented below. In them, the term learners is applied to the four case study students.

1. In videoconferencing lessons that are taught by the FLES teacher in the research site, what instances of interaction and output are observed?
2. In videoconferencing lessons that are taught by the FLES teacher in the remote site, what instances of interaction and output are observed?
3. In video-based lessons and in activities that are facilitated by the classroom teacher, what instances of interaction and output are observed?
4. Are patterns of change observed in learners' language production during the period under study?

Although the alternation of teaching responsibilities between the FLES teacher in the research site and the FLES teacher in the remote site that I had expected was replaced by team teaching of videoconferencing sessions, thus making the first two points of focus untenable, I maintained an interest in instances of interaction and output in different instructional settings. As I explained in the previous chapter, these settings included Spanish instructional sessions taught by Mrs. Ford without videoconferencing, video conferencing sessions taught by both Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten, video conferencing sessions for which Mr. Straten assumed teaching responsibility, Español para ti video lessons and associated activities facilitated by Mr. Baxter, supplementary video lessons, cooking sessions, Spanish plays, and a modified Jeopardy game. I have come to group these settings together in replacing the first three points of focus, not only for the sake of brevity but also to reflect the process through which I observed my participants in the different settings and came to realize that verbal
output on the part of individual students was not encouraged in all of them. Thus, I state the new point of focus in this way:

- What instances of interaction and output are observed in the different instructional settings?

Besides maintaining an interest in instances of interaction and output, I also maintained an interest in patterns of change in the language production of my case study participants over time and retained my original fourth point of focus:

- Are patterns of change observed in learners' language production during the period under study?

I present my findings in regard to these points of focus below. As will soon be seen, there were notable differences in the amount of verbal output among the participants.

**Time Spent Observing the Participants**

In Chapter 3, I described the process through which I came to select Claire, Brittany, Ciara, and Edward as case study participants and obtained their assent and the informed consent of their parents to include them in this study. Although I observed these four students as members of Mr. Baxter's class in the months of August and September 2004, my attention wasn't directed primarily on them, as it was after they had been selected. From the beginning of October onward, I am able to give an accurate accounting of the amount of time I observed them in the different instructional settings. This information is presented in Table 2.

I have not provided information in Table 2 on how many class sessions are represented by the time that I observed each participant in the different instructional settings, because I feel that in some cases this information would not present a clear picture of what actually happened. One reason is that in the category "Without VC: Mrs. Ford" I have combined the time that Mrs. Ford spent with Mr. Baxter's students before and after videoconferencing sessions with the time she spent with them in Spanish instructional sessions with no videoconferencing. Another reason the inclusion of the total number of class sessions might not present a clear picture is that sometimes students came and went during class. For example, on November 19, 2004, Claire and Edward left before the end of the 43-minute Spanish jeopardy game, so that they only attended 86% of the class session that day (Field notes, 11/19/04). In some cases, there would be the addition of multiple fractions of class sessions to arrive at a total that would not be the same as the number of individual classes attended.
Table 2
Amount of Time Each Participant Was Observed in the Different Instructional Settings From October 1, 2004, Through May 5, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional setting</th>
<th>Claire</th>
<th>Brittany</th>
<th>Ciara</th>
<th>Edward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without VC: Mrs. Ford</td>
<td>3 hrs. 53 min.</td>
<td>4 hrs. 21 min.</td>
<td>5 hrs. 46 min.</td>
<td>4 hrs. 23 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC: Mrs. Ford &amp; Mr. Straten</td>
<td>3 hrs. 12 min.</td>
<td>4 hrs. 12 min.</td>
<td>4 hrs. 53 min.</td>
<td>3 hrs. 54 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC: Mr. Straten</td>
<td>0 min.</td>
<td>22 min.</td>
<td>46 min.</td>
<td>46 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Español para ti</em> lessons</td>
<td>8 hrs. 23 min.</td>
<td>9 hrs. 1 min.</td>
<td>9 hrs. 1 min.</td>
<td>8 hrs. 41 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary video lessons</td>
<td>36 min.</td>
<td>1 hr. 21 min.</td>
<td>1 hr. 21 min.</td>
<td>35 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>3 hrs. 14 min.</td>
<td>3 hrs. 14 min.</td>
<td>3 hrs. 31 min.</td>
<td>3 hrs. 31 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeopardy</td>
<td>37 min.</td>
<td>43 min.</td>
<td>43 min.</td>
<td>37 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish plays</td>
<td>48 min.</td>
<td>48 min.</td>
<td>48 min.</td>
<td>48 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total time</td>
<td>20 hrs. 43 min.</td>
<td>24 hrs. 2 min.</td>
<td>26 hrs. 49 min.</td>
<td>23 hrs. 15 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* VC = videoconferencing.

Ciara had the best attendance for Spanish instruction, and the amount of time I observed him is most representative of the total time I spent in observations in the different instructional settings from October 1, 2004, through May 5, 2005. He was present for all 14 videoconferencing sessions and 7 instructional sessions in the Tele Café without videoconferencing in that time span, only missing 3.5 minutes before a videoconferencing connection was made on December 2. (In fact, I observed all instructional sessions in the Tele Café for Mr. Baxter’s class during the given time span.) November 16 and May 4 were the only other occasions on which Ciara missed any of the Spanish sessions that I observed. On November 16, he was out sick and missed the entire 19-minute *Español para ti* lesson (Lesson 22; field notes, 11/16/04). On May 4, he stepped out of Mr. Baxter’s classroom at the beginning of Lesson 55 of *Español para ti*, missing 2 minutes (Field notes, 5/4/05). (For a chronological listing of all of the Spanish sessions that I observed, see the Appendix.)
I spent additional time with the participants that is not included in Table 2. Besides my observations of them in August and September 2004, I later spent time with them in interviews, in the school cafeteria, between classes, at special events, and in three Spanish reviews that I provided for Mr. Baxter’s class at the end of the school year. Being with the participants in these situations helped me get to know them better and provided perspective for my consideration of them as language learners.

The basis for my examination of the Spanish utterances produced by each participant in the different instructional settings, however, was provided by my observations of the class sessions. In the next section, I will present a brief overview of the number of these utterances before moving on to a more detailed examination of the output and interactions of individual participants.

**Overview of Spanish Utterances Produced by the Participants**

During my observations of class sessions, I took notes on instructional activities and on the participation and behavior of Claire, Brittany, Ciara, and Edward. Beginning on October 19, 2004, I also made audio and video recordings of class sessions and transcribed the audio recordings. Based on my notes and transcripts, I have a record of the Spanish utterances of my participants and of the interactions in which they were involved.

Table 3 presents the number of Spanish utterances of each of the participants in the different instructional settings from October 1, 2004, through May 5, 2005, the same time frame employed in Table 2. For the purposes of this study, I define a Spanish utterance as anything said in Spanish that ranges in length from a word to a sentence. I only consider individual utterances here, not participation in group responses, except in those cases where the timing or volume of an individual’s utterance is different enough from those of the group to make the utterance stand out. There were many instances in which my participants took part in singing songs or responding with their class, especially in the Tele Café, but because of the impossibility of maintaining a clear view of each participant at all times (even with help of video recordings), I am unable to give an accurate count of participation in these group utterances. (In my field notes for December 9, 2004, for example, I wrote, “Mrs. Ford went through the song with the students first. Claire and Ciara joined in but not Edward. I couldn’t see Brittany’s mouth.”)

Differences in the number of utterances produced by each of the participants are apparent in Table 3. In the next sections, I will provide a more detailed examination of the output of each of the participants and of some of the interactions in which they took part, as I seek to answer the question, “What instances of interaction and output are observed in the different instructional settings?”
### Table 3
*Number of Spanish Utterances for Each Participant in the Different Instructional Settings From October 1, 2004, Through May 5, 2005*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional setting (Number of sessions(^a))</th>
<th>Claire</th>
<th>Brittany</th>
<th>Ciara</th>
<th>Edward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without VC: Mrs. Ford (^b)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC: Mrs. Ford &amp; Mr. Straten (12)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC: Mr. Straten (2)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During <em>Español para ti</em> videos (28)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After <em>Español para ti</em> videos (8)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking (6)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeopardy 11/19/04 (1)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total utterances</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Utterance length = a word to a sentence. NA = not applicable (not present); VC = videoconferencing. \(^a\)This refers to the number of sessions I observed and does not reflect the individual participants’ attendance. \(^b\)In addition to 7 Spanish instructional sessions taught by Mrs. Ford without videoconferencing, this category includes the time she spent with the students before and after the 14 videoconferencing sessions.

**Categorizing Claire’s Oral Output in the Different Instructional Settings**

Although Claire Montgomery, a quiet girl, produced relatively few Spanish utterances as an individual and sometimes spoke so softly in class that it was difficult to hear her, the utterances that I did hear clearly were usually without error. Taking into account both my observations in class and my recordings of class sessions, I was unable to hear 9 of her 45 Spanish utterances well enough to determine whether they contained errors or not. Of the remaining 36 utterances, only 4 involved errors. Two of these occurred in a Spanish jeopardy...
game when she offered, “¿sienta?” instead of the expected _siéntense_ [Sit down (plural)] and “¿nochenta y nueve?” instead of the correct _noventa y nueve_ [99] (Transcript, 11/19/04). Another utterance involving error occurred in a Spanish baseball game when she mistakenly identified a picture of _la bebé_ [the baby] as “¿tía?” [aunt] (Transcript, 4/14/05). In all three of these utterances, she showed her uncertainty by her questioning tone. The fourth utterance involving error was a math problem in which she mistakenly placed _y_ [and] between the hundreds and tens in the names of numbers and said, “ochocienten,” instead of the correct _ochocientos_ [800] (Transcript, 11/30/04).

All of Claire’s Spanish utterances were from 1 to 3 words in length, with the exception of the math problem that I have just mentioned, which was prepared in advance and was 10 words in length (Transcript, 11/30/04).

Claire’s utterances were also characterized by the fact that they contained a limited range of vocabulary. In Table 4, I have categorized them according to type of vocabulary upon which they were based and the instructional settings in which they occurred.

Table 4
Claire. Number of Spanish Utterances Classified by Type of Vocabulary and Instructional Setting From October 1, 2004, Through May 5, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of vocabulary</th>
<th>Instruction:</th>
<th>Español</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tele Café</td>
<td>para ti</td>
<td>Settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No VC: Ford</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC: Ford &amp; Straten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action word</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category &amp; number</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date &amp; calendar</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Utterance length = a word to a sentence. NA = not applicable (not present); VC = videoconferencing.
The way in which I group the types of vocabulary in Table 4 is influenced by the activities that occurred in the different instructional settings. Because of the prominence of the calendar segment in instructional sessions in the Tele Café, I have chosen to group utterances together that are based on vocabulary for “Dates and calendar.” Some of the utterances included here are numbers that refer to the date in some way. The designations “Category” and “Category & number” are derived from Spanish jeopardy games, both the one that took place before the Thanksgiving Break that I classify as a separate instructional setting (Field notes, 11/19/04) and a jeopardy game on February 17 that was begun during a videoconferencing session and was continued after the videoconferencing connection had been terminated (Field notes, 2/17/05).

In Table 4, cells have been left blank if no activity occurred in a given instructional setting that would have been likely to elicit a certain type of vocabulary. If there was such an activity in an instructional setting but Claire was not present at the time it occurred, the cell for vocabulary of that type in that instructional setting contains the abbreviation NA. For example, Claire was present for the jeopardy game during the videoconferencing session on February 17 and produced no Spanish utterances based on “Category” or “Category & number”; however, she left for Chorus before the videoconferencing connection was terminated and therefore was not present for the continuation of the game during Spanish instruction offered by Mrs. Ford without videoconferencing (Field notes, 2/17/05).

Table 5 shows how many utterances Claire produced during various types of activities in the different instructional settings. If the activity named in a given row did not occur in the instructional setting named in a given column, the corresponding cell has been left blank. In both this table and the previous one, it can be seen that Claire produced more Spanish utterances as an individual in instructional sessions in the Tele Café without videoconferencing than in those with it.

In this section, I have given an overview of Claire’s Spanish output in terms of the frequency and kinds of errors she made, the length of her utterances, the types of vocabulary she used, and the types of activities in which she produced utterances as an individual. Because Claire produced the utterances summarized in this section in the context of the Spanish instruction she received at Dolphin Point, I would like to provide a description of this instruction below, including input that Claire received and interactions in which she took part.
Table 5  
Claire. Number of Spanish Utterances Per Type of Activity in Different Instructional Settings From October 1, 2004, Through May 5, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activity</th>
<th>Instruction: Tele Café</th>
<th>Español para ti</th>
<th>Other settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No VC: Ford</td>
<td>VC: Ford &amp; Straten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/19/04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball game</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar segment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration game</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeopardy game</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line-up activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not part of activity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number activity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q &amp; A activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share actions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticktacktoe game</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Utterance length = a word to a sentence. NA = not applicable (not present); Q & A = question and answer; VC = videoconferencing.

Placing Claire’s Oral and Written Output in Context

The strongest link between Español para ti lessons and instructional sessions in the Tele Café was provided by Saber es poder cards. During the Español para ti videos, Claire would watch the lesson and write on her card but never responded orally. Because of Claire’s absorption in producing Saber es poder cards and the number of her cards that were featured in lessons in the Tele Café, I will follow one of her cards from its production in Mr. Baxter’s classroom through its inclusion in a lesson in the Tele Café. In doing this, not only will input received by Claire and other students be specified, but some of Claire’s written and oral output will also be featured.

Leaving the context of Saber es poder, the discussion of Claire’s Spanish output will continue, and interactions in which she participated will be included. Special attention will be given to her participation in the Spanish jeopardy game.
in Mr. Baxter’s classroom, participation that was greater than usual because of her role as group captain/spokesperson.

Following One of Claire’s Saber Es Poder Cards Through Its “Life Cycle.” Claire had four Saber es poder cards selected for presentation in the Tele Café and subsequent placement on its Knowledge Wall, more than any other student in Mr. Baxter’s class. This distinction reflects the favorable evaluation of Claire’s work by her peers, who, in the normal course of instruction, were the ones to make the selection. Using one of Claire’s cards that was selected in this way, I would like to follow it through what could be termed its life cycle, beginning with the directions Mr. Baxter gave before an Español para ti video and the input the students received during the video lesson, continuing with Claire’s participation in a postvideo activity in which she utilized information from her card, proceeding through Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten’s interaction in the videoconferencing session in which the card was featured, and ending with Mrs. Ford handing the card to Claire to place on the Tele Café’s Knowledge Wall.

In the third week of October 2004, the schedule for Español para ti lessons changed from one to two lessons a week. On October 19, after explaining this, Mr. Baxter gave his students directions for writing on their Saber es poder cards, some variation of which he had already shared at the beginning of previous Español para ti lessons:

A lot of you are, um, on this card are putting way too much information. What you really need to do is, uh; usually she has maybe a couple main ideas on her lessons; just try to pick one of them and then the vocabulary words that you write, write about that main idea. Don’t try to get down every single vocabulary word. That’s not what we’re really looking for. We’re looking for the important ones, the ones that you can learn, the ones that you understand. I know it’s quite quick when she puts the Spanish spelling of the words up there, but even so, the Spanish spelling is not as important as learning the words and what they mean. So, this is Lesson 14. [Pause.] I’ll tell you what, Colleen [a student in Mr. Baxter’s class], you press play in just a second. (Transcript, 10/19/04)

The lesson begins with the video teacher (la maestra) exchanging greetings with a puppet named Kipper, as well as greeting the viewers. Then she says, “Well, Kipper, we have been talking about action words.” When she goes on to ask him, “¿Qué haces tú?” [What are you doing?], he replies, “Yo canto” [I’m singing], which prompts the singing of the Español para ti song (Español para ti: Level 5, 1996, Lesson 14; Transcript, 10/19/04; see also Steele & Johnson, 1999).

Next la maestra gets Kipper to tell her what he does in different classes (e.g., Estudio música. [I study music.]). Their conversation continues as follows:

Maestra: And can you see that the -o ending on that verb tells me that you’re talking about yourself?
Kipper: Yo. [I.]
Maestra: Muy bien. [Very good.] Well, here are a couple of other things that you might want to say and things that we do at school en las clases [in classes]. You can say, “Leo, yo leo” [I read]. Clase, repite [Class, repeat]: [The voice of la maestra is joined by the voice of a child in Mr. Baxter’s class:] Leo.

Kipper: Leo.

Maestra and others (in Mr. Baxter’s class): Yo leo.

Kipper and others: Yo leo.

Maestra: You can say, “Yo leo el libro” [I read the book].

Kipper: Yo leo el libro.

Maestra: Muy bien. Leo is a very important activity that we do in so many of our classes, and I hope you’re doing it at home, too. Yo leo.

Kipper: Yo leo. Leo, leo.

Maestra: Here’s something else that is something that we do a lot at the school. Yo escribo. [I write.]

Kipper: Yo escribo.

Maestra: Or you can say, “Escribo.”

Kipper: Escribo. (Español para ti: Level 5, 1996, Lesson 14; Transcript, 10/19/04)

La maestra and Kipper elaborate their discussion of “yo escribo” and then do the same for additional action words and phrases: yo canto/canto [I sing] and yo corro/corro [I run]. After visiting a student in an art class, they also talk about yo pinto [I paint], yo dibujo [I draw], and yo coloreo [I color].

The next topic in this lesson is telling time. La maestra initiates the transition into this topic below:

Maestra: Yo pinto. Muy bien. Excelente. Well, we’ve been asking the question, “¿Qué haces tú?,” What are you doing?, but here’s another question for you. Let’s see if you can read this question right off the top of the screen.

Kipper: ¿Qué hora es?

Maestra: ¿Qué hora es? ¿Qué hora es? Well, we know qué means what and hora looks like the word hour in English, doesn’t it?

Kipper: Sí.

Maestra: So we might be talking about [Her voice trails off.].

Kipper: What time is it? What time is it? [The beginning of the following utterance overlaps this one.]

Maestra: What time is it? What hour is it? ¿Qué hora es? And this is an easy, easy one to answer. Let’s practice. (Español para ti: Level 5, 1996, Lesson 14; Transcript, 10/19/04)

While the lesson was in progress, I watched the actions of my four case study participants, noting, for example: “Corro came up on the video and later Pinto, at which point both Claire and Ciara were writing” (Field notes, 10/19/04). It wasn’t until later, however, that I saw what Claire had written on her card. I have placed the information contained on Claire’s card in Figure 1.
The lesson was mostly about actions or action words.

Figure 1. Information on Claire’s Saber es poder card for Lesson 14.

At the close of the Español para ti lesson Mr. Baxter instructed his students to finish up their cards. Then he engaged them in a discussion about the lesson, first saying that he would like someone to “share with us what they thought the main idea” of the lesson was and then continuing as follows:

Mr. Baxter: There were kind of two [main ideas], but there was one that was a little bit longer and bigger at the very beginning of the lesson. Colleen.

Colleen: Learning how to tell time.

Mr. Baxter: No, that was at the end. That was [Claire raises her hand.] the smaller lesson in that whole lesson here. What was the one at the beginning? Claire.

Claire: Action. [It is possible that at that point the last line on Claire’s card read, “The lesson was mostly about action.”]

Mr. Baxter: Action words. So I think that would be the one that you would want to have on your card, and then there were some words that went along with actions. Can anyone share a couple of those Spanish words that went along with actions? Uh, Damarcus.

Damarcus: Yo [unintelligible].

Mr. Baxter: Brittany.

Brittany: Canto.

Mr. Baxter: Canto. And what does canto mean?

Brittany: Singing.


Colleen: Yo color, [Claire raises her hand.] calo. I don’t know how to pronounce it.

Mr. Baxter: And what does it mean?

Colleen: Color.
Mr. Baxter: Coloring, all right. Uh, Claire.
Claire: Yo pinto.
Mr. Baxter: And what does that mean?
Claire: Paint.
Mr. Baxter: Paint. And notice again how some of the words in Spanish, uh, you can figure them out by looking at the way they are formed. So, you know you can become a detective here, and sometimes you can see the Spanish word, and you know right away what it means. Uh, give your cards to Colleen. She's going to be the one picking out the best cards today. (Transcript, 10/19/04)

In the normal course of Spanish instruction, the cards picked that day by Colleen, a White girl described by one Dolphin Point teacher as “12 going on 20” (Field notes, 5/2/05), would have been used 2 days later in the Saber es poder portion of a lesson in the Tele Café. However, Mrs. Ford was out on Thursday, October 21, due to the death of her aunt, and the following Thursday the students attended a special Spanish play instead of going to the Tele Café. Thus it was that the next occasion on which Saber es poder cards from Mr. Baxter’s class were featured in a lesson in the Tele Café was on November 4, and it so happened that both of the cards Mrs. Ford went over in that videoconferencing session with the class at Greenwood Park were from Lesson 14 on October 19. (Although three cards are mentioned by Mrs. Ford toward the beginning of the Saber es poder segment, she actually features two.) In the following lesson excerpt, Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten first establish that the classes they are leading brought cards, and then Mrs. Ford begins to talk about the Lesson 14 card prepared by Jane. I include this excerpt before presenting one in which the time question on Claire’s card is featured, because Mrs. Ford talks about information on Jane’s card that is very similar to that on Claire’s card:

Mrs. Ford: ¿Tu clase trajo Saber es poder? [Your class brought Saber es poder?]
Mr. Straten: Pues, sí, señora, el grupo de señor Allen es muy fiel con Saber es poder, y estamos listos. [Why, yes, ma’am, Mr. Allen’s group is very faithful with Saber es poder, and we’re ready.]
Mrs. Ford: Y el grupo de señor Baxter también. Es muy chévere. [And Mr. Baxter’s group, too. It’s really neat.]
Mr. Straten: Bueno, señora. Vayan primero si quieren. [All right, ma’am. You all go first if you want.]
Mr. Straten: Señora, lea otra vez, y puedo demostrar si quieren. [Read them again, ma’am, and I can demonstrate if you all want.] (Transcript, 11/4/04)
At this point, Mrs. Ford reads each of the action phrases on Jane’s card again, and Mr. Straten acts them out. When he has finished, Mrs. Ford tells him how good that had been and puts her hands together lightly. Edward picks up on this and starts clapping. Then Mrs. Ford prompts the rest of the students to clap (Field notes, 11/4/04).

Mr. Straten’s turn to go over a Saber es poder card comes next. After he and Mrs. Ford discuss several parts of a house, prompted by the vocabulary on a card at Greenwood Park, Mrs. Ford talks about Claire’s card, repeating her time-telling question as part of a rhyme on the subject:

Mrs. Ford: Pues, quiero, quiero enseñarle una cosa más aquí. ¿Qué hora es? ¿Qué hora es? ¿Es la una, o son las diez? [Mr. Straten: Son las diez.] No, no, no. Y mira qué bien, qué bien lo escribí. [Mrs. Ford doesn’t mention that hora is written as horo on the card.] ¿Qué hora? [Translation: Well, I want, I want to show you one more thing here. What time is it? What time is it? Is it one o’clock or ten o’clock? No, no, no. And look how well, how well it is written.]

Mr. Straten: Señora, acerca la cámara [unintelligible]. [Pause.] Si puedes. Exacto. OK. Otra vez, señora. [Translation: Ma’am, bring the camera in (unintelligible). (Pause). If you can. Exactly. Okay. Once more, ma’am.]

Mrs. Ford: ¿Qué hora es? ¿Qué hora es? ¿Qué hora es? ¿Es la una, o son las diez? No, no, no. Son las siete. [Translation: What time is it? What time is it? What time is it? Is it one o’clock or ten o’clock? No, no, no. It’s seven o’clock.]

Mr. Straten: Muy bien. Son las siete.

Mrs. Ford: Excelente.

Mrs. Ford: ¡Qué bien! Pues, aplausos [There is a little applause.] a estos niños [There is more applause. Mr. Straten: Señora, aplausos.] y a los maestros. ¿Quién es? [At this point, Claire whispers over her right shoulder to Jane, who is sitting slightly back from her.] Jane, Jane. [Jane gets up.] Excelente. [Jane goes over to Mrs. Ford, takes her card, and goes on to place it on the Knowledge Wall.] Eh, no sé. ¿De quién es? Ah, Montgomery. [Translation: How good! Well, applause for these children and for their teachers. Who is it? Jane, Jane. Excellent. Eh, I don’t know. Whose is it? Ah, Montgomery.] (Transcript, 11/4/04)

This sequence ends with Mrs. Ford pointing to Claire, who gets up, takes her card, and places it on the Knowledge Wall with the other cards that have been used in instruction in the Tele Café up to that date (Field notes, 11/4/04). Claire’s card remained there on the Wall until the last week of classes when Mrs. Ford invited me to remove it, along with others from Mr. Baxter’s class (Field notes, 5/12/05).

Because the use of the Saber es poder cards in lessons stopped before the end of the school year, when I interviewed Claire on May 2, she took a retrospective view in explaining them: “At the beginning of the year, we would
have to write some vocabulary words, and then we would, at the end of the video, we would have to write what the main idea was” (Interview, 5/2/05).

**Further Examples of Claire’s Spanish Utterances in Context.** The previous section contains an example of Claire’s participation in a discussion of an *Español para ti* lesson. Discussions of this type, led by Mr. Baxter, provided a setting in which Claire appeared comfortable with raising her hand and taking part, although she didn’t do this very often.

There were two occasions following *Español para ti* lessons when Mr. Baxter let the students know that he would be calling on each of them to participate. On the first occasion, Mr. Baxter asked the students to come up with a math problem in Spanish to share with the class (Field notes, 11/30/04), and on the second, he assigned numbers from 1 to 98 to the students one by one, so that most students gave the names of four numbers in Spanish (Field notes, 1/19/05). Because Claire’s response in giving a math problem stood out, I will include a portion of the transcript from that day here, starting with Jane’s turn in order to provide context:

Mr. Baxter: Jane.
Jane: Uno por uno son uno. [One times one equals one.]
Mr. Baxter: All right. Thank you, and, um, Claire. Turn around to us, and speak loudly. [Pause.]
Claire: Trescientos y veinte más quinientos y veinte son ochocientos y. [Pause. Translation: Three hundred and twenty plus five hundred and twenty are eight hundred and.]
Mr. Baxter: All I can say is ay, ay, ay. [Mr. Baxter and some children laugh softly. Big number. [Mr. Baxter laughs softly.] Thank you; you just made my day. Only thing worse than doing math is doing math in Spanish. (Transcript, 11/30/04).

The purpose of the number-naming activity, following an *Español para ti* video on January 19, was to prepare for a concentration game in the Tele Café the next day (Field notes, 1/19/05). The context of the game, in which students were to match the names of capitals and countries, turned out to be a Spanish instructional session that Mrs. Ford led without videoconferencing, because Mr. Allen’s class at Greenwood Park was involved in an activity related to the presidential inauguration (Field notes, 1/20/05). Claire participated in the game, naming two numbers. In the following excerpt, Mrs. Ford first reviews for Claire the names of the numbers that still remain in one set. Claire names one, is shown and told the name of the capital that corresponds to that number, and then names a number from the other set:

Mrs. Ford: Treinta y siete, sesenta y cuatro, catorce, cincuenta y dos, cuarenta y uno. [37, 64, 14, 52, 41.]
Claire: Cuarenta y uno.
A voice: Shh! [Pause. Some background noise.]
Claire: [Unintelligible] y tres.
Mrs. Ford and other voices: Salvador.
Mrs. Ford: El Salvador. No, no, no. (Transcript, 1/20/05)

Claire’s other Spanish utterances in instructional sessions in the Tele Café without videoconferencing were brief, as well. Most occurred during the calendar segment and involved the current date, the date of her birthday, and the number of days in April (Field notes, 11/11/04, 12/16/04, 4/14/05, 4/28/05). She was present for the line-up activity on December 16, and correctly named San Juan as the capital of Puerto Rico (Field notes, 12/16/04). The rest of her Spanish utterances in this setting are from April 14. Besides answering a calendar question that day, Claire answered a question about a member of the family that had appeared in the Spanish play her class had seen 3 days before, and she took part in the Spanish baseball game (Field note, 4/14/05).

There were few instances of Claire participating as an individual during videoconferencing sessions. On November 18, she responded to Mrs. Ford’s question about the name of the fifth country in a chant of countries and capitals (Field notes, 11/18/04). On February 3, she took part in a game of ticktacktoe, responding to the prompt Mr. Straten gave (after one Claire’s classmates had selected a number) and repeating her answer at the request of Mrs. Ford:

Mr. Straten: A ver, ¿cuál es la pregunta? Momentico. Disculpen. Dice, “La capital del Ecuador es [His voice trails off here.]” Pues, miren. La capital del Ecuador, ¿cuál es, Dolphin Point? [Let’s see; what’s the question? Just a moment. Excuse me. It says, “The capital of Ecuador is (His voice trails off here.).” Well, look. The capital of Ecuador, what is it, Dolphin Point?]
Child’s voice [whispers]: Chile.
Mrs. Ford: ¿Cuál es?
Child’s voice [very quietly]: Quito.
Child’s voice [very quietly]: Ou, ou!
Claire [very quietly]: Quito.
Mrs. Ford: Otra vez. ¿Qué es? [Again. What is it?]
Claire: Quito.
Mrs. Ford: Quito.
Mr. Straten: La capi [Child’s voice: Squito (sic)]. Ah, aplausos, Quito. [Applause.] Y miren. Digan conmigo, por favor, amigos: [Translation: The capi. Ah, applause, Quito. And look. Please, say with me, friends.]
Mr. Straten and Mrs. Ford: Ta te ti. [Ticktacktoe.] (Transcript, 2/3/05)

When Greenwood Park got the clue, “Quito es la capital de ______,” in the very next turn, Claire and her friend Laurie said, “Ecuador,” to each other quietly (Field notes, 2/3/05).

Claire answered several questions during cooking sessions (Field notes, 10/11/04, 1/26/05), including one from a classmate about how to say cheese in Spanish, but I would like to concentrate now on her Spanish utterances during the jeopardy game in which she assumed the role of captain/spokesperson. Mrs.
Ford led this game, which took place in the classroom of Mr. Baxter, who had spent hours preparing it (Field notes, 11/19/04).

As the jeopardy game began, Mr. Baxter prompted Claire’s group, El delfín [The Dolphin], concerning the selection they needed to make. Claire responded by giving her group’s selection as “Número cien” [Number 100]. Mrs. Ford interpreted this as her choice for number of points but soon ascertained that Claire wanted Números as the category:

- Mr. Baxter: So, El delfín, you need to pick a category and an amount.
- Somebody.
- Claire: Número cien.
- Mrs. Ford: Cien. Pais, Verbos, Oraciones, Animales, o Números. [100. Country, Verbs, Sentences, Animals, or Numbers.]
- Claire: [Unintelligible.]

(Transcript, 11/19/04)

When shown a large sheet of paper with the number “1” written on it, Claire was easily able to supply the correct answer, “uno.”

Following the next group’s turn, Mrs. Ford sent Colleen over to the Tele Café to get Mr. Straten (who had been meeting with her there), saying, “He needs to see this.” Mr. Straten soon entered the room with a FLES teacher from another school, and Mrs. Ford said to them, “Los invito a ver este juego tan fantástico” [I invite you to see this game that is so terrific] (Transcript, 11/19/04).

When it was the turn of El delfín again, Claire gave the group’s selection as “Verbos, doscientos” [Verbs, 200]. Mrs. Ford demonstrated the action of sitting down, while showing a picture of this. She gave the clue, “Levántense. Sí” [Stand up, si], with her voice trailing off at the end, and Claire responded, “¿Sienta?” After Mrs. Ford had repeated the clue, Claire gave the expected answer, “Siéntense” [Sit down] (Field notes & transcript, 11/19/04).

For the next turn of El delfín, Claire gave “Oraciones” [Sentences] as the category and “trescientos” [300] as the number of points. Mrs. Ford asked, “¿Cuántos años tienes?” [How old are you?] As a clue, she started to talk in Spanish about how old Abuela [Grandmother] might be, and Mr. Straten joined in, suggesting different ages for Abuela, ranging from 68 to 100. Mrs. Ford restated the question: “¿Cuántos años? ¿Cuántos? ¿Cuántos años tienes tú? Sí, no Abuela, tú.” [Literally: How many years? How many? How many years do you have? Yes, not Grandmother, you.] Claire answered, “Diez” [Ten], and after some further prompting, she added, “años.”

In El delfín’s next turn, Claire gave the group’s selection as “Animales, quinientos” [Animals, 500] but changed to “cuatrocientos” [400] as the number of points when she learned that 500 had already been taken. Mrs. Ford showed a picture of a cow. Several children identified it correctly as “vaca” (Field notes & transcript, 11/19/04).

Claire participated in one more turn before being called out of the room to receive a reward for having donated canned goods. She gave El delfín’s selection (with some prompting in between) as “Números . . . por . . . trescientos”
Mrs. Ford showed the number 99 written on a sheet of paper and began to sing: “Diez, veinte, treinta, cuarenta, [other voices join in] cincuenta, sesenta, setenta, [clap, clap] ochenta” [10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80]. Then the following interaction took place:

Claire: Nochenta [sic] y nueve. [Background noise.]
Mr. Straten: Setenta, ochenta.
Mrs. Ford: Say, say it again so that Señor Straten can hear you, and see what he says.
Edward: You can’t get another answer.
Darmarcus: Noventa. [Darmarcus, who isn’t in El delfín, puts his hand over his mouth. Background noise.]
Mr. Straten: Setenta, ochenta, y
Claire: Noventa
Mr. Straten: y
Claire: y nueve. [Background noise, applause.]
Mrs. Ford: ¡Bravo, bravo! [Background noise.] (Transcript, 11/19/04)

Claire’s participation as captain of her group in the jeopardy game shows that, although she usually didn’t produce many Spanish utterances as an individual in the regular course of instruction, she was able to produce more when she received additional encouragement and support.

From Claire, I will now move on to examine the language produced by Brittany. Where appropriate, I will comment on contrasts between Brittany and Claire.

Categorizing Brittany’s Oral Output in the Different Instructional Settings

Although Brittany Johnson was present for more Spanish instruction in the 2004–2005 school year than Claire, she produced even fewer Spanish utterances as an individual, the least of any of my participants. However, I wouldn’t characterize Brittany as quiet in the same way I do Claire, because Brittany’s quietness was mostly manifested in a hesitancy to say much in certain situations, such as competitive games and interviews.

When Brittany did participate in Spanish classes as an individual, she spoke with enough volume that I rarely had difficulty in hearing her clearly enough to determine whether her utterances contained errors or not. In fact, I only had difficulty in hearing 3 out of the 31 Spanish utterances that I gleaned from my observations and recordings over 7 months. Of the remaining 28 utterances, 7 involved errors.

Pronunciation errors occurred in three of Brittany’s utterances. In one a voiced, alveolar trill phoneme should have been produced for the -rr- in corro but wasn’t (Field notes, 1/18/05), and in another Brittany said, “veintisiete,” instead of the correct veintisiete (or veinte y siete; transcript, 1/27/05). The other pronunciation error was probably related to reading (Transcript, 12/2/04), as I will explain later.

Several errors are hard to categorize. During a videoconferencing session, Brittany, in referring to Fat Albert, said, “Gande Albert” (Transcript,
The first word resembles *grande* [big, large] (thus, a pronunciation error), but a better lexical selection would have been *gordo* [fat]. During Lesson 28 of *Español para ti*, after the video teacher had said, “Sí, el payaso es alto” [Yes, the (male) clown is tall.], Brittany said, “alta,” which appears to be a case in which an adjective doesn’t agree in gender with the noun it modifies (a morphosyntactic error), or, depending on what Brittany had in mind when she uttered the word, it may not be in error after all (*Español para ti: Level 5*, 1996; Transcript, 1/13/05).

The problems in the remaining utterances involving error are more straightforward. In one instance, Brittany selected the wrong lexical item, *uno*, when Mrs. Ford gave a choice between *uno* [one] and *primero* [first] for the date on October 1 (Field notes, 10/1/04). Another of Brittany’s utterances contains an English word (Transcript, 11/30/04) and might perhaps be better classified as “nontargetlike” (see Panova & Lyster, 2002) but has been grouped here with utterances involving error.

As was the case with Claire, all of Brittany’s Spanish utterances were from one to three words in length, with the exception of a math problem prepared in advance. This was seven words in length, including one word in English (Transcript, 11/30/04).

Brittany’s utterances were also characterized by their limited range of vocabulary. In Table 6, I present a categorization of Brittany’s utterances, according to the type of vocabulary on which they were based and the instructional settings in which they occurred.

The differences in the types of vocabulary used by Claire and Brittany are partly due to the types of activities in which they participated. For example, because Brittany didn’t participate in a jeopardy game, none of her utterances are based on “Category” and “Category & number,” as are five of Claire’s utterances. In fact, Brittany didn’t participate in any games; she produced her Spanish utterances in activities that didn’t involve the awarding of points for correct answers. For example, she took advantage of opportunities to practice description, telling time, and using action words during some *Español para ti* lessons (Field notes, 10/13/04, 10/20/04, 12/14/04, 12/15/04, 1/18/05). Table 7 shows how many utterances Brittany produced in various activities in the different instructional settings.
### Table 6

**Brittany. Number of Spanish Utterances Classified by Type of Vocabulary and Instructional Setting From October 1, 2004, Through May 5, 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of vocabulary</th>
<th>Instruction: Tele Café</th>
<th>Español para ti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No VC: Ford</td>
<td>VC: Ford &amp; Straten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action word</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date &amp; calendar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Me gusta”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Utterance length = a word to a sentence. NA = not applicable (not present); VC = videoconferencing. “I like.”*

I have used this section to give an overview of Brittany’s output in terms of the number and kinds of errors she made, the length of her utterances, the types of vocabulary she used, and the types of activities in which she produced utterances as an individual. The following sections are devoted to an examination of Brittany’s oral and written output in the instructional settings in which they occurred. “Brittany’s Participation in the Tele Café” places Brittany’s utterances in the context of the Spanish instruction she received in the Tele Café without videoconferencing, in the context of videoconferencing sessions led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten, and in the context of the videoconferencing session that Mr. Straten led (with Mrs. Ford in the background). This section will also point out examples of Brittany’s nonverbal participation and instances when she raised her hand but wasn’t called on. The next section, “Brittany’s Oral Production in Relation to Video Lessons,” contains examples that place her utterances in context both during and after *Español para ti* lessons. Brittany’s written output on a Saber es poder card is presented and discussed in the following section.
Table 7
Brittany. Number of Spanish Utterances Per Type of Activity in Different Instructional Settings From October 1, 2004, Through May 5, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activity</th>
<th>Instruction: Tele Café</th>
<th>Español para ti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No VC: Ford</td>
<td>VC: Ford &amp; Straten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar segment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line-up activity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not part of activity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number activity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice action words</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice description</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice telling time</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share likes &amp; dislikes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Utterance length = a word to a sentence. NA = not applicable (not present); VC = videoconferencing.

Brittany’s Participation in the Tele Café

It is interesting to note that Brittany produced the majority of her Spanish utterances in the Tele Café at the beginning and end of class and, therefore, not during videoconferencing sessions. Another Spanish utterance that she produced in a session without videoconferencing occurred during a geography activity. Her participation in the calendar segment of lessons occurred in each of the three instructional settings in the Tele Café: a session without videoconferencing, a videoconferencing session led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten, and the one videoconferencing session led by Mr. Straten for which she was present. Brittany also participated in an activity in which students shared likes and dislikes during a videoconferencing session led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten.

Brittany produced four utterances that weren’t part of a teaching activity at the beginning of class on December 2, 2004. Mr. Baxter was absent from school that day, but a substitute teacher stayed with his class during Spanish, sitting at
the back of the Tele Café. Not many students were in the room at first, and Mrs. Ford told the ones who were there how they should be arranged on the rug. Edward reacted to her directions by repeating the Spanish names of two items that were written on the rug. Apparently, Brittany was trying to read el pollo off the rug when she said, “el polo.” She seemed to be in a talkative mood and made several comments in English both before and after the singing of the Buenas tardes song, causing Mrs. Ford to caution, “No inglés. ¿Yo oigo inglés?” [No English. Do I hear English?]. Soon after that, at the time there was the sound of a ringing telephone (indicating that Mr. Straten was making a videoconferencing connection), Brittany said, “Tres; tres” [Three; three] and subsequently said, “Tres,” two more times (Field notes & transcript, 12/2/04).

Beginning on November 4, students who participated in Chorus were dismissed before Spanish instructional sessions in the Tele Café ended (Field notes, 11/4/04), and so from that date until the end of the school year, Brittany, a Chorus student, was only present for two line-up activities in the Tele Café. (Line-up activities were never part of videoconferencing sessions.) One of these activities occurred on December 16, at the end of the last Spanish class before the Winter Holidays. On this occasion, Brittany correctly gave Panamá as the capital of Panamá (Field notes, 12/16/04).

The best example of oral output by Brittany in the Tele Café took place on February 24, in the other line-up activity for which she was present following November 4. The videoconferencing connection had ended at 1:57 that day, due to a fire drill at Greenwood Park. Chorus had been canceled at Dolphin Point, and Mr. Baxter seemed to indicate that because of this, the Spanish class could keep going, which it did. Later, Mrs. Ford received a telephone call in the Tele Café. When she turned from the phone without having hung up, Mr. Baxter suggested that his class leave without a line-up activity. Mrs. Ford decided to let a student lead the activity and chose Colleen, because she was sitting nicely. At first Mrs. Ford said that the activity would involve the names of numbers, but then she changed it to the names of colors. Colleen, who had entered Dolphin Point in the fourth grade, indicated that she needed help, and Mrs. Ford chose Brittany, who had her hand raised and was sitting nicely at the front right, where she had been directed to sit by Mr. Baxter at the beginning of class:

Mr. Baxter: We'll, we'll go quietly, Miss Ford.
Mrs. Ford: Well, wait a minute; wait a minute. I'm gonna choose a teacher.
Mr. Baxter [correcting a student]: Stop it!
Mrs. Ford: You can do this. Let's see. Somebody who's still sitting very nicely. Colleen, would you like to do this? Would you like to be the teacher and call numbers? [Colleen nods.] You were sitting very nicely. Come over here. [Colleen gets up and goes to the front. Slight pause.] Call, call the colors, and if she needs help, then, then they can help you. Colleen: I don't know any of them.
Mrs. Ford: Okay. Then let me. Wait a minute; hold on. Stay right here. Stay right here. Do you know 'em? [Mrs. Ford talks to Brittany.] Good,
you’re also sitting nicely. So with, between the both of you. Okay?
[Background noise.] You can help her. [Mrs. Ford goes into her office.
Pause; background noise.]
Brittany [whispers very quietly]: Café. [Brown.]
Colleen: Café.
Mr. Baxter: We’re gonna line up at the back door. [Pause; background
noise.]
Brittany: Verde. [Green.]
Mrs. Ford [coming back from her office on her way to the classroom
telephone]: Verde. [Very quietly:] Verde. [Pause; background noise.]
Brittany: Blanco. [White.]
Mrs. Ford: [Unintelligible]. Her extension is 1-0-4-6. [Background noise.]
And I’m gonna try to transfer you. I’m hoping it will work, but if it doesn’t,
I’m sorry. [Pause.] Okay, bye.
Child’s voice: Gris. [Translation: Gray. Pause; background noise.]
Brittany: Uh, rojo. [Translation: Uh, red. Pause; background noise.]
Colleen [looks at a color card in her hand]: Wait. Green. I gotta go.
Child’s voice [laughing]: Green.
Mrs. Ford: Were you able to do it? [Brittany laughs briefly.]
Colleen: She told me what they were, and I said it. (Field notes &
transcript, 2/24/05)

Brittany also participated in a geography activity in the context of a
Spanish instructional session without videoconferencing. On December 9, the
students in Mr. Allen’s class at Greenwood Park were involved in a tornado drill.
At Dolphin Point, Mrs. Ford led Mr. Baxter’s class in an activity in which a student
was to reach into a container and take out the cutout of a Spanish-speaking
country of Central America or the Caribbean or a cutout of the United States.
Next the student was to read its name, which was written on it, place it on a map,
and give the name of its capital. Both Brittany and Ciara raised their hands for
the first turn, which went to Tim. Brittany raised her hand again for the second
turn. She was selected for the fourth turn, got up from the spot where she
usually sat at the back right, took Costa Rica out of the container, said its name,
and placed it on the map. She wasn’t able to give the name of its capital,
however (Field notes & transcript, 12/9/04).

Brittany also participated or raised her hand in geography activities during
videoconferencing sessions led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten, but she didn’t
produce any Spanish utterances in them. On January 27, a student at
Greenwood Park was supposed to name Argentina first, but Brittany got up to
label it on a map in the Tele Café before the student had done that (Field notes,
1/27/05). In a videoconferencing session in February, there was an activity that
involved taking a card with the name of a Florida city written on it out of a
container and pointing to the city on a map. Brittany raised her hand both when it
was Dolphin Point’s turn and when it was Greenwood Park’s turn (Field notes,
2/24/05).
Brittany produced two Spanish utterances in an activity having to do with likes and dislikes that took place in a videoconferencing session led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten. In the following excerpt, Mrs. Ford first sums up the names of movies that she and some students had said they liked; then she asks for the name of another movie:

Mrs. Ford: Me gusta *Beauty and the Beast*. Me gusta *Lord of the Ring* [sic]. Me gusta *Terminator*. Me gusta *Dodgeball*. Dolphin Point, otro más. [I like *Beauty and the Beast*. . . . Dolphin Point, one more.]

Mr. Straten: Dolphin Point.
Brittany: *Fat Albert*.
Mrs. Ford: Me, me, me gusta.
Brittany: Me gus [background noise].
Mrs. Ford: Shh, shh, shh! Un momento. [Just a moment.] Me
Brittany: Me gusta Gande [sic] Albert.
Mrs. Ford [laughs]: Muy bien. Me gusta *Fat Alberts* [sic], dice la niña. [Laughter in the background.] Me gusta Grande Albert. [Very good. The girl says, I like *Fat Alberts*. I like Big Albert.]

Mr. Straten: Ah, Grande Albert.
Mrs. Ford: Albert el Gordo. [Translation: Albert the Fat One. Child’s voice: Gordo. Background noise.] (Transcript, 1/13/05)

Brittany participated in the calendar segment of lessons in instructional sessions both with and without videoconferencing. In a session without videoconferencing on October 1, she made an attempt to give the date correctly after Mrs. Ford had given a choice between uno [one] and primero [first]. When Brittany said, “uno,” Mrs. Ford explained how primero is used in Spanish (Field notes, 10/1/04). On January 27 in a videoconferencing session led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten, Brittany gave the response, “Veintesiete” [sic], to Mrs. Ford’s question, “Y en Dolphin Point, ¿Hoy es jueves seis, trece, veinte, o veintisiete?” [And at Dolphin Point, today is Thursday the 6th, 13th, 20th, or 27th?] (Transcript, 1/27/05). On March 31 in the only videoconferencing session led by Mr. Straten for which Brittany was present, she correctly answered that the day was “jueves” [Thursday]. The interaction that came before and immediately after this response can be seen in the following excerpt. It is worth noting that Mrs. Ford, although not leading the lesson, continued to prompt the students who were with her. This prompting includes a comment to the effect that the answer should be directed to Mr. Straten and not to her.


Mrs. Ford [quietly]: Dolphin Point.
Child’s voice [barely audible]: Jueves.

Mrs. Ford [quietly]: ¿Qué día es hoy?
Child’s voice [barely audible]: Jueves.
As happened with Claire, Brittany benefited from prompting and verbal support for the language she produced, as can be seen in the activity in which she said she liked *Fat Albert*. Also similar to the case of Claire as a captain in the Spanish jeopardy game, Brittany, in helping Colleen with the Spanish names of colors, showed that she could produce more Spanish than usual when she was put in a position where someone else was relying on her Spanish output for the accomplishment of a task. No similar situation arose in connection with video lessons in Mr. Baxter’s room, but Brittany did take advantage of opportunities there to produce Spanish utterances.

**Brittany’s Oral Output in Relation to Video Lessons**

Brittany produced Spanish utterances both during and after *Español para ti* lessons. From time to time, she would orally respond to prompts in the lessons (Field notes, 10/13/04, 10/20/04, 12/15/04, 1/18/05; Transcripts 12/14/04, 12/15/04). On October 13, for example, after Ciara had pushed her elbow from the edge of his desk that adjoined hers, indicating that the surface of his desk was his space, I whispered, “Watch,” to them and pointed at the television. After I had whispered it again, they seemed to pay attention. I heard Brittany say, “canto” [I sing], “bato” [I mix], and “echo” [I throw] at the appropriate times in an activity for practicing action words (Field notes, 10/13/04).

Brittany also took part in *Español para ti* activities in which a male and a female clown are described (Lesson 28). In the following excerpt, she uses the feminine form of an adjective after the video teacher has described the male clown. I will begin the excerpt with the video teacher saying that the female clown is pretty and asking what the male clown is like. Brittany’s use of *alta* and the subsequent discussion with another student happened while the video teacher was talking:

Maestra: Bonita. Sí, la payasa es bonita. You have used the word *bonita*, because you are describing la payasa. Uno más. [Child’s voice: Alta.]
Woo, ¿cómo es el payaso?
Child’s voice: Alto, alto, alto, alto.
Child’s voice: Alto.
Child’s voice: o-o-o.
Maestra: Es alto. [Background noise.] Sí, el payaso es alto. And you have used the word [Brittany: Alta.] *alto*, because [Child’s voice: Alto.] you are describing [Brittany: I know that.] el payaso. [Child’s voice: No, you don’t.] Muy bien, excelente. [Castanets.] ¿Cómo es?, that’s a question we can use to ask for a description of people, ¿sí? (*Español para ti: Level 5, 1996; Transcript, 12/15/04*)
Another type of activity in which Brittany participated during an Español para ti lesson provided practice in telling time. She responded to the question, ¿Qué hora es? [What time is it?] with “nueve” [9] and “una” [1] before each of these times was given as the correct answer (Field notes, 10/20/04).

Activities after Español para ti lessons provided another context in which Brittany produced Spanish utterances. Brittany’s contribution of “canto” [I’m singing] after Mr. Baxter’s request for “Spanish words that went along with actions” (Transcript, 10/19/04) was included in the material that I presented to follow one of Claire’s Saber es poder cards through its life cycle.

In a postvideo activity on October 26, Brittany used canto as an action word again. When Lesson 16 of Español para ti ended on that day, Mr. Baxter made the following request of the class: “Could someone share an action word with us and ask a person in the classroom to do that action, please?” Although the class had been exposed to informal (second-person singular) commands through Cha-cha-cha songs in Lessons 7-8, 11-13, and 15-16 of Español para ti (Steele & Johnson, 1999), the activity proceeded with students using verbs in their first-person singular form, which had been presented in Lessons 13-16 (Steele & Johnson, 1999). The only exception was Elena, a native speaker of Spanish, who used an informal command, “Escribe” [Write]. When questioned about this by Mr. Baxter, Elena explained, “Escribo [I write; I am writing] is like when you’re writing” (Transcript, 10/26/04). Edward had the next turn, and then Brittany, whose hand was raised, was selected by Mr. Baxter:

Mr. Baxter: Uh, Brittany.

Brittany: Ciara. [As Brittany says this, she looks over her right shoulder at Ciara, who is sitting next to her, and smiles.]

Mr. Baxter: Ciara.

Brittany: Canto [I sing; I’m singing].

Child’s voice: Oh, that’s easy.

Ciara: Running. [Ciara starts to get up.]

Brittany: Singing, boy. Singing.

Ciara: Singing, my goodness, my goodness. [Ciara puts his palms down against his thighs three times, and Brittany laughs.]

Mr. Baxter: Well, but we need to know the action words. (Field notes & transcript, 10/26/04)

Not all of the students in the class were expected to contribute an action word on October 26 but were all supposed to share a math problem with the class on November 30. Following Claire’s addition problem with large numbers that impressed Mr. Baxter so much, Emily gave a multiplication problem. Brittany had the next turn and shared the same multiplication problem as Emily had used:

Emily: Tres por tres son nueve. [Three times three equals nine.]

Mr. Baxter: Son nueve. Okay, you got that one. Uh, Brittany.

Child’s voice: Ciara.

Brittany: Tres por tres equals nueve, son nueve. (Transcript, 11/30/04)

Although Brittany would sometimes respond orally to prompts given in Español para ti videos and would sometimes participate in a discussion or
activity following a video, as a whole, her oral production in relation to the videos was quite limited. The near cessation of postvideo activities in January surely was a contributing factor, but Brittany’s conception of video lessons should also be taken into account. When I asked her in January, “What are the main differences between the videos and Spanish in the Tele Café?” she responded, “Sometimes we have fun over there, and over here we just sit down and write things, what we see, what we see on video” (Interview, 1/21/05). I will consider some of Brittany’s written production in the next section.

**Brittany’s Saber Es Poder Cards**

Only one of Brittany’s Saber es poder cards (probably from Lesson 9 of *Español para ti*, presented on September 16, 2004) made it up on the Knowledge Wall in the Tele Café. Another of her cards (from Lesson 32) was selected on January 12 by Willie, who stapled it to a board that was used as a Knowledge Wall in Mr. Baxter’s room (Field notes, 1/12/05). Not all cards that received the distinction of this intermediate step were used in a lesson in the Tele Café. In this case, cards by Ciara, Lucy, and Laurie were used in the Tele Café the next day (Field notes, 1/13/05).

Brittany’s card from September that was on the Tele Café’s Knowledge Wall displays a different style than the one Brittany established a little later and maintained. Although there are signs of erasure on one side of this card, the finished product is confined to the other side, on which Brittany wrote with the card oriented vertically.

Brittany’s card from November 30, 2004, provides a more typical example of her work. She wrote the main idea of the lesson and some vocabulary words on one side of the card, all of which I have placed in Figure 2. On the reverse side, Brittany made a list of vocabulary words and also wrote the math problem that she shared in class that day, described in the previous section on Brittany’s oral output in relation to video lessons. The information from this reverse side of the card can be seen in Figure 3.

Brittany’s statement of the main idea contains a misspelling of *addresses*, and the material she copies from the *Español para ti* lesson contains two mistakes: “Tráeme” for *tráeme* [bring me] and “halbo” for *hablo* [I speak]. She misspells the numbers in her math problem, giving “thres” for *tres* and “neve” for *nueve* but pronounces the words well when she reads the problem for the class.
Today’s main idea is . . . Brittany about addresses and Johnson Street numbers. Here are 11-30-04 Lesson 23 Some words that I Learned in today’s lesson, Juego, tengo, Dibuja, Borra, Dame, Dale, Traeme, levanto, arte, Vivo en those words help me.

Figure 2. Information on one side of Brittany’s Saber es poder card for Lesson 23.

vivo en Juego
bailo tengo 3 X 3 = 9
halbo Dibuja thres por thres
levanto Borra son neve
Camino Dame
arte Dale
Pinto Traeme
escribo Como

Figure 3. Information on the reverse side of Brittany’s Saber es poder card for Lesson 23.

Brittany could often be seen writing on a Saber es poder card during Español para ti lessons and would sometimes sit and look at her card, something I observed her doing on five occasions. In our final interview, when I asked her how she feels when her Saber es poder card is selected and shown to students in the class at the other school, she answered, “I feel comfortable and proud” (Interview 5/2/05).

In moving from Brittany to Ciara in this discussion of the language produced by my participants, I move to a student who produced more utterances
in a greater variety of activities. The utterances he produced were also based on a wider range of vocabulary. However, like the utterances of Claire and Brittany, those of Ciara were usually only one to three words in length.

**Categorizing Ciara’s Oral Output in the Different Instructional Settings**

Ciara Nivea produced 83 Spanish utterances, more than the combined number of utterances produced by both Claire and Brittany. Before continuing, I should note that I included in Ciara’s total number of utterances 9 that were part of a response from the class or, in two cases, at least one other student. Because of the timing of these utterances or their volume, I was able to distinguish them clearly and chose to take advantage of them in my analyses of Ciara’s output. I will do the same for Edward. I was unable to distinguish the voices of Claire and Brittany in group responses, although I did include in my analyses the instances of Claire and her friend Laurie quietly saying, “Ecuador,” to each other during instruction (Field notes, 2/3/05) and of Brittany speaking at the same time as the video teacher (Transcript, 12/15/04).

Of Ciara’s 83 utterances, I was unable to hear 10 clearly enough to determine whether they contained errors or not. Twenty-five of the remaining 73 utterances involved some type of linguistic error. (There were 4 utterances that were incorrect factually but correct linguistically; they were grouped with the other utterances that did not involve linguistic errors.)

Twenty of Ciara’s Spanish utterances were flawed because of incorrect pronunciation. In 10 instances, Ciara pronounced the name of a continent or a country in English, offering it by itself or preceded by *oh* or *uh*. Rather than excluding these from my count, I chose to include them as Spanish utterances, because they were accepted as such in class. Of the remaining utterances that involved pronunciation errors, two that consisted of “piqueño” (Transcript, 12/15/04) were of special interest to me, because I heard Mr. Baxter use this same mispronunciation of the Spanish word *pequeño* [small] (e.g., “It’s a small star, a piqueño, you know, star, too.” Transcript 1/13/05).

Ciara’s use of *piqueño* was in the context of describing a male clown. Actually, *pequeño* wasn’t the adjective the video teacher expected from students, because she subsequently provided *bajo* [short] as the correct answer. Next she asked, “¿Cómo es la payasa?” [What is the female clown like], to which Ciara responded, “Bajo” (Español para ti: Level 5, 1996, Lesson 28; Transcript, 12/15/04). I classified this as an utterance involving an error, because *bajo* does not agree in gender with *la payasa*, but the possibility does exist that Ciara was simply repeating *bajo* after some delay.

In four cases, Ciara failed to provide the correct lexical item. For a line-up activity on March 31, students were supposed to identify a member of *La Familia Contenta* from a flashcard and supply an adjective to describe that person. Ciara identified Tío [Uncle], and when prompted by Mrs. Ford’s “Tío es,” said, “tonio.” Mrs. Ford corrected him by saying, “Tonto, tonto. Muy bien. Tío es tonto” [Foolish, foolish. Very good. Uncle is foolish.] (Field notes & transcript, 3/31/05). Because *tonio* is very close to *Toño* (a nickname for Antonio), a character in
In the three other instances of failure to provide the correct lexical item, it seems that Ciara was making up words that conform to Spanish phonology. Although the *cantón* that Ciara used in two utterances (Transcript, 4/14/05) is actually a Spanish word (meaning *corner* or *canton* in English), it is not likely that Ciara would have known this.

Ciara’s utterances were usually quite brief. Only four were longer than three words in length. Two of these involved a math problem prepared in advance (Transcript, 11/30/04). Another involved Ciara’s greeting when he entered the Tele Café for a cooking session on May 5: “Hola, Cinco di [sic] mayo” (Transcript, 5/5/05). The fourth also occurred in a cooking session. On January 26, Mrs. Ford told Mr. Baxter’s class, “I want you to tell me what you like the best of everything that you’ve eaten so far.” She reminded the students of the empanadas and churros [fritters] that they had eaten in previous sessions. Many children started to respond with “churros,” but Mrs. Ford cautioned them, “Wait, wait. Since you’ve got to tell me in a sentence in Spanish. So, ‘Me, me gusta más. Me gusta más.’” Ciara jumped in, “Me gusta más churros” [I like fritters best] (Transcript, 1/26/05). (Because Mrs. Ford used *me gusta* whether the noun in a sentence was singular or plural, I didn’t count this sentence as one involving a linguistic error on Ciara’s part.)

Not only did Ciara produce more Spanish utterances than Claire and Brittany, his utterances represented a greater range of vocabulary. It is also worth noting, however, that approximately one third of his utterances are based on geography (the names of capitals, countries, a continent, and the word *mapa* [map]). (This is similar to the case of Claire, more than one third of whose utterances were based on numbers.) In Table 8, I present a categorization of Ciara’s utterances, according to the type of vocabulary on which they were based and the instructional settings in which they occurred.

Ciara also produced utterances in a greater variety of activities than did Claire and Brittany. Ciara participated in games and other types of activities but didn’t produce any utterances in a Spanish jeopardy game. The fact that he was present for more line-up activities in the Tele Café than the other participants is reflected in the higher number of utterances that he produced in this kind of activity. Table 9 provides an overview of the number of Spanish utterances Ciara produced in various activities in the different instructional settings.
Table 8
Ciara. Number of Spanish Utterances Classified by Type of Vocabulary and Instructional Setting From October 1, 2004, Through May 5, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of vocabulary</th>
<th>Instruction: Tele Café</th>
<th>Español para ti</th>
<th>Other settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No VC: Ford</td>
<td>VC: Ford</td>
<td>During</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action word</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body part</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date &amp; calendar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farewell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Me gusta&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Utterance length = a word to a sentence. VC = videoconferencing. "Me gusta" = I like."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activity</th>
<th>Instruction: Tele Café</th>
<th>Español para ti</th>
<th>Other settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No VC: Ford</td>
<td>VC: Ford &amp; Straten</td>
<td>VC: Straten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball game</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar segment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration game</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion of stars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill-in-the blank activity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography activity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line-up activity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name dances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not part of activity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number activity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this section, I have provided an overview of the utterances Ciara produced in the different instructional settings, including the number and types of errors he made, the length of his utterances, the types of vocabulary on which they were based, and the types of activities in which they occurred. I have also placed a few of his utterances in context. In the next section, I will provide further examples of Ciara’s utterances in the instructional contexts in which they occurred. A section devoted to a discussion of Ciara’s Saber es poder cards will follow.

Examples of Ciara’s Utterances in Different Instructional Settings

The 41 Spanish utterances that I have noted for Ciara during Spanish instructional sessions in the Tele Café that did not involve videoconferencing were produced on 15 different days over the course of 7 months. He produced 26 of the utterances on 7 days when there was no videoconferencing, and he produced 15 on 8 days after the videoconferencing connection had been terminated.

Because of the fact that Ciara’s utterances were spread out over various class sessions, it is difficult to provide more than a quick summary of many of them. For example, during the calendar segment of a class session without videoconferencing on October 1, 2004, Mrs. Ford had the students count by threes. Ciara’s voice stood out from the other voices when he said, “quince” [15]. His voice also stood out when he said, “veinte” [20], instead of the correct number, veintiuno [21]. A little later, I heard him quietly advise Laurie, “No inglés” [No English] (Field notes, 10/1/04). On December 9, another day on...
which there was no videoconferencing, Ciara and another student supplied the year, “dos mil cuarto” [2004], during the calendar segment. In a geography activity with cutouts of countries, Ciara took and named, “El Salvador,” and said the name of its capital, “San Salvador.” At the end of class, he named three more countries (Field notes & transcript, 12/9/04).

The Spanish baseball games took place in instructional sessions without videoconferencing. In the first one on April 14, Ciara chose to answer a question from the category for going to first base. He was shown a flashcard with a picture of Hermano [Brother] on it and was asked, “¿Quién es?” [Who is it?]. At first, he gave two wrong answers and made two strikes. Apparently Mrs. Ford didn’t hear him when he said, “Hermano,” because she told him that he had made a third strike:

Mrs. Ford: Primera [First]. ¿Quién es?
Ciara: Cantón. [Although this means corner or canton in English, it is likely that Ciara had never heard cantón before and came up with it on his own.]
Mrs. Ford: No. Strike one. Strike número uno. [Pause.]
Ciara: Cantón, Tío [Canton, Uncle].
Mrs. Ford: ¡No! ¡Strike dos!
Ciara: Hermano.
Mrs. Ford: ¡No! ¡Strike tres! ¡Out! ¡Out! ¡Out! ¡Oh! ¡No! (Field notes & transcript, 4/14/05)

In the next Spanish baseball game two weeks later, Ciara chose the homerun category, and Mrs. Ford asked him, “¿Cuál es el país que está directamente al sur de México?” [What country is directly to the south of Mexico?] Ciara gave the correct response, “Guatemala” (Field notes, 4/28/05).

In the context of the videoconferencing sessions led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten, I have noted nine Spanish utterances from Ciara. They occurred in 5 of the 12 sessions of this type that Ciara attended. Like his utterances in Spanish instruction without videoconferencing, his utterances in this setting are spread over the different sessions in which they occurred. However, one of the best examples of Ciara’s enthusiastic participation in the geography portion of a lesson can be found in a session of this type. (I have classified the activity as a question-and-answer activity rather than a geography activity, because it didn’t involve students getting up to do anything with a map.)

On December 2, 2004, Mr. Baxter’s class was small, because some of the students were already in the Chorus room, where they were practicing for the Season’s Greetings Program that would take place on December 14. Approximately 20 minutes into the videoconferencing session, the rest of the students who were in Chorus left, so that only nine students remained in the room. Ciara and Colleen, two of them, moved up toward the center of the rug. Each spent a little time trying to put his or her thumb down on the other’s thumb (Field notes & video recording, 12/2/04).

Ciara’s attention was immediately attracted by an activity in which Mrs. Ford projected a map of Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean onto one of
the television monitors, and students from the classes at Dolphin Point and Greenwood Park took turns naming the Spanish-speaking countries and answering questions about them. The question about the name of the first country, Mexico, went to Greenwood Park, but Ciara raised his right hand upward to its full extent, moved his whole torso with the motion of his hand, and then changed to having his left hand raised (Field notes & video recording, 12/2/04).

Ciara also raised his hand to name the second country, Guatemala, but another student at Dolphin Point got to give that answer. However, Ciara was given the opportunity to respond to Mrs. Ford’s question, “Y Guatemala, ¿Guatemala es grande o pequeño?” [And Guatemala, Guatemala is big or small?]. Ciara and another student correctly answered, “Pequeño,” at the same time (Field notes & transcript, 12/2/04).

The activity proceeded in a similar fashion, and Ciara got to name the eighth country, “Cuba,” which he pronounced correctly in Spanish. By this time, he had moved up a little, but Colleen was farther back, stretched out on her belly (for which she was later corrected). A question about the ninth country went to Greenwood Park. Then Mrs. Ford called on Colleen to give the name of the tenth country. Ciara whispered the answer, “Puerto Rico,” to her (Field notes & video recording, 12/2/04).

A number of factors favored Ciara’s participation in the question-and-answer activity on this day. There weren’t many students in the Tele Café, as, in fact, was also the case in the Spanish room at Greenwood Park. The subject matter was geography, which appealed to Ciara. At the front of the Tele Café, there was even a poster with the names of capitals and countries written on it, to which Ciara pointed toward the end of the activity. Finally, a chant had been used to teach the students the names of the countries and their capitals, a chant in which Ciara enthusiastically participated when it was repeated for review after the activity was over, as he had in class on November 18 (Field notes, 12/2/04, 11/18/04).

Moving on now to a consideration of the videoconferencing sessions led by Mr. Straten, I should point out that although Ciara was present for both of them, I was only able to hear him produce three utterances in one of them. On March 17, in a part of the lesson in which students at Dolphin Point and Greenwood Park (and also Mrs. Ford) were repeating phrases about Florida after Mr. Straten, I heard Ciara and others saying, “es Tallahassee” [is Tallahassee]. (This immediately followed the first part of the sentence that had been repeated: “La capital” [The capital].) Later I heard Ciara say, “fruta” [fruit] when Mr. Straten was talking about the orange blossom (as State flower) and the orange (as State fruit). Toward the end of the lesson, when the words to the song Tic tac, tic tac, el reloj [Tick-tock, tick-tock, the clock] appeared on one of the television monitors, Ciara said, “Tic tac” (Field notes & transcript, 3/17/05).

I noted 14 utterances that Ciara produced in three of the six cooking sessions. Two of the utterances have already been presented: “Me gusta más churros” [I like fritters best] (Transcript, 1/26/05), and “Hola, Cinco di [sic] mayo
day” (Transcript, 5/5/05). The latter utterance occurred at the beginning of a special cooking session to celebrate Cinco de Mayo, when Mrs. Ford was exchanging greetings with the students in Mr. Baxter’s class:

Mrs. Ford: Hola, clase. [Hi, class.]
Children’s voices: Hola.
Ciara: Hola, Cinco di [sic] mayo day.
Mrs. Ford: Cinco de mayo.
Ciara: They won the war. Mexico beat [unintelligible].
Child’s voice: They did?
Mrs. Ford: Hola, clase.
Child’s voice: Hola.
Mrs. Ford: ¿Cómo están? [How are you (plural)?]
Ciara: ¿Cómo estás tú? Muy bien. [How are you (singular)? Very well.]
(Transcript, 5/5/05)

The other utterances that Ciara produced in cooking sessions consisted of more greetings, the names of capitals and countries, and one number.

Ciara didn’t produce many utterances either during or after Español para ti lessons. Other than the three utterances (“piquiño” [sic], “piquiño” [sic], and “bajo”) that he produced during Lesson 28 on December 15 (Transcript, 12/15/04), I noted only one utterance during each of five other lessons. Two of these weren’t part of an activity. During Lesson 13, when the video teacher started talking about maps, Ciara said, “Ouuu, mapa” (Field notes, 10/13/04). At the end of Lesson 16, after the video teacher had said, “Until next time, hasta luego,” Ciara said, “Adiós” (Español para ti: Level 5, 1996; Transcript & field notes, 10/26/04).

Ciara contributed eight utterances in postvideo activities on 4 different days. On December 7, he was the first to respond, naming the salsa, when Mr. Baxter asked, “Can someone raise their hand and tell me a dance, an español dance that we went over today?” (Field notes & transcript, 12/7/04). Because many of the students in the class were away on the Chorus road trip on December 7, Mr. Baxter asked the ones who had been there to name one of the dances on the following day. Ciara supplied the name of the cha-cha-cha (Field notes, 12/8/04).

There were only two other occasions on which I observed Ciara orally participating in an activity after an Español para ti video: November 30, when all of the students were required to give a math problem in Spanish, and January 19, when they were required to say different numbers in Spanish (Field notes, 11/30/04, 1/19/05). Ciara’s oral production of Spanish on November 30 was more memorable than his oral production in January and is detailed as follows.

Ciara’s turn to give a math problem in Spanish came right after Brittany’s.

The problem that he tried to give was uno más diez son once [one plus ten equals eleven], but he pronounced más [plus] like mes [month], added the English word plus, and broke up the diphthong in diez. His attempt was greeted by a roar of laughter:

Brittany: Tres por tres equals nueve, son nueve. [She sits down.]
Mr. Baxter: Okay. Ciara. [Ciara stands up, and Brittany laughs briefly.]

Ciara: What's so funny? Uno mes plus di-ez [Children in the class laugh loudly. Brittany is even laughing with her head thrown back.]

Mr. Baxter: You're not gonna say uno más plus, no. [Child's voice: Uno más.] Uno más.

Ciara: Uno más, uh, di-ez es, son, um, um, once. [Ciara gestures with his hands as he says this, and then Brittany laughs a little.]

Mr. Baxter: What was that? Uh, one plus ten [Ciara: Yeah.] equals

Ciara: Eleven.

Mr. Baxter: Oh, okay. (Transcript, 11/30/04)

Ciara described Spanish in the Tele Café as the “real deal” and said it was “more fun” than watching the Spanish videos (Interview, 5/2/05 & transcript, 1/6/05). However, he took working on his Saber es poder cards seriously. In an interview in May, when I complimented him on the last card of his that I had seen, he responded, “Was full of stuff, wasn’t it?” (Interview, 5/2/05). The next section will cover some of Ciara’s written production on his Saber es poder cards.

### Ciara’s Saber Es Poder Cards

Two of Ciara’s Saber es poder cards were placed on the Knowledge Wall in the Tele Café: one from January 12 and one from February 9, 2005. On one side of his January 12 card for Lesson 32, he wrote: “The mean idea Today el map because we is lrean about The dacing of the Spaish coutry a around. That my mean idea.” Ciara wrote this statement with the card oriented vertically and provided a heading, “mean idea,” in a box at the top.

Actually, Ciara’s attention to the Español para ti lesson on January 12 was extremely good, and he spent much of his time writing on his card. I have placed the information from the side of this card with the Spanish vocabulary in Figure 4.

The first words on the card (Por favor [please], de nada [you’re welcome]) are from El tango de cortesía [The Courtesy Tango], which is sung after the greetings with which this lesson begins. Next in the lesson is a review of the cardinal directions, followed by a demonstration of the tango. Most of the vocabulary on the card is from a story about Fredo’s picnic. The mistakes that Ciara makes in writing words from this group are leaving off the accent mark on café [brown (the meaning in the story)] and adding a letter to manzana [apple]. There is another segment of the video about picnic vocabulary, and then a song about hot chocolate (el chocolate) is sung. This is followed by La canción de geografía [The Geography Song]. Among the names of the countries from this song that Ciara writes on his card, he misspells Costa Rica and leaves an accent mark off of México. Adiós, which Ciara misspells, is said in the final segment of the video (Steele & Johnson, 1999). “Adious” is a word that Ciara also included on his cards for the three preceding lessons (Lessons 29, 30, 31).
Ciara’s other Saber es poder card that was placed on the Tele Café’s Knowledge Wall is from February 9, a day on which his attention to the Español para ti lesson wasn’t as good as on January 12. After the first 4.5 minutes of the video on the later date, he repeatedly looked around at different people and things in the classroom (Field notes & video recording, 2/9/05).

Lesson 39, shown on February 9, begins with greetings and then covers feeling expressions. Next there is a discussion of who various people are. This discussion includes different professions. The video continues with a visit to a fire station, additional fire-fighting vocabulary, a song in which help is sought, and the closing (Steele & Johnson, 1999).

Ciara’s card for Lesson 39 doesn’t include any information that was covered after the discussion of professions, except for “Adios” [sic]. He states the main idea of the lesson in this way: “The mean idea of Today lesson 39. You can see any job. The lady us see all kinds of jobs in the real world you can visit any Jobb”. On the other side of the card, Ciara’s presentation of vocabulary is less extensive than on January 12. Here the only mistake he makes, other than leaving off written accent marks, is in the spelling of contenta [happy]. I have placed the information from this side of Ciara’s card in Figure 5.
In considering all 14 of Ciara’s Saber es poder cards that I was able to acquire over the course of this study, I was much more favorably impressed by his presentation of Spanish vocabulary than by his English statements of main ideas. For these cards, Ciara spent enough time focused on the Español para ti videos to copy Spanish words from the television screen with a fair degree of success.

Although Ciara produced more utterances than either Claire or Brittany, his output was characterized by certain limitations, such as a high percentage of linguistic errors. In moving from Ciara to Edward in this discussion of the language produced by my case study participants, I move to a student who produced many more utterances than any of the others. With this increase in number of utterances comes an increase in the range of activities in which they were produced and an increase in the types of vocabulary on which they were based. Edward also produced a greater number of utterances that were longer than three words in length.

**Categorizing Edward’s Oral Output in the Different Instructional Settings**

I have a record of 309 Spanish utterances produced by Edward Jones in the different instructional settings from the beginning of October 2004 until the beginning of May 2005. The possibility exists for each of my participants that I may have missed utterances, but I have waited until the beginning of my discussion of Edward to point this out, because I am aware of a few instances in which I didn’t specifically note the utterances that he produced. For example, in my field notes for March 2, after writing about Edward’s correct response of “los maestros” [the teachers], I observed, “During the following discussion of dances, he kept quietly saying words to himself.” Unfortunately, in cases of students speaking softly, it is not possible to determine what they said from audio
recordings. But, in spite of the limitations of my record, it is evident that Edward produced many more utterances than any of my other participants.

In considering the 309 Spanish utterances produced by Edward, I found that there were 18 that I couldn’t hear clearly enough to determine whether they contained errors or not. Of the remaining 291 utterances, 38 involved errors that I considered linguistic in nature: In 16 Edward did not provide the correct lexical item; in 15 his pronunciation was flawed; 6 of his utterances involved a grammatical error; and 1 utterance involved both a pronunciation and a grammatical error. (In the grammatical error category I include syntactic, morphosyntactic, and morphological errors.)

Half of Edward’s 16 utterances with lexical errors involved numbers. In a videoconferencing session on January 13, for example, after Mrs. Ford had asked for the date (“¿Quién me puede decir toda la fecha? ¿Listo? Hoy es” [Who can tell me the whole date? Ready? Today is]) and another student had said, “jueves” [Thursday], Edward offered, “treinta” [30], instead of the correct trece [13] (Transcript, 1/13/05).

Two weeks later, Edward produced an utterance with lexical errors involving numbers that I consider more interesting. During the videoconferencing session on that day, Mrs. Ford received a telephone call. She told the person to whom she was talking, “Me llama en diez minutos. Estoy. OK. Uno, cuatro, cinco.” [Call me in 10 minutes. I am. Okay. One, four, five.] At that point, Edward said to himself, “Uno [pause] quina sete.” He was looking at his watch, so I guessed that his utterance had something to do with the time, which was around 1:47 [la una y cuarenta y siete] (Field notes & transcript, 1/27/05). Regardless of what Edward might have been referring to, quina [cinchona] and sete [sic] aren’t Spanish words that he would have known. (Although I grouped Edward’s whole utterance with those involving lexical error, the possibility exists of classifying “sete” as a mispronunciation of siete.)

Edward’s other lexical errors were varied. Twice during Español para ti lessons, he substituted, “canto” [I sing], for the correct bailo [I dance] (Field notes, 11/10/04, 1/11/05), and another time he supplied, “cartero” [letter carrier], for the correct camarera [waitress] (Field notes, 3/2/05). Once in the Tele Café, his Spanish sentence included a word that he had made up, based on the English word watch. This happened prior to the videoconferencing connection on February 17, when Mrs. Ford was asking Mr. Baxter’s students questions about Muzzy in preparation for a jeopardy game that day. One of her questions was “¿Y qué tiene Silvia en el bolso?” [And what does Silvia have in her handbag?] After some discussion, Edward said, “Tiene wache [sic],” and the interaction continued in this way:

- Child’s voice: Tic tac. [Tick-tock.]
- Mrs. Ford [half sings]: Tic tac, tac tic, el
- Children’s voices: Reloj. [Clock/watch.]
- Mrs. Ford: Reloj.
- Child’s voice: Reloj.
Mrs. Ford: Sí, tiene muchos relojes. [Yes, she has a lot of watches.]
(Transcript, 2/17/05)

Some of Edward’s pronunciation errors cannot be explained by the possible influence of English (e.g., his “matimáticas,” instead of the correct matemáticas [mathematics]; transcript, 1/27/05). Others clearly showed the influence of English (e.g., his pronunciation of leo like the English name; transcript, 10/26/04). The influence of English can especially be seen in cases where Edward took into account the way Spanish words looked in written form. For example, during two Español para ti lessons when the words jardinería [gardener] and jarabe [a Mexican dance] appeared on the screen, Edward read the beginning of them like the English word jar (Field notes, 2/16/05, 3/2/05). Another error of this type occurred during a cooking session on December 15. Mrs. Ford had gone through the items on a worksheet and explained how to pronounce taza [cup] (“Remember that zee is pronounced as an ess.”), but a little more than a minute later, Edward pronounced taza with its -z- voiced instead of voiceless, as it should have been (Transcript, 12/15/04).

Edward’s grammatical errors were varied, but two had to do with the lack of agreement in gender between an article and a noun. One of these was connected to a worksheet used in another cooking session. In this case, instead of reading el espejo off the worksheet, he said, “la espejo” (Field notes, 10/11/04). In a longer stretch of discourse that involved different grammatical errors, Edward substituted de for el in front of diecisiete, left out de in front of febrero, and used de instead of the correct del in front of año. This happened in the videoconferencing session on Thursday, February 17, 2005:

Mrs. Ford: Toda la fecha. Tengo un estudiante aquí, Edward, que quiere probar. ¿Listo? Hoy es. [The whole date. I have a student here, Edward, who wants to try. Ready? Today is.]
Mr. Straten: Bien. [Good.]
Edward: Jueves de diecisiete febrero de año dos mil cinco. I mean, dos mil cincuenta.
(Transcript, 2/17/05)

Edward’s utterance that I classified as involving both a pronunciation and a grammatical error was “Son las once midia.” The correct response in the Español para ti practice exercise for telling the time was “Son las once y media” [It's 11:30]. Edward’s omission of the y [and] was a grammatical (syntactic) error, and his pronunciation of media was incorrect (Field notes, 1/11/05).

Although the majority of Edward’s utterances were three words in length or shorter, he did produce 16 utterances that were longer than that. Seven of these were related to songs. On the two occasions when Edward led the class at Dolphin Point and the class at Greenwood Park in the Buenas tardes [Good afternoon] song (using the written words of the song as a reference), he produced 4 utterances that were from four to five words in length (Transcripts, 1/13/05, 1/27/05). On January 20, at the end of a class without videoconferencing in which the request of Edward’s friend Willie for the class to
sing Soy una pizza [I am a pizza] had been granted, Edward spontaneously began to sing to himself, “Soy una pizza de peperoni, peperoni” (Transcript, 1/20/05). On February 17, during the calendar segment of a videoconferencing session, Edward began to sing the song for the month before anyone else: “Muchas fiestas en febrero. Carnaval [unintelligible] en febrero” [A lot of parties/holidays in February. Carnival (is) in February.] (Transcript, 2/17/05).

I have already made reference to two of Edward’s remaining utterances that were longer than three words in length: “Jueves de diecisiete febrero de año dos mil cua” (Transcript, 2/17/05) and “Son las once midia” (Field notes, 1/11/05). Edward produced another longer utterance involving the date in the Tele Café and another three utterances involving the time (or a combination of time and action) during Español para ti lessons. There were two additional longer utterances that involved numbers. In one, Edward was counting by twos ahead of the other students (Transcript, 2/17/05). In the other, Edward read his prepared math problem after the Español para ti lesson on November 30 (Transcript, 11/30/04).

Another of Edward’s longer utterances involved a repetition of muy [very]. At the end of a class that had included a concentration game during the videoconferencing connection, Mrs. Ford chastised Mr. Baxter’s class, and Edward in particular, for using English when only Spanish should have been spoken. Edward said, “Muy, muy mal” [Very, very bad.], and after Mrs. Ford and another student had repeated that, he said, “Muy, muy, muy, muy mal” (Field notes & transcript, 3/3/05).

As I have already indicated, Edward’s utterances were based on a relatively wide range of vocabulary. In fact, he produced utterances based on all of the vocabulary categories that I have used for my other participants, as well as utterances based on five additional categories: Professions, School subjects, Sea animals, Time and action, and Yes and no. In the utterances based on vocabulary indicative of time and action, Edward answered the question of the Español para ti video teacher, “Ahora, ¿qué haces tú?” [What are you doing now?] (Field notes, 11/10/04, 1/11/05). Concerning the Yes and no category, it is interesting to note that in the instructional settings in which Mrs. Ford was teaching (with the exception of the Spanish jeopardy game on November 19), Edward took an active part by saying, “sí” and “no,” a type of utterance that none of my other participants produced. Table 10 shows my categorization of Edward’s utterances, according to the type of vocabulary on which they were based and the instructional settings in which they occurred.
Table 10
Edward. Number of Spanish Utterances Classified by Type of Vocabulary and Instructional Setting From October 1, 2004, Through May 5, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of vocab.</th>
<th>Instruction: Tele Café</th>
<th>Español para ti</th>
<th>Other settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No VC: Ford</td>
<td>VC: Ford &amp; Straten</td>
<td>VC: Straten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action word</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body part</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. &amp; number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Color</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date &amp; calendar</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family mem.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farewell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Me gusta”*a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Edward produced Spanish utterances in a greater variety of activities than did my others participants. Although he didn’t produce utterances in every activity in which the others did, there were eight activities in which he produced utterances, but they didn’t: farewells, a pizza-ordering activity, practicing dates, practicing the names of professions, practicing the names of sea animals, practicing times and actions, Saber es poder, and songs. The activities in which he didn’t produce Spanish utterances were a fill-in-the black activity, a ticktacktoe game, geography activities, practicing description, and naming dances. (Perhaps the last activity should not be counted, because Edward wasn’t invited to participate in it, having been absent from Spanish on the previous day when dances were covered). Table 11 shows how many utterances Edward produced in various activities in the different instructional settings.
Table 11
Edward. Number of Spanish Utterances Per Type of Activity in Different Instructional Settings From October 1, 2004, Through May 5, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activity</th>
<th>Instruction: Tele Café</th>
<th>Español para ti</th>
<th>Other settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No VC: Ford</td>
<td>VC: Ford &amp; Straten</td>
<td>VC: Straten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball game</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calendar segment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrated game</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking dis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display of stars</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farewells</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greetings</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeopardy game</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line-up activity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not part of activity</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pizza activity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr. action words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In this section, I have provided an overview of the utterances that Edward produced in the different instructional settings, categorizing them according to the number and types of errors that he made, the length of his utterances, the types of vocabulary on which they were based, and the types of activities in which they occurred. I have also provided examples of his utterances, placing these in context. In the next section, I will provide further examples of Edward's utterances in instructional sessions in the Tele Café without videoconferencing.
Examples of Edward’s oral and written production in relation to *Español para ti* lessons will be given in a separate section.

**Examples of Edward’s Utterances in Different Instructional Settings**

The examples of Edward’s utterances that I provide in this section will generally be taken from a specific activity in a given instructional setting. This is the case in my presentation of Edward’s utterances in a concentration game during a Spanish instructional session without videoconferencing and in my discussion of the way in which Edward led the *Buenas tardes* song in videoconferencing sessions taught by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten. However, because Edward’s production of Spanish utterances was of a limited nature in the videoconferencing sessions taught by Mr. Straten, all of the activities in which these utterances were produced will be mentioned. I will return to the consideration of a specific activity, a cooking discussion, in the instructional setting of a cooking session. I will end this section by giving an example of one of Edward’s utterances in the Spanish jeopardy game before the Thanksgiving Break.

The concentration game that is the context of some of Edward’s Spanish utterances in an instructional session without videoconferencing took place on January 20. Mrs. Ford started the game by showing Mr. Baxter’s class two sets of numbers and saying, “Aquí arriba, aquí arriba, la capital. ¿Sí?” [Here on top, here on top, the capital. Right?], and, “Aquí abajo, los países” [Here below, the countries]. Then she went through the names of the numbers in Spanish (Field notes & transcript, 1/20/05).

When Mrs. Ford asked, “¿Quién quiere ir primero?” [Who wants to go first?], Edward immediately said, “Trece, trece” [13, 13]. Mrs. Ford apparently believed that Edward was pointing out that there was a 13 in the top set of numbers and a 13 in the bottom set, because, instead of showing the name of the capital and the name of the country associated with the identical numbers, she agreed that there were two 13s, saying this was easy and a bonus (Transcript, 1/20/05).

The first turn then went to Eric and the second to Joanna, but Mrs. Ford selected Edward for the third turn:

- Mrs. Ford: Uh, Eduardo.
- **Edward**: Trece.
- Mrs. Ford and other voices: Tegucigalpa.
- Mrs. Ford: Tegucigalpa. Hay que buscar [Tegucigalpa. You have to look for]
- **Mrs. Ford and other voices**: Honduras.
- Mrs. Ford: Hon
- **Edward**: Trece.
Mrs. Ford: Trece.

Mrs. Ford and other voices: Guatemala.

Mrs. Ford: Guatemala. Trece, Guatemala. Trece, Tegucigalpa, Tegucigalpa. Memoria, memoria [Memory, memory]. (Transcript, 1/20/05)

The next turn went to Tim, who chose "cien" [100] after Mrs. Ford had named some of the numbers in the top set for him. Mrs. Ford repeated the number and named of the capital that was associated with it: "¿Cien? San José. San José. ¿Dónde está Costa Rica?" [100? San Jose. San Jose. Where is Costa Rica?] There was whispering in the background, prompting Tim to select 30 because Joanna’s turn had revealed that that was the number for Costa Rica. Mrs. Ford asked, “¿Treinta?” [30?], and Edward voiced his agreement, “Sí” (Field notes & transcript, 1/20/05).

Edward didn’t produce another utterance until the eighth turn, after his friend Willie had selected “Sesenta y cuatro” [64] and Mrs. Ford named San Juan as the capital that went with that number. It was then that Edward repeated, “San Juan” (Field notes, 1/20/05). (Because Edward was repeating the name of the capital to himself, and the utterance wasn’t part of the action of the game, I classified it as “Not part of activity.”)

After the 11th turn, Mrs. Ford asked a general question about who hadn’t had a turn yet, and then she addressed several students in particular, including Edward: “¿Eduardo, tú, tú jugaste?” [Edward, you, you played?]. He replied, “Sí” (Transcript, 1/20/05).

By the 16th turn, Edward had a chance to participate again and was able to match San Juan and Puerto Rico:

Edward: Sesenta y cuarto [sic].
Mrs. Ford: Sesenta y cuatro. San Juan. ¿Dónde está Puerto Rico? [64. San Juan. Where is Puerto Rico?]
Child’s voice [whispers]: Veinti [unintelligible].

A voice: Shh!
Mrs. Ford: Diecisiete, cincuenta y siete, cin [Seventeen, fifty-seven, fif]
Edward: Cincuenta y siete.
Mrs. Ford: Cincuenta y siete.
Mrs. Ford and other voices: Puerto Rico. [Applause.]
Mrs. Ford: San Juan, Puerto Rico. (Transcript, 1/20/05)

Ciara also had a second turn, following the second turn of Edward, which has just been presented. Ciara chose 14 for Panamá, the capital. There was a little discussion about which number Ciara should pick next, and when Mrs. Ford said, “Treinta y” and Ciara added, “cinco,” Edward said, “sí,” voicing his agreement with the choice of 35. However, 35 was not the number for Panamá but for México. Edward repeated the name of the latter country after Mrs. Ford had said it. This was his last utterance in the concentration game, which went on through another four turns (Field notes & transcript, 1/20/05).

I have already mentioned that on two occasions Edward led the class at Dolphin Point and the class at Greenwood Park in singing the Buenas tardes
song. He did this in the context of videoconferencing sessions taught by both Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten (Transcripts, 1/13/05, 1/27/05). However, he wasn't the first student from Mr. Baxter's class to take on the role of teacher in leading the song but was preceded in this undertaking by Elena, a native speaker of Spanish.

In the videoconferencing session on January 6, when the classes at Dolphin Point and Greenwood Park sang the *Buenas tardes* song, they were a little off in their timing. Mrs. Ford asked for someone to take her place in leading the song a second time: “¿Hay alguien que quiere ser la maestra de español o el maestro de español?” [Is there somebody who wants to be the Spanish teacher?] Elena volunteered and led the song (Field notes & transcript, 1/6/05).

The next week, Mrs. Ford suggested to Mr. Straten that a student lead the song again: “Señor, ¿crees que un estudiante de Greenwood Park y un estudiante de Dolphin Point pueden ser maestros o maestras?” [Sir, do you think a student from Greenwood Park and a student from Dolphin Point can be teachers?] Mr. Straten agreed that this was a good idea but couldn’t immediately find a volunteer. Mrs. Ford talked to Edward in Spanish, trying to convince him to lead the song. He got up, went to the front of the class, and led both classes in singing it:

Mrs. Ford: Vamo, vamos a ver. [Translation: Let’s see. Whispers:] Okay [unintelligible]. Buenas tarde
Edward [singing]: Buenas [with laugh in voice] tardes.
Many voices [singing; delay for some at end]: Buenas tardes.
Mrs. Ford [whispers]: Bienvenido
Edward [singing]: Bienvenido al español. [Translation: Welcome to Spanish.]
Many voices [singing; delay for some at end]: Bienvenido al español.
Mrs. Ford [whispers]: Buenas
Edward [singing]: Buenas tardes.
Many voices [singing]: Buenas tardes.
Edward [singing]: ¿Cómo estás [with laugh in voice] hoy? [Translation: How are you today?]
Many voices [singing; delay for some at end]: ¿Cómo estás hoy?
Edward [singing]: Buenas tardes.
Many voices [singing]: Buenas tardes.
Edward [singing]: Saluda a tus aminga [sic].
Many voices [singing]: Saluda a tus amigos. [Translation: Greet your friends.]
Edward [singing]: Vamos a [fades out] ar y aprender. [A little laughter.]
Many voices [singing]: Vamos a escuchar y aprender. [Translation: Let’s listen and learn.] (Field notes & transcript, 1/13/05)

After Edward had led the song, there was a lot of applause for him. When he had gone about two yards along the side of the Tele Café, he put his closed hand at the side of his face, partially hiding it, and looked embarrassed. He went to the dolphin cookie jar to get something out of it as a reward. Mrs. Ford called
him back to introduce him to the class at Greenwood Park. He stood with her and smiled, but he squeezed his eyes closed. He looked embarrassed again (Field notes, 1/13/05).

Edward participated less and produced fewer utterances in the two videoconferencing sessions during which Mr. Straten taught both classes. On March 17, the first of these sessions, Edward seemed ready to take an active part at the beginning of the lesson but soon became quieter.

After the videoconferencing connection had been made on that day, Mr. Straten asked the class at Dolphin Point, “¿Cómo están?” [How are you (plural)?]. Mrs. Ford quietly prompted Mr. Baxter’s class, “Uno, dos, tres,” then increased her volume slightly to repeat Mr. Straten’s question and give the first word of a reply, “¿Cómo están? Muy.” A few children said, “Muy bien, gracias” [Very well, thank you], while Edward replied, “Así así” [So-so] (Transcript, 3/17/05).

After the calendar segment of the lesson and some questions from Mr. Straten about la Familia Contenta, I noted that Edward joined in a song about members of that family. Next Mr. Straten brought out a photograph of himself with his family when he was a child, which he projected on one of the television monitors. He talked to the classes at both schools about the picture and asked for someone to point to him. As he was still making this request, Mrs. Ford suggested to Edward that he go up to the television to point. While Edward was hesitating, a student at Greenwood Park made the identification. After Mr. Straten had talked about the picture a little more, he asked students at both schools to estimate the year in which it was taken:

Mr. Straten: ¿Alguien quiere estimar en qué año sacaron esta foto?
Mrs. Ford: Sí, Dolphin Point.

In the interaction that followed, Edward offered a guess of “sesenta” [60] (Transcript, 3/17/05).

A little later in the class, there was a song about Florida. Edward was sitting with his head in his hands. He was frowning and wasn’t singing. In answering questions about Florida, he whispered, “Tallahassee,” to Mrs. Ford. She directed him, “Dícelo [sic] a señor Straten” [Tell it to Mr. Straten], and he said, “Tallahassee,” more loudly. Edward also joined Willie in identifying an animal as a “manatí” [manatee]. During the closing song, however, Edward didn’t participate but sat with his hands in front of his face (Field notes, 3/17/05).

The second time that Mr. Straten taught both classes by himself, Edward took part in an activity in which students were supposed to raise their hands to make predictions about whether different types of fruit would float or sink, although I have no utterances recorded for him from this activity. Later, instead of singing the song about Florida, Edward just sat and watched (Field notes, 3/31/04).
A more informal atmosphere prevailed in the cooking sessions in the Tele Café, providing time for the students to interact with each other and for me to interact with them, as I will later explain. During the portions of lessons led by Mrs. Ford, Edward answered questions related to worksheets and took part in cooking discussions.

The cooking session on March 10 featured fiesta taco salad, which Edward and Willie had requested after the previous cooking session (Field notes, 1/26/05). Mrs. Ford talked about the salad’s different ingredients, asking questions about their colors. Edward repeated, “maíz” [corn], after Mrs. Ford and said, “sí,” when she sought confirmation that the corn was in a can: “Y el maíz está en una lata. Una lata. Una lata. ¿Sí? Una lata. ¿Una, una lata?” A little later, Edward asked how to say violet in Spanish:

   Edward: What is violet, rojo [red]?
   Mrs. Ford: No, violeta.
   Edward [quietly]: Oh, violeta. (Transcript, 3/10/05)

Another instructional setting in which Edward produced Spanish utterances was the jeopardy game on November 19. Like Claire, Edward was captain/spokesperson for his group and voiced their selections for category and number of points in Spanish. One selection was Numbers for 400. When Edward saw the numeral that was to be named written on a sheet of paper, he laughed and said, “cuatrocientos” [400] (Transcript, 11/19/04).

In this section, examples of Edward’s Spanish utterances have been placed in context in all of the instructional settings in which students produced utterances, with the exception of the Español para ti lessons. Examples of Edward’s oral and written output during Español para ti videos and of his oral output in activities following videos will be given in the next section.

Edward’s Oral and Written Output in Relation to Video Lessons

Edward’s involvement in Español para ti lessons varied. Sometimes he was very active in orally responding to prompts on the videos. At other times, he watched the lessons in silence. There were also occasions when he looked at a book or worked on a design instead of watching a given Español para ti lesson. However, it was unusual for him to show no interest at all. On the contrary, there were some occasions in Mr. Baxter’s room when I was able to observe Edward’s enthusiasm for Spanish and his very active participation through responding orally during the video lessons.

One such class session occurred on November 10. Before the video began, I sat down on the floor at the front of the room, with the tripod and camcorder to my right and Edward to my left. He initiated a conversation with me about how to say Christmas in Spanish and then shared his new knowledge with his friend Willie:

   EJ: How do you say Christmas in Spanish?
   AN: Navidad.
   EJ: Navidad. Feliz Navidad means Merry Christmas.
   AN: That’s right.
EJ: Willie, I bet you don’t know what Feliz Navidad mean. Edward, Willie, and other students had been singing *Feliz Navidad* in Chorus, but according to Edward, their teacher hadn’t told them what it meant (Field notes & transcript, 11/10/04).

Sitting next to Edward that day I was able to hear each of his utterances clearly. I also felt free to write them down, because his attention was on the Spanish lesson (Lesson 21) and not on what I was writing. The first part of the video lesson linked times and actions. I took part quietly, saying some of the times. Edward said, “estudio” [I study], quietly as the action that occurs at 4:15. For the 4:00 action, he said, “canto” [I sing], but it was supposed to be *bailo* [I dance]. He repeated, “cinco y cuarto” [5:15], and, “nueve y media” [9:30], slightly after these times were given on the video. He said, “siete” [7:00], before it was given, as he did the whole sentence, “A las doce canto.” [At 12:00, I sing.] He seemed pleased about the latter, and said, “Yes!” (Field notes & transcript, 11/10/04).

In the next part of the lesson, words were put on the television screen, corresponding to what Fredo said he did at different times of the day. Edward began reading along with Fredo’s voice and continued reading before or along with it. (Unfortunately, I didn’t keep track of what he read.) He also said, “pinto” [I paint], during the discussion of Fredo’s activities that followed (Field notes, 11/10/04).

When the lesson was on large numbers, Edward said, “doscientos” [200], after it was given and, “ochocientos” [800], before it was given. He said, “nuevecientos” [sic], instead of *novecientos* [900] and said, “diez” [10], apparently as the beginning of a number expression for 1,000, instead of using the correct term *mil*. As the lesson progressed, there were two other Spanish numbers (“quince” [15] and “veinticinco” [25]) that he repeated after they were given (Field notes, 11/10/04).

Besides orally participating on November 10, Edward produced a Saber es poder card in which he makes reference to the last segments of the lesson, where addition and subtraction are practiced and vocabulary for multiplication is presented (Steele & Johnson, 1999). Edward also included the first-person singular forms of various verbs. On one side of the card, Edward wrote his statement of the main idea: “Today’s lesson was mostly about mathematics. We talked about multiplication (por) and addition (mas [sic]). I learned a few spanish words like como and camino.” I have placed the information from the other side of the card in Figure 6.

Edward’s “englis” that heads his column of English equivalents to Spanish words is missing an *h* and isn’t capitalized, but otherwise everything on this side of his card is spelled correctly. The only other corrections that I would make here would be (a) to write *I paint* instead of the second occurrence of *pinto* and (b) to add the subject pronoun *I* before each of the words in the English column so that, for example, *dance* becomes *I dance*. 
Edward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Español</th>
<th>englis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bailo</td>
<td>dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>como</td>
<td>eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>camino</td>
<td>walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>canto</td>
<td>sing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pinto</td>
<td>pinto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coloreo</td>
<td>color</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Edward               |

Figure 6. Information on one side of Edward’s Saber es poder card for Lesson 21.

There were a number of other occasions when Edward orally participated in Español para ti lessons. On January 11, for example, he was very active in the segment of Lesson 31 about telling time and in another segment in which times and actions were combined (Field notes, 1/11/05). He also participated in time-telling practice on October 20 and October 27 and practiced using action words on October 26, October 27, and January 18 (Field notes, 10/20/04, 10/26/04, 10/27/04, 1/18/05).

On February 16, Edward gave different dates, read the names of several professions off the television screen, and correctly changed the form of one profession word from the masculine to the feminine (Field notes, 2/16/05). He identified pictures of people with different professions on March 2, in many cases making a correct identification before the answer was given. When this happened with los basureros [the garbage collectors], he said, “Yes!” and smiled (Field notes, 3/2/05). A further example of his oral participation during an Español para ti video was when he identified sea creatures in Spanish on April 28 (Field notes, 4/28/05).

Edward participated in several of the activities that followed video lessons, as well. The contribution he made on October 26 showed that there were things in Spanish that he hadn’t mastered, especially at that point in the school year. Like Brittany and other students, with the exception of Elena, Edward mistakenly used the first-person singular form of a verb when directed by Mr. Baxter to share an action word and “ask a person in the classroom to do that action.” Edward said, “Leo” [I read], to his friend, Calvin, using the English instead of the Spanish pronunciation of the word. Calvin got a math book, but there was some confusion about what he was supposed to do with it. Mr. Baxter intervened:

Mr. Baxter: He just said leo [pronounced as the English word]. What is he to do?
Edward: Study.
Mr. Baxter: Study or read. All right. (Field notes & transcript, 10/26/04)

November 30, the day on which Mr. Baxter followed up on the Español para ti lesson by asking all of his students to write a math problem in Spanish and later share it with the class, was a day on which Edward wasn’t actively involved in the lesson, keeping his head down part of the time and also toying with his Saber es poder card (Field notes, 11/30/04).

Edward had momentarily stepped out of the classroom at the time Mr. Baxter asked the students to write down a math problem in Spanish. When he came back in and discovered that something was going on, he asked Mr. Baxter, “What problem? I wasn't here when you said it.” Mr. Baxter repeated his directions, “I forgot the words.” He asked to see them on the card of Mr. Baxter, who handed it to him but told him that he couldn’t take his problem. Mr. Baxter asked Elena to write the words for add and subtract on the board. Edward and three other boys gathered around the classroom poster with the names of numbers written in Spanish. When Edward’s turn to share his problem came, he said, “Cuatrocientos veinte más cien son quinientos noventa [sic]” [420 + 100 = 590] (Field notes & transcript, 11/30/04). He had meant for his second number to be 170, as the Saber es poder card on which he wrote the problem shows. I have placed the information on this side of his card in Figure 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cuatro cientosveinte</th>
<th>mas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cien son quinientosnoventa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7.** Information on the reverse side of Edward’s Saber es poder card for Lesson 23.

Edward was ambitious in the problem he gave, but his lack of engagement in the video lesson that day can be seen not only in his statement to Mr. Baxter about having forgotten mathematical terms in Spanish but also in what he wrote on the other side of his Saber es poder card. The main focus of the lesson had been on numbers, including math problems, street addresses, large numbers, and the combination of times and actions (Steele & Johnson, 1999). Only in the
segment before the closing had commands been practiced through a Cha-cha-cha song, but it appears that the words Edward wrote on his card prior to receiving his postvideo assignment were solely related to this song, possibly to the lines, “Muy bien, cha-cha-cha. Vamos a bailar” [Very good, cha-cha-cha. Let’s dance.], and to the name of the character who receives the commands, Toño (Steele & Johnson, 1999). I have placed the information from this side of Edward’s Saber es poder card in Figure 8.

Edward J.

Cha, cha, cha
Bamo’s y Biey
ya
ton’o, ton’o

*Figure 8. Information on the front side of Edward’s Saber es poder card for Lesson 23.*

There were times when Edward was very actively engaged in Español para ti lessons. Whereas I occasionally noted oral responses by Brittany and Ciara to prompts during video lessons, Edward’s responses during some lessons were of such a quantity and quality that I noted their timing. Often Edward, who described himself as competitive (Interview, 5/2/05), appeared to be challenging himself to give correct responses and to give them quickly.

For Edward, as for each of my participants, I have attempted to present a comprehensive picture of oral Spanish output, in some cases providing examples of the interactions in which utterances were produced. I have also presented examples of written output.

In the next section, I will bring together information on all of the participants in an attempt to show more clearly differences that exist between them. I will also highlight the main types of vocabulary on which their utterances were based and the main types of activities in which their utterances were produced.

**Summary of Oral Output in the Different Instructional Settings**

I have presented information on how many Spanish utterances my participants produced in each of the instructional settings that provided
opportunities for Spanish output on their part. Because the participants spent much more time in some instructional settings than in others and because some participants were present for more instruction than were others, it is difficult to get a clear picture of the relative amount of their Spanish output in the different settings by simply comparing the number of their utterances (given in Table 3). In order to provide for comparison, I decided to calculate the average number of minutes between utterances for each participant in the different instructional settings. The results are presented in Table 12.

Among the insights that the calculation of average number of minutes between utterances makes possible is the fact that Edward, who produced 87 utterances in Spanish instructional sessions led by Mrs. Ford without videoconferencing, 81 utterances in videoconferencing sessions led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten, and 13 utterances in the Spanish jeopardy game on November 19; was equally productive of Spanish utterances in these three settings, with an average of 3 minutes between his utterances in each. The calculation of average number of minutes between utterances is not meant to give the impression that the participants produced their utterances at even intervals within a given instructional setting but rather to provide a common measure for comparisons of productivity between participants and between instructional settings.

As could be predicted, overall, Edward is the student with the least amount of time between his utterances, followed by Ciara, Claire, and then Brittany. (This ranking of the participants is, in fact, the same as that given by the ordering of the total number of their utterances from highest to lowest.) A few exceptions to the overall ranking by amount of time between utterances occur in the individual instructional settings. Claire produced more utterances than Edward in the Spanish jeopardy game, in which they were present for the same amount of time. Neither Ciara nor Brittany produced any utterances in this setting. Another exception can be seen during Español para ti videos, when Claire remained silent, and there was, on the average, less time between Brittany’s utterances than between Ciara’s. The average time between utterances is the most similar for the four participants in activities following Español para ti videos.

It is interesting to note that the average number of minutes between Claire’s utterances is three times greater in videoconferencing sessions led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten than in instructional sessions in the Tele Café without videoconferencing. For Brittany, the average number of minutes is three and a half times greater in videoconferencing sessions led by the two teachers, and for Ciara it is more than four times greater. For Edward, however, the average number of minutes between his utterances in the two settings is identical.
Table 12
Average Number of Minutes Between Utterances for Each Participant in the Different Instructional Settings From October 1, 2004, Through May 5, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional setting</th>
<th>Claire</th>
<th>Brittany</th>
<th>Ciara</th>
<th>Edward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without VC: Mrs. Ford</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC: Mrs. Ford &amp; Mr. Straten</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC: Mr. Straten</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During <em>Español para ti</em> videos</td>
<td>NU</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After <em>Español para ti</em> videos</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>NU</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeopardy 11/19/04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NU</td>
<td>NU</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall average</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Utterance length = a word to a sentence. NA = not applicable (not present); NU = no utterances; VC = videoconferencing. *a*The calculation for this row uses the total time following *Español para ti* videos on days when there was a postvideo activity.

Caution should be exercised in interpreting the average number of minutes between utterances in the videoconferencing sessions led by Mr. Straten, because the amount of time spent in these sessions was brief compared to the amount of time spent in videoconferencing sessions led by the two teachers and compared to the amount of time spent in Spanish instruction in the Tele Café without videoconferencing. Claire was not present for either of the sessions led by Mr. Straten, and Brittany was present for only the second one. During this 22-minute session, she produced one utterance, “jueves” [Thursday]. Ciara and Edward were present for both sessions (totaling 46 minutes) but produced their three and five utterances during the first one. As I will discuss later in this section, the activities that are used in a session have a bearing on how many utterances are produced.

Turning now to a consideration of linguistic errors, only 11.1% of Claire’s Spanish utterances involved such errors. Edward’s percentage of errors was similar, 13.1%. The percentage of errors was higher for Brittany (25.0%) and
higher still for Ciara (34.2%). This is another area in which caution should be used in interpreting results, because the percentages are based on the utterances that I could hear well enough to make a determination of whether they involved errors or not. Mostly owing to Claire’s quiet speech, I was unable to hear 20.0% of her utterances well enough to make such a determination. In regard to my other participants, I was unable to hear 12.0% of Ciara’s utterances adequately, 9.7% of Brittany’s, and 5.8% of Edward’s.

The participants’ linguistic errors involved mispronunciations and incorrect lexical selections for the most part. Ciara had the highest number (20), as well as percentage, of utterances that involved pronunciation errors. In half of these he used English pronunciation. The low occurrence of grammatical errors in the utterances of the participants is reflective of the lack of complexity of their Spanish speech.

Most of the Spanish utterances of the participants were three words in length or shorter. Claire and Brittany each produced one utterance that was longer than that, representing 2.2% and 3.2% of their utterances, respectively. For each girl, this utterance was a math problem, prepared in advance. Ciara produced four utterances that were longer than three words in length (4.8% of his utterances), two of which were his math problem. Sixteen of Edward’s utterances were longer than three words in length (5.2% of his utterances), one of which was his math problem and seven of which were related to songs.

The names of numbers in Spanish were not only the basis for some of the longer utterances but for the largest number of utterances from any one category of vocabulary: 97 of the 468 utterances produced by my participants. (If I had added a count of the names of numbers that were related to dates and the calendar and were related to time to the Number category instead of keeping them in separate categories, the total number of utterances based on number vocabulary would be higher.) Geography vocabulary was the basis for the next highest number of utterances (55), followed by the vocabulary categories Date & calendar (42), Action word (34), and Greeting (32). All of the participants produced utterances based on these types of vocabulary, except in the case of the last category, where all of the utterances were produced by Edward and Ciara.

I find it interesting to note that 28 of the 34 utterances based on action words were produced during and after Español para ti videos, 3 were produced in the Spanish jeopardy game on November 19, and 3 in the context of Spanish instructional sessions in the Tele Café. The latter 3 were produced by Edward in videoconferencing sessions taught by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten. Two of the utterances were a sentence from the Buenas tardes song that Edward led the classes in singing on two occasions (Transcripts, 1/13/05, 1/27/05). The third occurred when Edward quietly repeated one of Mrs. Ford’s utterances, “Levántense” [Stand up] (Transcript, 1/27/05).

Edward, Ciara, Claire, and Brittany produced Spanish utterances during different activities, but I would like to highlight the activities in which at least two of them participated and in which at least 9 utterances were produced. All four
students produced utterances (47 in total) during the calendar segment of Spanish instructional sessions in the Tele Café. All of them also produced utterances (28) in the line-up activities that took place at the close of instructional sessions in the Tele Café and, on one occasion, at the end of a cooking session. Number activities took place in videoconferencing sessions and during and after Español para ti videos. Considering number activities in all of these settings together, Edward, Ciara, Claire, and Brittany produced 30 utterances. In the context of instructional sessions in the Tele Café, Edward, Ciara, and Claire, produced utterances in question-and-answer activities (32), concentration games (22), and baseball games (17), and Edward and Brittany took part in activities for sharing likes and dislikes (producing 9 utterances). In greetings at the beginning of videoconferencing and cooking sessions, Edward and Ciara produced 17 utterances. Edward and Ciara also participated in cooking discussions during cooking sessions, producing 9 utterances. In the jeopardy game in Mr. Baxter’s classroom and in the one in the Tele Café, Edward and Claire produced 45 utterances. During Español para ti videos, Edward, Ciara, and Brittany practiced time telling, producing 17 utterances, and practiced action words, producing 16 utterances.

To sum up, I have analyzed the participants’ oral Spanish output in terms of the number of their utterances, the average number of minutes between these, the number of utterances that involved linguistic errors and the types of errors that were involved, the length of utterances, the types of vocabulary on which they were based, and the types of activities in which they were produced. These categories were inductively derived from the abundant data for each student.

Thus far this chapter has concentrated on the following point of focus: What instances of interaction and output are observed in the different instructional settings? In the next section, I will consider whether any patterns of change can be discerned in the participants’ oral Spanish output over time.

**Patterns of Change in Oral Spanish Output**

This section will address the following point of focus: Are patterns of change observed in learners’ language production during the period under study? I will first consider differences in the relative amount of the participants’ Spanish output from month to month. I will then consider whether their output changed in terms of the language they used and how they used it.

In order to provide a measure that allows for the comparison of the participants’ output from month to month, I have calculated the average number of minutes between their utterances. The results are presented in Table 13. I have not included May in this table, because I observed each participant for less than an hour during that month. The utterances considered in this table (as in the rest of this chapter) are those produced by participants as individuals and not as a part of a group response, except in those cases where the timing or volume of a participant’s utterance is different enough from those of the group to make the utterance stand out.
Table 13
Average Number of Minutes Between Utterances for Each Participant From October 2004 Through April 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Claire</th>
<th>Brittany</th>
<th>Ciara</th>
<th>Edward</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>NU</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>NU</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Utterance length = a word to a sentence. NU = no utterances.

An examination of Table 13 reveals that the participants generally differed from each other in the average number of minutes between their utterances in a given month. There was usually also variation in this measure for the individual participants from month to month.

The abbreviation NU in Table 13 indicates that a participant produced no utterances as an individual during my observations in a given month. This was the case in March for Claire, who in April returned to producing utterances as an individual. Brittany produced no utterances in April, and in fact, her answer of “jueves” [Thursday] in the calendar segment of the videoconferencing session on March 31 (Transcript, 3/31/05) is the last utterance I have recorded for her for the year. (“Jueves” was the only utterance Brittany produced as an individual in March, when I observed her for 104 minutes. The only utterance she produced in November, when I observed her for 203 minutes, was the math problem that she prepared in advance.)

Leaving aside the issue of quantity of output and turning to the issue of patterns of change over time in the language used by the individual participants, I must admit that I was unable to discern any such patterns in the language used by Claire and Brittany, partly owing to the small number of utterances that they produced. Claire could do very well if she were pushed to produce Spanish. The occasions when she did this were rare enough that I got an impression of periods of silence and then bursts of language that sometimes favorably surprised me but from which I wasn’t able to trace patterns of change. Brittany was also quiet in Spanish classes, and her oral production was even more limited than Claire’s.
Ciara showed evidence of learning the Spanish names of capitals and countries as time went by. I also noted growth in his use of Spanish greetings, which occurred toward the end of the school year.

In a cooking session in December, I asked Ciara, “¿Cómo estás? ¿Bien?” [How are you? Well?]. When he just looked at me silently, I switched to English, asking, “How are you?” and he replied, “Oh, I forgot what that meant” (Field notes, 12/15/04).

In another cooking session on April 21, Ciara echoed Mrs. Ford’s greeting and began to answer on his own:

Mrs. Ford: Buenas tardes. [Good afternoon.]
Children’s voices, including Ciara’s (which I can make out clearly): Buenas tardes.
Mrs. Ford: ¿Cómo están? [How are you (plural)?]
Ciara: ¿Cómo están?
Mrs. Ford: ¿Bien, mal, así así? [Good, bad, so-so?]
Ciara: Muy [Very]. (Transcript, 4/21/05)

At the beginning of the final cooking session on May 5, Ciara responded to Mrs. Ford’s greeting of “Hola, clase” with his own greeting, “Hola, Cinco de [sic] mayo day.” After she asked the class, “¿Cómo están?” Ciara said, “¿Cómo estás tú? Muy bien” (Transcript, 5/5/05).

It was in Edward that I saw the most growth in Spanish. At the beginning of the school year, Edward’s friend Willie took an active part in Spanish classes, while Edward remained fairly quiet. When he did respond to video prompts, I noticed various things that he hadn’t yet mastered, but he was willing to make mistakes in the process of learning. By the end of the school year, Edward was able to take an active part in lessons, and he used Spanish to communicate. I sometimes heard Edward repeating Spanish words to himself (Field notes, 11/11/04, 1/13/05, 1/18/05, 1/20/05, 1/27/05, 2/3/05, 3/2/05, 4/21/05). One challenging word that I heard him using and repeating was quinientos [500]. In the Spanish jeopardy game on November 19, he spoke for his group in choosing 500 as the number of points but said, “Qui, quinciento, qui, qui” (Transcript, 11/19/04). Later in the game he chose 500 again but this time said, “quiniento” (Transcript, 11/19/04). On November 30, when he read from his Saber es poder card the numbers that he had copied from a poster, he said, “quinientos,” correctly (Field notes & transcript, 11/30/04). As Mr. Straten was going over numbers for a game on February 3, Edward went ahead of him and made a mistake on 500 again. When he heard the correct pronunciation for quinientos, he repeated it to himself several times (Field notes, 2/3/05).

I have already included a description and the transcript of Edward leading the Buenas tardes song on January 13 (Field notes & transcript, 1/13/05). When he led it again on January 27, he showed much more self-confidence and delivered an almost flawless performance (Field notes & transcript, 1/27/05).

On the last day of school, I prepared to read a Jorge el Curioso [Curious George] book to Mr. Baxter’s class, asking some students to help me dramatize it. I got Elena, a native speaker of Spanish, to handle a toy monkey that, with her
help, played the part of Curious George. I asked Edward to take the other major part, that of the man with the yellow hat. I had written a line for him to deliver as this character while he was talking on the telephone to someone at the zoo: “Aló. Tengo un mono de África. Sí. Sí. Hasta luego.” [Hello. I have a monkey from Africa. Yes. Yes. I’ll see you later.] When he agreed to help me, I gave him a script with his actions listed, along with this line, which I got him to read over several times. I had a brief practice with all of the students who had parts, and then they acted out the story while I read it to the class. As I wrote in my field notes, Elena and Edward were great, doing just what I had wanted them to, and Edward delivered his line very well (Field notes, 5/17/05). With this, I had even more evidence of how far Edward, my participant who had only started learning Spanish at the beginning of the fourth grade, had progressed in learning Spanish over the course of the school year.
Chapter 6. Individual Learner Factors, Preferences, and Perceptions

The purpose of the previous chapter was to provide a detailed examination of the oral Spanish output and interactions of the four case study participants in the different instructional settings. The participants’ written output was also discussed and examples were given. The chapter ended with a discussion of whether patterns of change were observed in the participants’ language production during the period under study.

As was shown in the previous chapter, the participants differed in their production of Spanish. My growing interest in the reasons for the differences led me to explore the following point of focus:

• What individual learner factors help to explain differences in the participants’ Spanish output?

Attitudes may be considered in terms of the individual learner factor of motivation. However, I chose to bring together in one section the participants’ preferences and perceptions in regard to different aspects of the FLETT program, instead of including them in the separate treatments of each learner’s individual factors, which follow this introduction. In this way, patterns of preferences related to different program aspects may be discerned more easily. The following point of focus helped me to organize my findings in this area:

• What are the participants’ preferences and perceptions concerning different aspects of the Spanish program?

A discussion of this point of focus is provided at the end of this chapter.

A summary of oral Spanish output is provided for each participant before the discussion of his or her individual factors in order to set the stage for that discussion.

Claire Montgomery

Claire Montgomery usually produced relatively few Spanish utterances as an individual (45), but in a situation like the Spanish jeopardy game, in which she was captain/spokesperson of her group, her production increased. The average number of minutes between her Spanish utterances provides an indication of how actively engaged she was in participating orally, as well as providing a measure with which to gauge the relative frequency of her oral output. Ranking her productivity in different instructional settings according to the average number of minutes between her Spanish utterances, she was most productive in the jeopardy game, followed by instruction led by Mr. Baxter after Español para ti videos, instructional sessions in the Tele Café without videoconferencing, videoconferencing sessions led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten, and cooking sessions. Claire was absent on both days when Mr. Straten led
videoconferencing sessions. In the setting of the Español para ti videos themselves, she didn’t produce any utterances but worked on her Saber es poder cards. She was the student in Mr. Baxter’s class who had the most cards selected for presentation in the Tele Café.

Sometimes Claire spoke so softly that it was difficult to understand everything she said, but the Spanish utterances that I understood clearly rarely involved errors. Her utterances were generally brief, and more than half of them were based on number, date, and calendar vocabulary. She produced most of her utterances as an individual while taking part in games, the calendar segment of lessons, number activities, and question-and-answer activities.

One of the things that I found most interesting about Claire’s Spanish output was the fact that she produced few utterances but produced them with a high degree of accuracy. I interacted with Claire less than with my other participants, and her absences from Spanish classes resulted in my observing her less. She sometimes displayed ambivalence toward Spanish, and some of her statements concerning practice away from school did not match what her mother told me. For these reasons, I came to think of Claire as the most enigmatic of my participants.

I learned more about Claire as a Spanish student as time went by, gaining insights from many sources, including her academic record, the concerns she voiced about being wrong, her interactions with her school friends, and the contact she had with Spanish away from school.

My Early Concerns Regarding Claire. Of my four case study participants, Claire is the most like me: a quiet, White, middle-class female who does well in school. Probably from Claire’s perspective, I am similar to her mother, Sarah Montgomery. At the County’s Recycle Regatta, an event at which students from different schools race boats made of recycled materials against each other, Sarah and I spent about an hour and 45 minutes in easy and enjoyable conversation with each other (Field notes, 4/30/05). During the school year, I assumed that the things Claire and I had in common were central to explaining why we weren’t more interested in each other and why we didn’t interact with each other more. I also noted that Claire usually attracted little attention to herself. Although I still believe these things are true, my observations of Claire require a fuller explanation.

First of all, I should say that my early concern about possible difficulties in establishing rapport with Claire did not prove to be valid. Although I noticed some shyness in our initial interactions, after those, I found Claire to be articulate and easy to talk to. An example of this took place in the cafeteria at Dolphin Point, following a Spanish play that was put on by Mrs. Ford, Mr. Straten, and other local FLES teachers in honor of Dolphin Point’s Ocean Week. Claire was sitting between Emily and me and was talking to Emily so quietly that I couldn’t hear anything she was saying, although I noted that she was copying some of the movements used by one of the characters in the play, such as rotating her hand as if swinging a bikini around. When there seemed to be a lull in this
conversation, I asked Claire if she had a brother. (Her cumulative folder indicated that she had both a sister and a brother.) In a voice that was clearly audible, she told me her brother’s name, age, that he is married, and where he lives. She also told me the name of her sister-in-law and the names and ages of her nephew and two nieces. It turned out that her brother and his family live in the same small North Florida town where my sister and brother-in-law live, and we talked about the town and our relatives there until it was time to leave the cafeteria (Field notes, 4/11/05).

I appreciated that opportunity to interact with Claire, and I also greatly appreciated her willingness to be interviewed by me, through which she helped me with this research. However, as a general rule, I found that Claire did not volunteer to be a helper. In considering my coded field notes, the contrast between Claire and Brittany in this area becomes apparent. I have 4 instances of Claire as a helper and 39 of Brittany as a helper. I bring this up because the occasions on which Brittany and Ciara carried my recording equipment gave me extra opportunities to interact with them that I did not have with Claire.

Besides my early concern about establishing rapport with Claire, another concern I had about her participation in this research was her apparently ambivalent attitude toward Spanish. As time went by, I came to value Claire’s contribution to the research, but I still wondered what her attitude toward Spanish really was. In our first interview, I asked her to tell me her favorite class, and she said, “I think [pause] math. Math, yeah.” She indicated, however that she liked Spanish (Interview, 1/21/05).

I looked into Claire’s feelings toward Spanish class again in our second interview:

AN: How do you feel about Spanish compared to your other classes?
[Pause.]  
CM: Um. [Pause.] I don’t know. Um, I think it’s like. [Brief pause.] I don’t think it’s as fun, because you have to sit down and actually watch the tape, but I think it’s fun when you have to say the words, because it’s a little funny when other people are trying to say it, [I laugh.] because sometimes they mess up.

AN: Mm-hmm. [Pause.] Okay. Are there some classes you like better than Spanish, like math or something? [Pause.]
CM: I kind of like math better but, mm, not really. Like. [Pause.] Mm, yeah. Um. [Very quietly:] I don’t know. (Interview, 5/2/05)

Whereas Claire expressed definite opinions on some matters, such as her preference for being taught by Mrs. Ford over receiving instruction through videoconferencing (Interviews, 1/21/05, 5/2/05), I came to accept her lack of strong preferences in other matters, such as which class was her favorite or what her pseudonym should be.

On Tuesday, January 18, I talked to Claire about needing a research name for her (Field notes, 1/18/05). On Friday morning of that week, she hadn’t thought of one yet, so by the time of our interview that afternoon, I came up with a list of five first names, which I showed her, and she picked Claire (Field notes,
1/21/05). She still hadn’t given me a last name for the research by the beginning of May, so I offered her a list of three (including Montgomery), and when she still wasn’t sure, I told her she could take the list home, suggesting that she get the help of her sister or mother in thinking of a name (Field notes & interview, 5/2/05). I followed up on May 12, asking her if she had decided on a last name for herself for the research. Because she hadn’t, I said I would use Montgomery if that was all right with her, and it was (Field notes, 5/12/05).

Another way in which I learned about Claire was through observing her in Spanish lessons, where I found there to be so little variation in her behavior that I took special note of Mr. Baxter’s interactions with her in regard to the way she normally sat during early Español para ti videos.

Observations of Claire in Spanish Lessons. In the normal course of Spanish instruction, Claire attracted little attention to herself. During Español para ti lessons, she usually sat at her desk at the front of the room, watched the video, and wrote on her Saber es poder card. If Mr. Baxter asked questions about the video afterwards, she might raise her hand and answer some of them. In the Tele Café, she followed the lessons and took part in singing and group responses; sometimes she provided answers in different activities, especially in the sessions that Mrs. Ford led without videoconferencing.

The only occasions on which I ever observed Mr. Baxter correct Claire for anything even vaguely related to her behavior or deportment were when he gave her directions for her seating. In the first part of the year, although she sat in the front left grouping of desks, her desk and chair faced the back of the room. During the Español para ti videos, she would remain in her seat, with her chair facing the back of the room, unless directed to do otherwise. To watch the video on the television that was in the front left corner of the room she would swivel her legs toward the windows on the right (to her left), would twist her body toward the back of her chair, and would often lean on the back of it. To write on her Saber es poder card she would turn back to her desk.

Mr. Baxter would give seating directions at the beginning of the Español para ti lessons. On October 19, 2004, among his string of directions, he said, “Uh, Lucy, Elena, and Claire, you’re gonna need to turn around, please” (Transcript, 10/19/04). The circumstances were similar on November 10, when he said, “Claire, you need to turn around, so your back is not towards the television” (Transcript, 11/10/04). On the previous day, he had gotten the majority of the students to sit on the floor, including Claire, who sat with her back to her desk (Field notes, 11/9/04). The following week, Mr. Baxter also got her to sit on the floor, another exception to her usual position at her desk: “Claire, Lucy, Emily, Damarcus, Jane, I’d like you sitting on the floor like you do in the Spanish lab and be part of the group” (Transcript, 11/16/04).

In the Tele Café (or the Spanish lab, as Mr. Baxter called it) for all lessons except the cooking activities, Claire sat on the floor, as did the majority of the other students. She would sit toward the front of the group but often not on the first row. The only example I have of her seating being corrected there was on
April 14, when Mr. Baxter was trying to fill in gaps in seating. He told Claire to move up, but she only did a little. She was wearing fairly short shorts and was sitting with her legs carefully arranged, folded to her right (Field notes, 4/14/05).

Mr. Baxter, in fact, had a high opinion of Claire, who, like Edward, was a very good student. In March when I asked Mr. Baxter what Claire was like as a student in her other subjects (besides Spanish), he replied, “Claire is just like Edward. Terrific student, grasps everything, loves school, intelligent kid, well behaved.” Mr. Baxter went on to mention Claire’s sister, who had been in his class the previous year, and then concluded his comments on Claire: “So she’s just a terrific kid” (Interview, 3/16/05).

Through a discussion of Claire’s report cards in the next section, her academic achievements and strengths will be more fully revealed. A discussion of her absences from Spanish lessons will also be offered.

Claire’s Academic Record and Her Absences from Spanish Lessons. An examination of report cards for the 2004–2005 school year reveals that, for the five subjects that Mr. Baxter taught his class (Reading, Science, Social Studies, Writing, and Math), Claire and Edward received identical grades for each of the three marking periods: straight A’s (A = 90–100%), except for the B (B = 80–89%) that they each received in Writing in Marking Period 2.

The report cards also record Mr. Baxter’s ratings of his students’ Work Habits and Conduct. Claire received V’s (V = Very Good performance, the second highest rating) in both for the first two marking periods. Her grades for Work Habits and Conduct had improved to E’s (E = Excellent performance, the highest rating) in Marking Period 3.

The students in Mr. Baxter’s class also received grades for classroom work and conduct from three other teachers for the following classes: Art, Music, and Physical Education. Claire received straight E’s in Art. Her grades in Music were all E’s except for a V for Conduct in Marking Period 1. In Physical Education, Claire received an S (Satisfactory performance, the next rating under V) for her “classroom work” in Marking Period 1. Otherwise, she received V’s in Physical Education, except for an E for Conduct in Marking Period 3.

In three of the classes that Claire attended, no grades were assigned. Two of these, attended by all students in Mr. Baxter’s class, were Spanish and Marine Science. The third class was Chorus, taught by Mrs. Buchanan, who also taught the Music class. Early in the school year, Mr. Baxter explained to me what was required to get into Chorus: A student needed to possess behavior that was considered good and had to have brought back the permission slip and shown an interest (Field notes, 8/20/04). Many of Mr. Baxter’s students went to Chorus at 2:00 on Thursdays, often before Spanish instructional sessions in the Tele Café had ended.

Another source of information on Claire’s academic achievement is the report-card section devoted to the County Instructional Assessment Plan, where the results of assessments in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics are given. As the Dolphin Point Newsletter for October 1, 2004, explains, the assessments are
linked to the *Essential Learnings* that have been identified by the County in answer to the question: “What do we want our children to know and be able to do as a result of being in our class this year?” Claire met or surpassed the expectations in the three areas for September, January, and April, the three dates for which results were given.

Claire’s final report card of the year (for Marking Period 3) contains information on her “year to date attendance.” Here it is stated that she was absent 1 day. However, because I was at Dolphin Point on January 6 and 7 and because I questioned Brittany and later Claire on the subject (Field notes, 1/7/05, 1/11/05), I know that Claire was absent due to illness on both those days. As I have already mentioned (see Table 2), I observed Claire for less time than my other participants. Leaving aside the issue of the final report card’s inaccuracy in this area, Claire’s absences from Spanish lessons are not fully explained by her absences from school.

Claire was involved in various activities that took her away from Spanish lessons. For example, on Thursday, November 4, 2004, she and other students who were in Chorus began to leave the Tele Café before the Spanish lesson was over (Field notes, 11/4/04, ff.). It was also due to participation in Chorus that Claire and other students missed an *Español para ti* lesson on Tuesday, December 7. From January to the beginning of April 2005, besides her absences from school on a Thursday and a Friday, Claire missed three and a half Thursday lessons in the Tele Café, three Friday video lessons involving *Muzzy*, and at least two Wednesday and one Tuesday *Español para ti* lessons. It is possible that on one Wednesday Claire was attending the Principal’s List (Dolphin Point’s highest academic honor) Bowling Party and that her attendance on Fridays was affected by her involvement in the Multicultural Club. On the Thursday Claire missed the first half of a lesson in the Tele Café, she had apparently been working with a teacher employed with Title I funds, who practiced skills with all of Mr. Baxter’s students at various times throughout the school year (Field notes, 1/13/05).

Having presented information on Claire’s academic achievements in other subjects and on her absences from Spanish lessons, I will now offer some explanations for her limited oral participation in the Spanish lessons she attended.

*Reasons for Limited Oral Participation in Spanish Lessons.* As far as oral participation in Spanish classes is concerned, Claire wasn’t always interested in answering questions. My query, “Do you like answering questions in Spanish?” elicited this response from Claire: “Depends on how I feel” (Interview, 1/21/05). In studying Claire’s oral production, I have discovered that when she did answer questions, her responses were usually both linguistically and factually correct. Indeed, one factor in her willingness to raise her hand during Spanish instruction seemed to be a need to feel fairly confident that she knew the right answer, as the following anecdotes illustrate.
One Thursday in April, there was no videoconferencing because of a field day at Greenwood Park, and Mrs. Ford was trying out a Spanish game that was based on baseball. Claire, Ciara, and others raised their hands after Tim had struck out, due to his inability to answer a question. Later in the game, however, I noticed that Mr. Baxter was signaling Claire to raise her hand, and I heard her tell him, "I'm scared" (Field notes, 4/14/05).

I noticed Claire's reticence again 2 weeks later when Mr. Baxter's class was playing a Spanish baseball game against Dolphin Point's other fifth-grade class. Partway into the game, Mr. Baxter suggested that the students from each class line up in batting order instead of sitting together on the rug and having Mrs. Ford pick who would have the next turn. I noticed that Claire assumed a position toward the back of the line that her class formed (Field notes, 4/28/05).

Some of Claire's concerns about being wrong came out in several interchanges between us in her interview the following Monday. These concerns had to do with how other students would perceive her and whether they would make fun of her or laugh at her. The following interchange begins with my seeking Claire's reaction to communicating with students in another class through videoconferencing:

**AN:** When you're in the Tele Café, how do you feel about saying things in Spanish to students in the class at the other school? [Pause.] I guess you mostly say things to the teacher.

**CM:** Yeah. 'Cause the kids aren't really asking the questions.

**AN:** Yeah. What about them listening?

**CM:** Um, I think it's all right, because they don't laugh if we mess up.

[Pause.]

**AN:** Okay. Um, would you? Well, you don't really do this, but if, if you did: Would you rather say things in Spanish to students in your class or to students in the class at the other school?

**CM:** Just the students in the class at the other school.

**AN:** Oh, so you're interested in saying things to them?

**CM:** Yes.

**AN:** Oh, okay, that's interesting. Why?

**CM:** Because the kids in your class, I think they would be like, um, "What are you talking about?"

**AN:** Oh.

**CM:** 'Cause they don't know that you're trying to speak in Spanish.

**AN:** Okay. When your Saber es poder card is selected, how do you feel about it being shown to students in the class at the other school?

**CM:** I kinda feel embarrassed because all of the, um, because sometimes a word could be written wrong, and she would have to correct it. And I just always think that they're gonna laugh. (Interview, 5/2/05)

Claire also expressed her concerns in an interchange in which I tried to describe the assessment program that Mrs. Ford had implemented with fourth graders and asked for Claire's reaction to it:
AN: Suppose you had to learn certain things in Spanish, like the numbers up to 100, and the Spanish teacher spent time with just you, asking you questions about the numbers until you could give the right answers. Do you think Spanish would be different then?
CM: Yes, because then you would, I think you would feel embarrassed, because you, she has to take you away from the whole class and has to let you learn that way.
AN: Oh, but if she were doing it with all of the students in the class, one by one.
CM: I think it would be the, all right, because none of them would feel differently, because then they wouldn’t be able to make fun of you.
(Interview, 5/2/05)
In spite of Claire’s concerns about being wrong and the reticence she displayed in Spanish baseball games, she expressed a preference for competing in teams when I asked her about this:
AN: What do you think would be better in games with the class at the other school: adding the points for both classes together or adding the points separately for each class so that you’re playing against each other?
CM: They should add the points separately, I think.
AN: Oh, can, is that more fun?
CM: Yeah.
AN: Okay. What about in your own class, do you like doing things all together; or in teams; or sometimes together, sometimes in teams?
CM: In teams. (Interview, 5/2/05)
Claire also talked about the Spanish baseball games in positive terms at the end of the interview:
AN: What do you think you'll remember the longest about Spanish here over the years you've taken it? [Pause.]
CM: The baseball games.
AN: Oh, I think that there may be one more. That's what Mr. Baxter told me, maybe the last week.
CM [very quietly]: Oh, cool. [I laugh.]
AN: Do you want to say anything else about Spanish?
CM: Uh. [Pause.] Just that I [with a laugh in her voice] hope they do have another baseball game. (Interview, 5/2/05)
Claire’s enjoyment of the baseball games was something of which I was unaware until she told me about it. In fact, during the course of this research, I learned various things about Claire that I would not have guessed toward the beginning of the 2004–2005 school year.
One way in which I was able to learn more about Claire and about my other participants was through a consideration of what was important to them. For Claire in the school setting, this seemed to be her friends. When I asked her in the May interview, “What do you think you’ll remember the longest about school this year?” she replied, “My friends and how much math we had to do”
(Interview, 5/2/05). My examination of Claire’s friendships at school in the next section will also provide an opportunity for me to consider Claire’s assumption of leadership roles and the question of whether she ever interacted with her friends in Spanish.

**Claire’s Friends at School.** From observing Claire, I learned that her best friends in Mr. Baxter’s class were Emily, Jane, and Lucy. Claire and these students often sat near each other. For example, they sat in the front left grouping of desks in Mr. Baxter’s classroom at the beginning of the school year, and when the desks were arranged in rows, they maintained the same positions (Lucy, Jane, Claire, Emily) in the middle of the front row from the beginning of January to the beginning of March (after which the arrangement of desks was changed again). Mr. Baxter’s statement to me that the students “pretty much group themselves” (Interview, 3/16/05) reinforced my belief that these students stayed together by choice.

Like Claire, Emily, Jane, and Lucy were quiet. Jane, an Asian girl whom I considered the quietest student in Mr. Baxter’s class, had been at Dolphin Point at least since the second grade. Both Emily, a White girl, and Lucy, an Asian girl, entered Dolphin Point in the fifth grade. Lucy, like Claire, was a very good student, receiving mostly A’s in Mr. Baxter’s classes. Emily and Jane were both good students, whose grades were almost evenly divided between A’s and B’s, with the exception of a C that Jane received in Writing in Marking Period 2.

The extent to which Claire paid attention in class stood out to me as her most notable characteristic. Because of this, I took particular note of any instances in which her attention to a lesson was even temporarily broken. For example, during the *Español para ti* lesson on October 13 when the video teacher was singing the Spanish song about making hot chocolate, Claire whispered something to Jane (Field notes, 10/13/04). Later in the school year, during another *Español para ti* lesson when the video teacher was talking about different professions, it was Jane who quietly said something to Claire (Field notes, 2/16/05).

During the cooking sessions in the Tele Café, a reward earned by individual fourth and fifth grade classes, students had the opportunity to interact with each other. When I asked Claire what she liked best about the cooking, she explained, “... it’s kinda when we sit down, and we actually get to talk to our friends while we’re waiting. And we get to do, um, we get to do the activities that are in Spanish on the paper” (Interview, 1/21/05). I also appreciated and took advantage of the opportunity provided by the cooking sessions to interact with students, as well as observe them.

The first cooking session took place on October 11, 2004, and featured empanadas [turnovers]. After a group that included Ciara, Brittany, and Edward had gotten their empanadas, I went over to the table where Claire was sitting. She was reading the paragraph that Emily had written about the cooking experience. Another girl at the table asked what cheese was in Spanish. Claire
and I said, “queso,” at almost the same time, Claire starting to say it only slightly after I had begun (Field notes, 10/11/04).

The third cooking session featured plantains. During this session, I went over to Claire’s table and asked her if she liked the plantain that Mrs. Ford had just cooked. She hadn’t taken a bite yet, so I asked Emily. It ended up that neither of them liked the cooked plantain that much, but they liked the chips (Field notes, 1/26/05).

During the next cooking session, I approached the table where Claire was sitting with Emily, Jane, and Lucy. I started talking to both Claire and Lucy, with whom I had spent time at the County’s World Languages Field Day less than 2 weeks before. I questioned them about the tortilla salad, “¿Te gusta? Do you like it?” They each indicated (by their expressions and gestures) that they only liked it so-so. I verbalized this, “¿Así, así? So-so?” (Field notes, 3/10/05).

Not only did Claire sit with Jane, Emily, and Lucy in Spanish classes, she also spent time with them outside of Mr. Baxter’s classroom and the Tele Café. For example, on the last day before the Winter Holidays, Claire and Jane left the Tele Café together before the end of class to run an errand (Field notes, 12/16/04). I sometimes observed Claire with her friends in the hallways and interacted with them there. This happened on May 4, when Mr. Baxter and his class were late in returning to their classroom from lunch, and I went to look for them. After waiting for the students to come upstairs and talking to Edward, I approached Claire, Lucy, and Emily, who were standing together by the railing opposite the library. I asked Lucy if this were her first year at Dolphin Point. Both she and Emily said yes. I went on to ask Lucy if she had known any Spanish before she came to the school, and she replied that she hadn’t. Next, indicating that I was addressing both Lucy and Emily, I asked if it was hard coming in and learning Spanish when the other students had been taking it already. Lucy replied, “Not really.” When Claire prompted Emily to respond, she said that it was kind of hard (Field notes, 5/4/05).

Another friend with whom Claire sometimes interacted was Laurie, a White girl with a bubbly personality. Laurie, who entered Dolphin Point in the fourth grade, accidentally blurted things out in English during Spanish-only time in the Tele Café more often than any of the other students in Mr. Baxter’s class. Toward the beginning of October, Claire and Laurie were together in the Chorus room when I went to talk to Claire there (Field notes 10/7/04). In the ticktacktoe game during a videoconferencing session on February 3, after Claire had given “Quito” as the correct answer to “La capital del Ecuador es ______”, she and Laurie started saying, “Ecuador,” to each other quietly when Mr. Allen’s class at Greenwood Park got the clue, “Quito es la capital de ______” (Field notes & transcript, 2/3/05). I also noticed Claire and Laurie going around together toward the beginning of April, when they were about to work on depicting a marine habitat in the vestibule with students from Dolphin Point’s other fifth-grade class (Field notes, 4/6/05).
Claire sometimes took on a leadership role among her peers. For example, she spoke to a standing-room-only crowd of children and adults at the Dolphin Point Season’s Greetings Program, expressing the sentiments of the fifth graders, as the end of their time at the school approached, in the “Fifth Grade Farewell” (Field notes, 12/14/04).

Claire also assumed the role of team captain on at least two occasions. I have already mentioned that she was a captain in the Spanish jeopardy game on the last day before the Thanksgiving Break. On that occasion, Mr. Baxter assigned his students to four groups for the game and told the groups to pick a captain to act as spokesperson (Field notes & transcript, 11/19/04). On another occasion, April 5, Claire was the captain of the fifth-grade team for the Battle of the Books (Dolphin Point Newsletter, 4/1/05). When I asked her about this competition the next day, she explained that there was a list of 15 books that students were supposed to read and about which they answered questions, buzzing in (Field notes, 4/6/05).

There were only a few isolated instances when I heard Claire say anything in Spanish to her friends, all of whom had entered Dolphin Point’s Spanish program later than she had, with the exception of Jane. Claire verified that she and her friends didn’t try to speak Spanish with each other in school, when I asked her about this in an interview (Interview, 1/21/05). However, there were occasions when Claire took on a leadership role among her peers, stepping out of her usual quietness. This was the case in the Spanish jeopardy game when Claire produced even more Spanish utterances than did Edward (Transcript, 11/19/04).

In this section, I have tried to portray Claire in interactions with her friends at school and in the leadership roles she sometimes assumed, bearing in mind any opportunities for speaking Spanish of which she availed herself. In the next section, I will consider the possible influence of Claire’s family on her development as a Spanish student.

Claire and Her Family. Claire’s sister, Stacey, was a student in Mr. Baxter’s fifth-grade class the year before Claire was. Their mother, Sarah Montgomery, who is active in her daughters’ education, shared a story about Stacey with Mrs. Ford in the fall of 2004 that, I believe, came to symbolize for Mrs. Ford and Mr. Baxter both the success Dolphin Point’s Spanish program and the County’s failure to offer Spanish in the sixth grade in the majority of middle schools. I first heard Mrs. Ford relate the story to Mr. Baxter after his class had entered the Tele Café on November 4, 2004:

Do you remember Stacey? Stacey wanted to take Spanish this year in Fern Creek, and she couldn’t. And I mean, she walked in the room . . . , and she started reading things from all over the room. And she [the teacher] said, “Where did you learn all your Spanish?” But she [Stacey] couldn’t take it. So she’s taking it next year. (Transcript, 11/4/04)

In interviews with Mrs. Ford and with Mr. Baxter in March, when I asked them about Claire, both brought up Stacey and mentioned her not being able to
take Spanish in the sixth grade. The question that I posed to Mrs. Ford was
“Could you describe Claire as a Spanish student?” In her answer, Mrs. Ford
immediately brought up Claire’s sister, telling me, “Now I’m gonna give you the
background here, because it’s important.” She told me that Stacey was a “very
good student, a little more outgoing than Claire. Claire is a little quieter.” Mrs.
Ford went on to tell me that when Stacey had gone to middle school that year,
she hadn’t been able to take Spanish because of scheduling and wouldn’t be
able to take it until seventh grade. Mrs. Ford again related what had happened
at the middle school:
But she went into the Spanish room, and she started to read everything
that was up around the walls. And the teacher said, “Why aren’t you in my
Spanish class?” [Mrs. Ford and I laugh.] and, “Where did you learn all your
Spanish?” So, of course, . . . Stacey told her. (Interview, 3/8/05)
After sharing her wish that Stacey could have taken Spanish that year and
her admiration for Stacey as a Spanish student, Mrs. Ford gave a more detailed
appraisal of Claire as a Spanish student before discussing both Claire and
Stacey again:
Claire was always more quiet, but I knew, I could see that she was
processing this, this language. She has really shown a lot of growth this
year in just being a little bit more outspoken and just being, um, more
involved in the lesson. She will sit, and watch, and listen, and she’ll, she’s
very focused when she’s in here, very focused. And I could tell, even
though she’s not one that will raise her hand a lot of times and not one
that’s really outspoken, you could almost see the wheels turning with
Claire.
Her mom says that Claire will bring a lot of it home, and then
Stacey with Claire will talk. Now next year when Claire, when Stacey
takes Spanish, Claire will be in the sixth grade, and she’ll be in the same
boat her sister’s in, so maybe her sister, Stacey, will be the one that can
help her out. (Interview, 3/8/05)
I have already related Mr. Baxter’s comments about Claire – “Terrific
student, grasps everything, loves school, intelligent kid, well behaved” – when I
asked him, “What is Claire like as a student in her other subjects?” That
statement was immediately followed by a reference to Claire’s sister and her
situation in middle school:
She had a sister that was with me last year, who went to middle school
and was terribly upset that she couldn’t go into Spanish in sixth grade, but
she will be there in seventh grade, and Claire will continue her Spanish
studies, I’m sure, also. (Interview, 3/16/05)
In my next interview with Mrs. Ford, I reminded her, “When we ended the
last time, you were talking about Claire and Stacey,” and I asked her, “Did you
want to say anything else about Claire as a Spanish student?” She replied, “No,
they’re both excellent students,” and went on, “I’m sure they’ll continue with their
studies” (Interview, 4/21/05).
I had seen Stacey Montgomery (although I didn’t know her last name at the time) in Mr. Baxter’s class on the occasions I had observed it during the 2003–2004 school year. My memory of her was refreshed when I attended the County’s World Languages Field Day on February 26, 2005, and saw her there. It was also on that day that I met Claire and Stacey’s mother, Sarah, who was very friendly and provided me with helpful information on her daughters.

The County’s Field Day was held at a high school approximately 13 miles away from Dolphin Point. After the morning’s activities, lunch was served in the school cafeteria. I had already gotten my food when I saw a group from Dolphin Point enter that included Claire, Lucy, and a lady I guessed to be Claire’s mother. I asked Lucy and Claire which activities they had participated in, and when they got up to get food, I introduced myself to the lady, who did turn out to be Claire’s mother, Sarah Montgomery. Sarah and I visited while Claire, Lucy, and others ate lunch. We talked about many topics, including Field Day, my research, Claire and Stacey, Dolphin Point, and Mr. Baxter (Field notes, 2/26/05).

I asked Sarah how Stacey and Claire had come to be students at Dolphin Point, and she explained. When Stacey was just a toddler, an elementary school was being built quite close to their home, and Sarah had told Stacey that she would be able to go there. It turned out, however, that they lived on the wrong side of the road to attend that school, and Stacey was bused to Dolphin Point, beginning in kindergarten. At first, Sarah hadn’t been happy about this, but she had come to really like Dolphin Point and said that it was like one big family (Field notes, 2/26/05).

Sarah went on to tell me that Claire is 16 months younger than Stacey and really should have been one grade farther back in school, because her birthday is in November. However, Sarah and her husband had placed Claire in a private school so that she wouldn’t have to wait an extra year to start her formal education. As soon as Claire was old enough, Sarah had gotten her into Dolphin Point (Field notes, 2/26/05). (Claire’s cumulative folder indicates that she went to private school in kindergarten and first grade and entered Dolphin Point at the beginning of second grade. Her folder also contains a report from the end of second grade that states that Claire showed the “majority of the characteristics of a gifted child, according to a standard scale or checklist.”)

Sarah told me that Stacey was going to Fern Creek Middle School, which is close to their home, but the bad thing about Fern Creek is that Spanish isn’t offered there until seventh grade. Sarah said that Claire was helping Stacey keep up with her Spanish; they sing songs and go over country names together (Field notes, 2/26/05).

It was about 12:30 when Sarah told me that she needed to get together the children she had brought, because she had told Edward Jones’ mother that she would have him back to Dolphin Point by 1:00. She helped Claire, Lucy, and Edward, who had all been sitting close to us, to gather up the flowers they had made, along with their Field Day passports (that had been stamped for the activities they had attended). Sarah then said that she needed to find Stacey. I
saw Claire shrug her shoulders. Sarah pointed out and explained this reaction, saying, “Claire is like, ‘Why do we have to find Stacey?’” (Field notes, 2/26/04).

I didn’t go off with Sarah, Claire, Lucy, and Edward at first but later joined their search for Stacey. Finally, at the end of a side hall, Sarah saw Stacey inside a classroom, where there was a doll-making activity (Field notes, 2/26/05).

More than 2 months later, when I asked Claire, “What do you remember most about World Languages Field Day?” she replied, “I remember mostly having to wait outside the doors [to go in and do activities], because it was so crowded. But I like, I liked doing the paper flowers.” She paused briefly and added in a slightly ironic tone of voice, “And I remember my sister running away” (Interview, 5/2/05).

The impression that I got from Claire’s mother of Claire and Stacey practicing Spanish away from school was different from the one that I got from Claire herself. In my interview with her in January, after confirming that her sister had gone to Dolphin Point and was currently in middle school, I asked, “So do you and your sister ever speak Spanish outside of, I mean to each other?” to which Claire replied, “No.” I followed up: “No? You ever try with anybody outside of school? Say things in Spanish?” and Claire said no again (Interview, 1/21/05).

At the end of April when I saw Sarah, Stacey, and Claire at the Recycle Regatta, Sarah and I again talked about her daughters and Spanish. Sarah told me that she isn’t good at languages but that her girls are. She said she goes over the countries and capitals with them, and they say, “Mom, that’s not how you say it.” Stacey was standing by us at that time, and Sarah asked her, “What’s that one?” Stacey replied, “República Dominicana,” with good Spanish pronunciation (Field notes, 4/30/05).

As I had planned, I interviewed Claire 2 days later and questioned her about her use of Spanish outside of school. When I asked her whether she ever did anything on the computer at home that had to do with Spanish, she replied, “Mm, no. ‘Cause usually, um, [brief pause] my mom will want me to help around the house.” Our interchange continued as follows:

**AN**: Oh. Okay. Have you done anything with Spanish outside of school over the past few months? [Brief pause.] Like, uh, has your mother helped you review or anything?

**CM**: No, not really. (Interview, 5/2/05)

My interview with Claire continued with my question about World Languages Field Day and her response. Then I asked her about her experiences taking Spanish at Dolphin Point when her sister was there:

**AN**: So, what was it like for you when your sister was at this school and you were both taking Spanish? [Pause.]

**CM**: I think it was okay, because we weren’t in the same class, and, um, usually she’ll get mad at me, so.

**AN**: Oh. [I laugh.] Did you ever talk about Spanish outside of school? [Brief pause.]

**CM**: I would tell my mom what I learned in Spanish.
AN: Oh. What about with Stacey, did you ever say anything to her? Did you? No?
CM: No. Sh, um, she doesn’t have Spanish at school.
AN: But I mean before, [CM (very quietly): ‘Yeah.’] when you were both here.
CM: Mm, no.
AN: Okay. So you didn’t practice Spanish together or anything? Okay.
CM: Maybe if she had something in Spanish that was homework.
AN: Oh.
CM: And I don’t think she really had that. (Interview, 5/2/05)

I believe that Claire’s responses show what stood out or didn’t stand out in her mind. For example, helping her mother around the house must have made much more of an impression on her than reviewing Spanish. This reminds me of the impression I had by the end of the school year that the blinds in Mr. Baxter’s classroom were never open (Field notes, 5/17/05). I know, however, that the blinds weren’t always closed, because there were three occasions in the fall when I noted that Mr. Baxter asked a student to close them before an Español para ti video (Field notes, 9/22/04, 9/29/04, 10/20/04).

Talking to Claire and her mother and seeing Claire and Stacey in non-school settings helped me to understand Claire as a Spanish student and to understand something of the relationship between Claire and Stacey. One thing I learned was that although Claire remembered telling her mother what she had learned in Spanish, any practice of Spanish that she may have done with her sister didn’t stand out in her memory. Besides opportunities Claire may have had to practice Spanish with family members, I was interested in the things that helped her learn Spanish in school, her attitude toward learning Spanish, and any contact with the Spanish language and its speakers she may have had outside of school.

Questions About Spanish in and out of School. Although I will wait until a later section to write about the reactions of all my participants to the main components of the Spanish program at Dolphin Point, I would like to mention here a few things that Claire said she liked about Spanish and to discuss her attitude toward learning the language. I will also mention her contact with Spanish outside of school.

When I asked her what she liked about Spanish, Claire first mentioned the way in which clowns were described: “how big they are, how small they are.” Since she was referring to something in Español para ti, I followed up by asking her what else she liked about the video series, and she told me, “I like talking about the fruits” (Interview, 1/21/05).

Claire also talked about fruit when I asked her about her learning of Spanish:

AN: Do you feel like you’ve learned a lot of Spanish?
CM: Yeah.
AN: What are some things that you’ve learned?
CM: I learned how to [with a laugh in her voice:] say apple in Spanish. Orange. Um, I’ve learned how to say the colors. I’ve learned how to say, um. [Pause.] (Interview, 1/21/05)

Although I gave Claire the opportunity to continue with the list of what she had learned, she didn’t add anything else. I find it interesting that the things she said she had learned weren’t the same as the vocabulary she used in her utterances as an individual. This reinforces my impression that she could have produced more Spanish than she actually did.

When I asked Claire how Mr. Baxter helped her learn Spanish, she did make reference to the number, date, and calendar vocabulary on which she based most of her individual utterances:

CM: Sometimes he talks about the calendar, and he makes us say the numbers and the month in Spanish.

AN: Wow. I didn’t even realize that. Is that at the beginning of the day?

CM: He doesn’t always do that.

AN: Just sometimes. Oh. Anything else you can think of? [Pause.]

CN: Yesterday he was making us say numbers in Spanish so we could know about the number board for, um, in the Tele Café. [This was for a concentration game.] (Interview, 1/21/05)

In her interview in May, I again looked into what helped Claire learn Spanish, but instead of focusing on Mr. Baxter, I asked what helped her in her classroom, outside of the Tele Café. In her reply, Claire talked about learning words from the videos that she would then hear Mrs. Ford using (Interview, 5/2/05).

I was interested not only in what helped the participants learn but also in how they felt about what they had learned, so I asked Claire in May, “How do you feel about your learning of Spanish, about what you’ve accomplished?” She responded, “I think it’s good because, if you get a job, they would most likely hire you, because you know a different language.” When I asked her if she were satisfied with the amount she had accomplished, she replied that she was. In comparing herself with other students, as I requested, Claire said she thought she had learned the same amount of Spanish as other students in the fifth grade and that she and other fifth graders had learned more than students in the younger grades (Interview, 5/2/05).

Outside of school, Claire had little contact with Spanish. She said that sometimes she heard people speaking Spanish on the news. However, she didn’t hear much of what they said, because a translation would be given over their speech. She also described observing a lady who went up to the counter in a store and was speaking Spanish. Claire said she had recognized the word más [more] and recalled another word that the lady had used that she didn’t know. When I asked Claire if she ever read any Spanish outside of school, she said no, but then added, “Like sometimes I’ll be reading a book, and some Spanish will be in the book, and I’ll try and read that” (Interview, 1/21/05).

Because of Claire’s limited exposure to and practice with Spanish away from school, it is likely that she learned almost all of her Spanish through Dolphin
Point’s FLETT program. Claire was a high academic achiever in other subjects, and her performance in Spanish was good, with a high degree of accuracy in her utterances. She expressed concern about being wrong in Spanish, specifically in regard to being laughed at by other students. In spite of this, she enjoyed competitive activities, such as the Spanish baseball games. Although she rarely spoke Spanish with her friends, when Claire assumed a leadership role in the Spanish jeopardy game she showed that she could produce more Spanish utterances than she usually did.

**Brittany Johnson**

Brittany Johnson produced only 31 Spanish utterances as an individual during the 7 months of this study. In fact, after March 31, she did not produce any utterances as an individual in the different instructional settings. Ranking her productivity in these settings according to the average number of minutes between her Spanish utterances, she was most productive in instruction led by Mr. Baxter after *Español para ti* videos, followed by the single videoconferencing session led by Mr. Straten for which she was present, instructional sessions in the Tele Café without videoconferencing, the *Español para ti* videos themselves, and videoconferencing sessions led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten. Brittany didn’t produce any Spanish utterances in cooking sessions or in the jeopardy game before the Thanksgiving Break.

All but one of Brittany’s Spanish utterances were three words long or less, and a quarter of those I heard clearly involved linguistic errors. Eight of her utterances were based on action words, and another seven were based on number vocabulary. Color vocabulary was the basis of another four, and date and calendar vocabulary was the basis of another three. Brittany produced most of her utterances as an individual in practice activities during *Español para ti* videos, in line-up activities at the conclusion of lessons in the Tele Café, in activities led by Mr. Baxter after *Español para ti* videos, and in the calendar segment of lessons in the Tele Café. She also produced four utterances that weren’t part of a teaching activity and that she seemed to be directing to herself. She did not produce any utterances as an individual during games.

As will be revealed in a later section, Brittany said that Spanish was her favorite class and talked about telling her mother and other members of her family what she had learned. The contrast that existed between Brittany’s positive attitude toward Spanish and Claire’s generally ambivalent attitude came to interest me, especially in view of Claire’s greater linguistic accuracy and the higher number of utterances that she produced in an instructional setting such as the Spanish jeopardy game. The contrast between Brittany’s extroverted behavior in informal settings and her quietness in certain situations, such as interviews and competitive games, also attracted my attention.

I came to know Brittany through observing her and through interacting with her both informally and in interviews. I learned more about her from her academic record, and from insights that Mrs. Ford and Mr. Baxter shared with me.
**My Interactions with Brittany.** One of the first things I noticed about Brittany, a large Black girl, was the interest she showed in what I was writing in my notebook on the occasion when she sat near me on the floor in Mr. Baxter’s room during an *Español para ti* lesson in September (Field notes, 9/22/04). Brittany’s interest in me and in what I was doing continued throughout the school year and was just one example of her interest in other people, an interest that I soon learned was teamed with a great desire to be helpful.

During the course of this research, Brittany often helped me with the recording equipment that I used. Subsequent to Mr. Baxter’s initial suggestion on October 27 that I get a student to carry something for me and his selection of Damarcus to do it (Field notes, 10/27/04), the next opportunity I had to get such help with equipment was on November 9 when I approached Mr. Baxter’s class in the courtyard by the cafeteria prior to an *Español para ti* lesson and asked if Ciara and Brittany could carry equipment for me (Field notes, 11/9/04). Securing their assistance on this occasion meant that I was able to interact with them and become better acquainted with them not only as we walked to Mr. Baxter’s room but also in the room both before and after the arrival of the rest of the class (Field notes, 11/9/04).

On that day, Brittany and Ciara each expressed an interest in seeing what I had previously recorded with the camcorder. At the time, I wasn’t familiar with how to review a recorded segment, and when Ciara crowded in to look at the instructions I had with me before I had even had a chance to focus my vision on them, I offered to demonstrate how the CD recorder worked instead, playing a small portion of the last videoconferencing session (Field notes, 11/9/04). Then, as the class was entering the room, I made a brief recording of some interaction between Brittany, Ciara, and me:

- **Miss Norwood:** ¿Cómo estás? ¿Cómo estás? ¿Bien?
- **Brittany:** Ciara, say somethin’!
- **Miss Norwood:** I have it recording.
- **Brittany:** Say, Hola [Hi].
- **Ciara:** Hola. [Ciara laughs.]
- **Brittany:** Down there. (Transcript, 11/9/04)

I only have four such spontaneous recordings of students, and Brittany is included in all of them. The next recording is from the following day, when Brittany, Colleen, and Cassandra asked to help me. On that occasion, they took the camera and tripod, the CD recorder, and my bag, and we went up to Mr. Baxter’s room together. Brittany helped me set up the tripod and plug in the CD recorder. I played segments of what I had previously recorded on a CD for the girls and made a brief recording of them. In this, Brittany first urges Cassandra, a pretty and friendly Black girl, to “say somethin’,” and then the three girls get together to say, “hello,” and, “hola.” Next Brittany sings a little in English. Colleen comments, “Okay, Brittany,” and Brittany says, “Hablo” [I speak] with a good Spanish pronunciation. Colleen repeats, “Hablo,” but her pronunciation is heavily influenced by English. Brittany corrects her, emphatically pronouncing
“hablo” as a Spanish word. Their interaction continues, including Cassandra’s contribution of “Hola,” and ends with Colleen’s exclamation concerning the impending arrival of the rest of the class, “They’re coming!” (Field notes & transcript, 11/10/04).

Although Brittany and her friends used some Spanish words in the recordings I made of them (Transcripts, 11/9/04, 11/10/04, 11/16/04, 1/18/05), when I asked Brittany if she and her friends “ever speak Spanish to each other” at school, she said, “No.” I reminded her, “One time I heard you and Ciara messing around with a little.” At my further prompting, she confirmed that they didn’t use much Spanish beyond that (Interview, 1/21/05).

I rarely made a special request for a particular student to help me carry things, usually allowing those who asked first to do it. I only requested Brittany’s help on the first of the 19 occasions that she carried things for me. Her assistance in this regard was more than twice as frequent at that of any other student. In her desire to help, she sometimes showed herself very insistent, asking me several times when I didn’t immediately give her what she wanted (Field notes, 11/16/04 & 1/4/05), or taking hold of the straps of my purse when there was nothing else left to carry (Field notes, 2/9/05).

By the time Brittany started carrying things for me, the initial shy tones in which she had addressed me, introducing herself as, “Brit, Brittany” (Field notes, 10/6/04), or with which she had talked about me, telling Mr. Baxter, “There’s that lady,” when I approached them one day in the courtyard (Field notes, 10/20/04), were being replaced by friendlier and happier tones, so that later in the school year, she greeted me exuberantly: “Miss Norwood!” (Field notes, 3/30/05) or “Hi, Miss Norwood, girl!” (Field notes, 4/6/05). Although the way Brittany addressed me underwent change during the school year, her interest in me and in what I was doing seemed to remain constant, as her actions on January 12, 2005, show.

On that day, neither the camcorder nor the CD recorder I used in my research were available to me, and I arrived at Dolphin Point, planning simply to observe the Español para ti lesson and take notes. Not seeing Mr. Baxter’s class in the courtyard, I went upstairs and subsequently met the students in the upstairs hall as they returned from lunch. I said hello to Colleen, who was toward the front of the line of students. Brittany came up to me and stood a few inches from my face. After we had greeted each other, she asked me about the plastic nametag holder in which I had placed my Dolphin Point visitor sticker. Then she wanted to know what I had in my folder. I told her I just had some papers in it, and, to direct her attention elsewhere, I handed her a small, bilingual, double book (What Daddies Do Best/Lo Mejor de Papá – What Mommies Do Best/Lo Mejor de Mamá, Numeroff, 1998). She wanted to know if I was going to read it to them, and I said I had just brought it for them to look at (Field notes, 1/12/05).

Once we were in Mr. Baxter’s room, Brittany asked me if I needed a chair, and when I said yes, she got me one and put it by her desk. I moved it back a little. While she continued looking at the book, I wrote down abbreviations for who was sitting in the first two rows. Then she noticed that I had written
something and wanted to know what it was, and I quietly went through what I had meant for the first row: “Ciara, Lucy, Jane, Claire, Emily, and you” (Field notes, 1/12/05). When the Español para ti video started, Brittany began to watch it and write on her Saber es poder card, as usual. Brittany’s behaviors in video lessons and in class sessions in the Tele Café will be the subject of the next section.

Brittany in her Spanish Classes. During Español para ti lessons, Brittany displayed many of the same behaviors as Claire, most notably watching the video and writing on her Saber es poder card. Brittany’s focus wasn’t as good as Claire’s, but there were respects in which she sometimes seemed more actively involved in lessons, physically responding to music with movement or orally responding to the prompting of the video teacher, for example.

I noted five different occasions during Español para ti lessons when Brittany moved her shoulders along with music, but didn’t ever note Claire doing this. On October 20, for example, Brittany moved her shoulders with the music and joined in the singing of a Cha-cha-cha song, telling Toño what to do (Field notes, 10/20/04). She seemed especially animated on December 8 when Lesson 26, a review through songs, was shown. During this lesson, she not only moved her shoulders, sang, and wrote on her card, but, while remaining seated, moved her body in a way that resembled dancing (Field notes, 12/8/04). In contrast, Claire sat quietly in her seat during this lesson and wrote on her card (Field notes, 12/8/04). (Although I didn’t see Claire singing during this lesson, there were several occasions on which I noticed her singing or silently mouthing words along with songs in video lessons; Field notes, 10/20/04, 4/8/05, 1/12/05.)

Occasionally during a video lesson, Brittany’s attention was distracted because of interaction with a person sitting near her. This can be seen in two incidents that I would characterize as territory disputes: one in which Ciara pushed Brittany’s elbow away (Field notes, 10/13/04) and another that took place when Brittany and Ciara were sitting on the floor, and, in the midst of a presentation about the times when certain things are done, Brittany burst out, “Move your leg, Ciara!” (Field notes & transcript, 11/10/04). There were also instances of Brittany, like Claire, quietly talking with students sitting near her: Ciara (Field notes, 11/30/04, 1/21/05), Cassandra (Field notes, 1/18/05), and Amanda (Field notes, 2/9/05).

In January 2005, Brittany began to display certain mannerisms that seemed to indicate that her attention wasn’t fully on the Spanish lesson at hand, whether this was delivered through videoconferencing or through video. On January 6, when she entered the Tele Café, I noticed that hair was done in a special way, with many thin braids. During that videoconferencing session, I saw her examining and doing something to her fingernails and later twisting around one of her bracelets (Field notes, 1/6/05). The following week during an Español para ti lesson, she flipped one of her thin braids over her head and looked at the end of her hair (Field notes, 1/12/05). On other occasions, I observed her moving her head forward and backward so that her hair was flying in front of her face and then back (Field notes, 1/18/05), looking at her hands and fingernails
In spite of these lapses in Brittany’s attention, as well as the two occasions during *Español para ti* lessons when she was looking at a piece of paper she had slipped out of her desk (Field notes, 4/28/05, 5/4/05) and the two occasions during *Muzzy* videos when she was doing math (Field notes, 1/7/05, 2/25/05), she was generally attentive and involved in the Spanish lessons, whether in Mr. Baxter’s room or in the Tele Café.

I was able to gain Mrs. Ford’s insights on Brittany as a Spanish student in an interview in April:

**AN:** Then, could you describe Brittany as a Spanish student? You know? [LF motions toward the table where Brittany had been sitting earlier during a cooking activity.] Yeah, she was over there today.

**LF:** Aha. Um, very quiet, very quiet. I don’t know. Have you had her one-to-one? (Interview, 4/21/05)

I told Mrs. Ford about Brittany’s brief answers in our first interview, and she went on to talk about Brittany being quiet in first language learning, as well as second language learning, concluding that she isn’t a verbal child. Mrs. Ford didn’t stop there, however, but added her observations on the quality of Brittany’s listening:

On the other hand, I must say that she listens. Sometimes I look at her, and I know she’s listening, and I’m sure it’s all coming in. So I think she’s a case where she probably knows much more than we hear her saying. (Interview, 4/21/05)

Another characteristic of Brittany that I have already discussed is the interest that she took in other people. This interest was manifested in her friendships and the importance she placed on them. With her friends, Brittany displayed a tendency to laugh that those who prompted the laughter could have interpreted as laughing at them.

**Brittany and Her Friends.** Something of Brittany’s orientation toward her friends can be illustrated through the way in which she approached deciding on a pseudonym for herself. I gave each of my case study participants the opportunity to come up with a pseudonym. Edward Jones was the first to do this, deciding on that name fairly quickly (Field notes, 1/14/05). When I approached Brittany soon thereafter, I explained to her about needing another name for the research, and she got me to tell her the name Edward had chosen. She said that she wanted her research name to be the real first name of Ciara. I told her that would be too confusing for me and cautioned her to pick a girl’s name. She chose Brittany, and I agreed to that. (On February 3, 2005, I heard her use this name in talking to Mrs. Ford about a fifth-grade field trip, so it is possible that Brittany is the name of one of her friends from the other fifth-grade class.) She gave her own last name and asked if she could use that. Then she wanted Jones, and when I wouldn’t let her use that, she wanted Ciara’s real last name. Finally she chose “Johnson,” to which I agreed. (Field notes, 1/14/05. Johnson
is actually the last name of one of Brittany’s friends, but at the time I was thinking about Johnson being a common name.)

Of the students in Mr. Baxter’s class, Brittany interacted the most with her friend Ciara. Although they only sat near each other in Mr. Baxter’s classroom until November and their seating in relationship to each other varied in regular class sessions in the Tele Café, I saw them together and noted their interactions and similar interests under various circumstances. On November 2, for example, I was waiting in Mr. Baxter’s classroom for the students to return from lunch. When they came in, Ciara gave me a high-five, and then Brittany did, too. Next Ciara asked me if I could do “this,” and he showed me a kind of dance that looked similar to a jitterbug. A demonstration by Brittany followed (Field notes, 11/2/04).

Brittany was a good source of information on Ciara. At the end of class on November 2, when Ciara was trying to get me to give him a pencil I had lent to Brittany, showing me the stubby pencil he was using, she said that he had a couple of long ones at the bottom of his backpack (Field notes, 11/2/04). In the courtyard prior to Spanish on November 16, she told me that he was absent that day (Field notes, 11/16/04). Before school started on the morning of April 11, Ciara and Brittany were by themselves in the front corner of Mr. Baxter’s room, and Ciara was showing Brittany some dance steps. Because Mr. Baxter had told me that the only way I would be able to get information on which students participated in the federal meal program was to ask them, I approached Ciara and Brittany and asked if either of them got free or reduced-price lunch. Brittany said that she got free lunch. Ciara shook his head, indicating that he didn’t, but Brittany maintained that he got lunch for reduced price. He agreed with that (Field notes, 4/11/05).

Cassandra was a friend of both Ciara and Brittany. Brittany and Cassandra got together to help me carry things on three occasions (Field notes, 11/10/04, 11/16/04, 5/17/05), and the two of them, along with Ciara and Mark, helped Mrs. Ford by passing out students’ folders at the beginning of a cooking session in January (Field notes, 1/26/05).

Brittany and Cassandra liked to laugh together, as they did in one of the audio recordings I made of them in November (Transcript, 11/16/04). Brittany, Cassandra, and Ciara were the ones who laughed during a videoconferencing session in January when the topic of discussion for likes and dislikes changed to movies, and Mrs. Ford talked enthusiastically in Spanish about how much she liked Beauty and the Beast, her favorite movie (Field notes & transcript, 1/13/05). At the Chorus program that was put on at the end of the school year by fourth-grade Chorus students for the fifth graders in Chorus and a few guests, Brittany and Cassandra, as well as the two girls sitting between them, also laughed, so much so that the girl sitting to my left began to grumble about how they shouldn’t be laughing when they can’t even sing themselves (Field notes, 4/29/05).

Another incident of either Brittany or Cassandra laughing took place on November 16, just after I had arrived at Dolphin Point. I was in the courtyard with Claire to my left and Brittany to my right and was asking these two students if
they had any ideas of what I should ask them in an interview. When I told them that Ciara had suggested, “How are you doing?” and “What other language do you use?” as possible interview questions, Claire answered the second question, saying, “English.” Either Brittany or Cassandra, who was with her, laughed a little (Field notes, 11/16/04). I have included this incident because both Claire and Brittany later expressed concerns about being laughed at (Interviews, 5/2/05).

Brittany displayed a readiness to laugh, a keen desire to be helpful, and an interest in other people that led her to learn many things about them, especially if they were her friends. Her first-grade teacher at Dolphin Point left this record of her strengths: “Brittany is a very cheerful and helpful student” (Cumulative folder, 10/26/00). At the time of this study, Mr. Baxter described her as follows: “She’s a sweet child. She really is. She wants to please, but she has a low reading level” (Interview, 3/16/05). He also characterized her as “academically challenged” (Interview, 3/16/05). In the next section, I will present information from Brittany’s academic record.

**Brittany’s Academic Record.** Brittany was a longtime Dolphin Point student, having first enrolled there when she was 4 years old. Throughout her cumulative folder, there are references to her academic difficulties, especially in mathematics. In Brittany’s final report card from the first grade, her teacher commented that she had made “good progress in all areas except math.” This can be seen in the grades she received: all N’s (Needs Improvement) in the first two marking periods in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics; an E (Excellent) in Reading in Marking Period 3, along with a V (Very Good) in Writing and an N in Mathematics.

At the beginning of the third grade, Brittany’s teacher noted that she was “below grade level in math” (Cumulative folder, 8/30/02). Two months later, this teacher stated that Brittany had not improved in math but was “on grade level for reading and writing” (Cumulative folder, 10/29/02). Later in the school year, however, Brittany exhibited difficulty in reading and was considered for retention in the third grade (Cumulative folder, 2/28/03), a retention that didn’t take place (Cumulative folder, 5/6/03).

In the fourth grade, Brittany did not meet the requirements of the County’s policy on promotion but again was not retained. As the form letter sent to Brittany’s mother by her teacher and Dennis Newberry, Dolphin Point’s principal, explains, “We feel that it is in the best interest of your child for him/her to be promoted to the next grade level at the end of this school year” (Cumulative folder, 4/27/04).

Brittany’s fifth-grade report card shows her grades for the 2004–2005 school year. In the classes she took with Mr. Baxter, Brittany received three C’s in Reading, three B’s in Science, a C and two B’s in Social Studies, three C’s in Writing, and a C, a D, and another C in Math for each of the three marking periods. Additional codes are included with the D, indicating that Brittany needed to improve in all areas of Math: Mathematical Concepts, Computational Skills,
and Problem Solving Skills. For Work Habits, Brittany received an S (Satisfactory performance) from Mr. Baxter in each of the three marking periods, as she did in Conduct.

Brittany’s classroom work and conduct were also rated in Art, Music, and Physical Education. In Art, Brittany received three V’s (Very Good performance) for her “classroom work” and a V and two E’s (Excellent performance) for Conduct. In Music, she received all E’s and in Physical Education, all S’s.

As I explained in my discussion of Claire’s report card, results of assessments in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics are given in a report-card section devoted to the County Instructional Assessment Plan. Brittany met or surpassed the September and January expectations for Writing but did not meet the April expectations in this area, nor did she meet the expectations for Mathematics for any of the three testing dates. At the bottom of her report card for Marking Period 3 is the statement: “Brittany received a score below grade level on the April math assessment.” This poor performance, however, did not lead to her retention, as the statement immediately following that one indicates: “Brittany is being promoted to Grade 06.”

Returning now to the County Instructional Assessment Plan report-card section, it can be seen that in addition to scores on the Common Reading Assessment, indicating that Brittany met or surpassed September, January, and April expectations, Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) Lexile results are provided for the three testing dates. According to the website of the Lexile Framework for Reading, it is “a scientific approach to reading measurement that matches readers to text” (n.d., Researchers section, ¶ 1). In September, Brittany’s SRI Lexile score was 249; in January, it was 689; and in April, it was 772. (Claire’s scores were 1090, 1132, and 1105 for the same dates.) Expected Lexile ranges by grade level are given on the website of another elementary school in the County: 500-800 in third grade, 600-900 in fourth grade, and 700-1000 in fifth grade.

Brittany’s report card for Marking Period 3 shows that she was only absent from school on 2 days during the school year. Her attendance in Spanish classes was also good, and the time she missed can mostly be attributed to her involvement in Chorus. Because of this involvement, she often left Spanish instructional sessions in the Tele Café before they were over. The Chorus road trip also kept her away from an Español para ti lesson on December 7 (Field notes, 12/7/04, 12/8/04). The only other absence from a Spanish class that I have recorded for her occurred on March 17, when she missed one of the two videoconferencing sessions led by Mr. Straten (Field notes, 3/17/05).

In March 2005, I asked Mr. Baxter what Brittany was like as a student in her school subjects other than Spanish. He mentioned her positive attitude toward school and the academic challenges she experiences. Then he expressed uncertainty about her Spanish skills:

Brittany, again, is academically challenged. She loves school, and she works hard, but her reading level keeps her academics low, and I’m not sure what her Spanish skills are. You know, it’s just really challenging for
her to grasp anything because of a low reading ability. (Interview, 3/16/05)

In the next section, I will discuss Brittany’s attitude toward Spanish in comparison to her other classes, what was important to her about learning the language, and what helped her learn it, including the role of her family in her learning.

Questions About Spanish in and out of School. At the beginning of my first interview with Brittany, I asked her what her favorite class was, and she responded, “Spanish.” As the interview progressed a little, I noticed how brief her answers were and that she seemed subdued, so I asked if she minded answering and if she felt uncomfortable at all. When she said, “yes,” I inquired if she wanted me to turn the recorder off, so we could just talk for a while without it. She replied, “no,” and the interview continued (Interview, 1/21/05).

I was surprised by the brevity of most of Brittany’s responses, and although I gained insight into her learning of Spanish through many of them, other responses were difficult to interpret. This was the case when I offered her alternatives, but she simply answered with “yes.” For example, after Brittany had responded, “Yes,” to a question about whether she ever hears people speaking Spanish in stores or other places, I asked her if she understands “a few words here and there or any more.” When she replied, “Yes,” to this question, as well, I tried to find out what she meant:

AN: Can you understand [BJ: Yes.] a? So, like a few words here and there or any more?
BJ: Yes.
AN: What? [I laugh a little.]
BJ: A few words.
AN: A few words. Okay. I wasn’t sure what you meant, since I gave you a choice. A few words. (Interview, 1/21/05)

Before our next interview in May had started, I made an effort to put Brittany at ease. I told her that it wasn’t a test but that I wanted to know what she thought about some things. I started the interview with a few questions, which she answered and then pointed to the recorder. There was a record error, so we started over again:

AN: Oh, well, I hope this works. So, you were talking about Spanish compared to your other classes. And what did you say?
BJ: Um. That Spanish helps me more often than the other classes.
AN: Okay. And you like Spanish?
BJ: Yes.

Although Brittany’s answers were also brief in this interview, she appeared to be more at ease than during the previous interview (Field notes, 5/2/05).

Besides asking Brittany in both interviews about her feelings toward Spanish in comparison to other classes, I questioned her about her learning of Spanish. In January, I asked, “Do you feel like you’ve learned a lot of Spanish?” to which she responded, “Yes.” I followed up by asking what some of the things
she had learned were. She replied, “I learned how to say plate, in Spanish, um, [pause] the name of the country” (Interview, 1/21/05). In May, we had the following interchange about her learning of Spanish:

AN: How do you feel about your learning of Spanish, about how much you’ve accomplished?
BJ: I feel that it’s helped me get better at Spanish.
AN: Are you satisfied with what you’ve accomplished?
BJ: Yes.
AN: Good. Why do you think you’ve accomplished as much as you have?
BJ: Because, um, maybe sometimes I want to get a word right, and I know the word more, more better than I was before. (Interview, 5/2/05)

In another response, Brittany indicated that she thought she had learned the same amount of Spanish as the other students (Interview, 5/2/05).

Another topic that I looked into in the second interview was Brittany’s attitude toward competition in different situations:

AN: What do you think would be better in games with the class at the other school: adding the points for both classes together or adding the points separately for each class so that you’re playing against each other?
BJ: Mm. Add the points separately.
AN: Ah. Okay. What about in your own class, do you like doing things all together; or in teams; or sometimes together, sometimes in teams?
BJ: All together. (Interview, 5/2/05)

In the course of both interviews, Brittany brought up her mother, and we talked about the role of her family in her learning of Spanish. When this first happened in January, I had just asked Brittany, “What’s the best thing about Spanish in the Tele Café?” leading to the following response and interchange:

BJ: That when you, when you, the more you learn it, the more you get better at it. You’ll be able to talk it to other people, too, and teach them how to talk Spanish.
AN: Have you tried that, to teach somebody?
BJ: Yes.
AN: Who?
BJ: My mom. (Interview, 1/21/05)

After a brief interruption by a teacher who was retrieving something from the office area where the interview was taking place, I followed up on Brittany’s response:

AN: So, do you do that with your mother very often?
BJ: Yes.
AN: Okay. What kinds of things do you tell her, trying to teach her?
BJ: How to do the numbers and teach her different words that we’ve learned. (Interview, 1/21/05)

What led up to Brittany’s next mention of her mother in the first interview was my question about whether Brittany ever listens to Spanish on TV or the radio, her affirmative reply, and my further question, “Can you understand
anything?” to which she responded, “Yes.” Then I asked her about what she can understand, which prompted the following interchange:

BJ: Like on TV, when they’re talking Spanish, and I can like remember what I did that day in school about Spanish, [AN: Oh, good.] and I can tell my mom what it, what it means.

AN: Oh, that’s good. Do you do that very often?
BJ: Yes. (Interview, 1/21/04)

A little later in the interview, I returned to the subject of Brittany’s mother and Brittany’s use of Spanish:

AN: And you were saying you talk with your mother in Spanish, and [BJ: Yes.] what about anybody else?
BJ: Mm, um, [pause] sometimes I talk with my grandma or my sister. (Interview, 1/21/05)

I asked Brittany if either of them speaks Spanish, and when she said, “No,” I questioned her about whether she is teaching them or just telling them things she has learned, but the only answer I got to this was “Yes” (Interview, 1/21/05).

Brittany again volunteered information about her mother and what they do with Spanish when I interviewed her more than 3 months later:

AN: Have you done anything with Spanish outside of school over the past few months?
BJ: Yes.
AN: What have you done?
BJ: My, my words that I learned. [Brief pause.] (Interview, 5/2/05)

When I asked Brittany about reviewing these words, she said her mother helps her review and indicated that she and one of her sisters, who has taken Spanish, sometimes review together (Interview, 5/2/05).

Besides talking about teaching her mother Spanish numbers and words and replying that Spanish words were what she had done outside of school, Brittany emphasized the importance of learning Spanish numbers and words in school. In the first interview, she said that what she liked best about the Español para ti videos was that they taught her how to do the large numbers (Interview, 1/21/05). She expressed a preference for Muzzy over Español para ti, because it taught her more Spanish. When asked how it did this, she replied, “They’re countin’ in Spanish. I count with them, and it help me more to learn how to do my Spanish” (Interview, 1/21/05). She also explained that the way in which Mr. Baxter helped her to learn Spanish was “he goes over with the numbers and works with us” (Interview, 1/21/05).

Brittany talked more about numbers and words in the second interview. She said that words were what helped her to learn Spanish in her classroom (Interview, 5/2/05). Unlike Claire who expressed a preference for interacting with students in the class at the other school because “they don’t laugh if we, if we mess up,” Brittany maintained she would rather listen to what students in her class have to say “because they know how to teach me the words without laughing at me” (Interview, 5/2/05). (In the previous interview, Brittany had said that she preferred Spanish in the Tele Café with just Mrs. Ford to
videoconferencing, “because we can concentrate better and not have people joking around and not messin’ with us.” Interview, 1/21/05.) When I asked Brittany, “If you could have your Spanish class just the way you like it, what would it be like?” she replied, “It would be like doing numbers and reviewing my Spanish” (Interview, 5/2/05). Her responses to my questions about things she would remember the longest again involved words and numbers:

**AN**: This doesn’t have to be about Spanish. What do you think you’ll remember the longest about school this year?

**BJ**: That I learned how to say Spanish words.

**AN**: Okay. Wow. What do you think you’ll remember the longest about Spanish here over the years you’ve taken it?

**BJ**: The numbers. (Interview, 5/2/05)

Although Brittany emphasized words and numbers, she didn’t think of Spanish solely in these terms. This can be seen in her reply to my question about how she thought knowing Spanish would help her in the future:

**AN**: How do you think that knowing Spanish will help you? Or do you think that it will help you? Later on.

**BJ**: Um, it will help me [pause] by me asking questions in Spanish and learning how to do things in Spanish. (Interview, 1/21/05)

Although I still entertain the possibility that Brittany may have liked another class, such as Music, as much as or more than Spanish, I do believe that learning Spanish was important to her and that she put serious thought into building upon the knowledge that she gained over time. I also believe that practicing Spanish outside of school had a much more prominent place in Brittany’s mind than in Claire’s, regardless of who actually practiced more in that setting.

Brittany’s friends were important to her, and she was interested in other people. Her behavior was extroverted in interactions with her friends and in other informal settings. Perhaps the academic difficulties that she experienced contributed to her quietness in certain school settings. She said that she preferred doing things together with her classmates to having her class divided into teams but voiced a preference for competition in games against the class at Greenwood Park during videoconferencing sessions. In spite of this preference, she never produced any Spanish utterances as an individual during games. Some of her utterances were produced during *Español para ti* videos when what she said wouldn’t be noticed by more than a few people. She produced utterances in other settings when there was no awarding of points and when she was familiar with the activity and could be fairly confident about knowing the correct response. For example, the calendar segment was invariably a part of Spanish instructional sessions in the Tele Café, and Brittany participated in it in a session without videoconferencing, in a videoconferencing session led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten, and in a videoconferencing session led by Mr. Straten.

Brittany often expressed herself in terms of the word *help*. She was eager to help me carry equipment. She talked and wrote about what helped her learn Spanish, and she voiced her belief that Spanish helps her “more often than the
other classes” (Interview, 5/2/05). In fact, as was shown in the chapter on the participants’ language, it was in the context of helping Colleen call colors in a line-up activity that Brittany produced more Spanish utterances than was usual for her (Transcript, 2/24/05).

**Ciara Nivea**

Ciara Nivea produced 83 Spanish utterances in the different instructional settings during the 7 months of this study. This number includes both his utterances as an individual and some utterances I could hear clearly that were part of a response that included one or more other people. Ranking Ciara’s productivity in the different instructional settings according to the average number of minutes between his Spanish utterances, he was most productive in instruction led by Mr. Baxter after *Español para ti* videos (6 minutes between utterances), followed by instructional sessions in the Tele Café without videoconferencing (8 minutes between utterances). Ciara’s productivity declined in videoconferencing sessions led by Mr. Straten and cooking sessions, in both of which the average number of minutes between his utterances was 15. Ciara was even less productive in videoconferencing sessions led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten, with an average of 33 minutes between his utterances, and during *Español para ti* videos, with an average of 49 minutes between his utterances. He did not produce any Spanish utterances in the jeopardy game before the Thanksgiving Break.

Only 4 of Ciara’s 83 Spanish utterances were longer than three words in length. More than a third (25) of his 73 utterances that I could hear clearly involved linguistic errors, pronunciation errors occurring in the majority (20) of these. The English pronunciation of the name of a country or continent accounted for 10 instances of flawed Spanish pronunciation. Although Ciara’s utterances were based on various types of vocabulary, geography vocabulary was the basis for the highest number (28), followed by number vocabulary, the basis of 18 utterances. Ciara produced Spanish utterances during many different activities, including baseball and concentration games; the calendar segment of lessons in the Tele Café; geography, line-up, number, and question-and-answer activities; greetings; and practice activities during *Español para ti* videos. He was present for more line-up activities than the other participants and produced more utterances in them (15) than in any other type of activity.

Ciara actively participated in Spanish lessons, and sometimes his performance exceeded others’ expectations for him. As will be discussed in the following sections, Ciara was an academically challenged student who often had a hard time maintaining focus, but capitalizing on his strengths helped him to play an active role in Spanish lessons.

*Introduction to Ciara.* In comparing my case study participants, some of the most striking differences could be found between small, blond Claire and Ciara, a tall, thin Black boy. Besides differing in race and sex, they differed in socioeconomic status, with Claire paying full price for lunch (Field notes, 5/12/05).
and Ciara getting lunch for reduced price (Field notes, 4/11/05). The youngest of my participants, Claire was born in November 1994 and should have been in the fourth grade. Ciara, the oldest student in my study, was born in February 1993 and would have been in the sixth grade if he hadn’t been retained in the third grade. As this implies, Ciara was academically challenged. Claire, on the other hand, was a high academic achiever and displayed many characteristics of a gifted child.

There were differences between Claire and Ciara as Spanish students, as well. The rare occasions in Spanish class when Claire communicated in whispers with her friends were of such brief duration that I got the impression that her attention was never truly drawn away from the lesson. Ciara, on the other hand, had a hard time focusing, especially in video lessons, where he would sometimes repeatedly talk to other students, show them his Saber es poder card, and look at different people and objects in the classroom. He was eager to participate, however, and raised his hand many times, especially in lessons without videoconferencing in the Tele Café. Claire raised her hand much less frequently, not always feeling like answering questions. The amount of time these students spent in Spanish classes was also different. Claire was absent from or missed a portion of a number of Spanish classes, whereas Ciara had almost perfect attendance, and I spent more time observing him than my other case study participants. Of all the Spanish lessons for which I was present in the 2004–2005 school year, he only missed one Español para ti lesson, as well as 2 minutes at the beginning of another Español para ti video and 3.5 minutes at the beginning of a lesson in the Tele Café.

Ciara was usually eager to help me with my research. Once when I introduced myself to a substitute teacher who had Mr. Baxter’s class for the day and let him know that I was there to study the Spanish program, Ciara indicated that he was helping me with the research and said that he was one of the best (Field notes, 1/7/05). As I told Mrs. Ford at the beginning of October 2004, it was more like Ciara chose me than I chose him (Field notes, 10/1/04). Although he had had many academic difficulties, there were some respects in which Ciara did very well in Spanish class.

In the next section, I will explore Ciara’s feelings toward Spanish in comparison to his other classes. I will also look into what helped him to learn the language and into additional contact he had with Spanish both in and out of school.

Questions About Spanish in and out of School. In early October 2004, Ciara expressed a desire to be interviewed by me (Field notes, 10/7/04) and subsequently asked me on several occasions when I would be doing it (Field notes, 10/11/04, 10/28/04, 12/1/04). Partly because of his interest, I engaged him in a brief recorded conversation on January 6 that served as practice for our first interview later that month (Field notes, 1/6/05). In our early January conversation in Mr. Baxter’s classroom, Ciara revealed some of his academic
frustrations, as well as his interest in places. He also shared some of his feelings and insights regarding the Spanish program (Transcript, 1/6/05).

I began the January 6 conversation with a question that Ciara had earlier offered me as a good one to use in an interview, “How are you doing?” Ciara replied that he was all right (Field notes, 11/11/04; transcript, 1/6/05). Because it was the fourth day back at school, following the Winter Holidays, I asked him if he had had a good vacation. He indicated that he had and went on, “Got, got a better way from the teachers and the testing and stuff. Then we came back; we had tests.” He mentioned tests in reading, writing, and math, and quietly concluded, “Yeah, I made a F” (Transcript, 1/6/05).

Ciara and I proceeded to talk about what he considered his favorite classes to be and about his feelings toward Spanish:

AN: What’s your favorite class? [Pause.]

CN: Lunch.
AN: [I laugh]: You like lunch.
CN: And PE.
AN: Do you like Spanish?
CN: Kinda.
AN: Why do you?
CN: I don’t understand what she’s sayin’.
AN: Is it hard for it to be all in Spanish?
CN: Once you get it, and then the next moment she change the word. You’ll get confused by her. (Transcript, 1/6/05)

I commented that once I had used English in the Tele Café when I should have been using Spanish, and then I asked Ciara, “So, do you like it better with the video in here or in the Tele Café?” He said that he liked it better in the Tele Café and expanded:

It’s more fun over there, because she’s doing it real life. She’s doing it bad on the tape. So [unintelligible], she’s [unintelligible] teachin’ us, and she don’t even know who we is. That lady over there know who we is. (Transcript, 1/6/05)

When I asked Ciara what he thought about Señora Ford talking back and forth with Señor Straten, he responded, “Well, I say it’s not confusing. We’ve been doing that for years.” After my expression of assent, he added, “Since the old building right here.” This led to my mention of the site used by Dolphin Point during the construction of the new school building, after which Ciara launched into a discussion of his neighborhood, which is “dangerous at night” (Transcript, 1/6/05).

Although Ciara never mentioned Social Studies (in which he received the only A’s on his 2004–2005 report card) as one of his favorite classes, I came to realize that he often thought in terms of places. In addition to Ciara’s first approaching me to ask which side of town I lived on and his bringing up Dolphin Point’s old building and commenting on his neighborhood on January 6, he mentioned different places in his interviews on January 21 and May 2 (Field notes, 8/25/04; transcript, 1/6/05, interviews, 1/21/05, 5/2/05).
Several of my questions of Ciara on January 21 elicited references to places. For example, he answered my question, “What are some differences in what the class is like now compared to when you first started?” by saying, “Oh, well, I first started, it was in the old building. It was the old building, a real, real old building. Now they just tore it down” (Interview, 1/21/05). He continued with a fuller description of the building and the surrounding area.

The question from January 21 that brought forth the longest description of a place from Ciara was “Do you think knowing Spanish will help you? Later on.” Interrupted only by my intermittent comments and questions, Ciara talked about Miami for almost 2.5 minutes, starting in this way:

Yeah, ‘cause it’s. I went to Miami, girl! Child, please. They're speakin’ Spanish and English at the same time. [I laugh.] I’m like, what? [I laugh.] And she was American. I’m like, what? What she sayin’? I’m like, uh-uh. (Interview, 1/21/05)

Ciara broached the subject of people from the south of Florida coming to the west central region of the state in his response to the second question I asked him following his extended comments on Miami:

AN: Do you, around here, do you ever hear people [speaking Spanish] in a store, someplace like that?
CN: Nope, they mostly speaking English.
AN: Mm-hmm. Okay.
CN: ‘Cause the Spanish people haven’t came up, up on Florida. They came, they staying down with Miami and the Everglades and all their stuff down there, where they came from. (Interview, 1/21/05)

In our interview on May 2, Ciara offered a different view on whether people from Miami were coming to his area of the state. I had asked him if he would want to learn Spanish if his only option for doing it were through watching the videotapes. He indicated that he would make an effort and explained why he would try to learn Spanish in this way: “‘Cause my mamma said that; I told her, ‘You gonna have to learn Spanish’; she said, ‘I'm old anyways.’ [I laugh.] Girl, then we speaking Spanish here, ‘cause they coming from Miami, coming up here” (Interview, 5/2/05).

Ciara’s comments in the previous paragraph include a reference to his mother’s perceptions of the importance of age in second language acquisition. He elaborated on what she had said: “‘I'm almost ‘bout to die [with a laugh in his voice:] anyways.’ She said, ‘I’m almost ‘bout to die anyway. [Ciara laughs.] Too late to learn it now’” (Interview, 5/2/05).

Other comments that Ciara made in his May interview show that he based his beliefs about what a particular speaker’s native language must be on her racial identity: “It was a Black girl that looked like me, and she walked past, and she speakin’ Spanish. I’m like, ‘What?’ They speak; they learn Spanish real down there. Real quick, ‘cause they right by Spanish people” (Interview 5/2/05).

In the May 2 interview, Ciara talks about places in connection with what is important to him about Spanish or what would help him learn Spanish better. My first question to him in that interview was “How do you feel about Spanish
compared to your other classes?” In his reply, he mentions a Spanish baseball game against the other fifth-grade class and highlights a geography answer he gave:

Spanish get us, español class get us more like, more time not to do work a lot and stuff, yeah. And much funner when we play baseball in español, and we caught up with Miss Jackson class. We were. And I had an answer named Argentina. (Interview, 5/2/05)

Later in the May interview, Ciara replied in the affirmative to my questions about whether he thought he had accomplished a lot in his learning of Spanish and whether he felt satisfied with what he had accomplished. When I asked him why he thought he had accomplished as much as he had in Spanish, he said, “Spanish countries.” He referred to them again when I asked him, “What do you think you’ll remember the longest about Spanish here over the years you’ve taken it?” replying with a chant that he made up:

Argentina! [He chants, clapping:] Oh, and Argentina, Bonos Airs! [Sic.] Mexico City, Mexico, oh! Guatemala, Guatemala! [He recites nonsense syllables.] Oh! [He recites more nonsense syllables and continues:] Sanduras, Sanduras, Sanduras! [Sic.] El Salvador, El Salvador, El Salvador. Oh! (Interview, 5/2/05)

When I asked Ciara if he ever does anything on the computer that has to do with Spanish, he mentioned Spanish fights, which he called “stick-body fightin’,” and then said that he had checked up on countries’ websites, too. In response to my question about what would help him learn Spanish better, he said that visiting a Spanish country would (Interview, 5/2/05).

As one would expect, not all of Ciara’s responses in interviews had to do with places. When I asked him what helped him in learning Spanish in his classroom, outside of the Tele Café, he said, “Doing it all day, like we did that other day. Yeah, remember you was there? We were doing it all day” (Interview, 5/2/05). Actually, Ciara’s statement included a combination of Spanish instructional settings. On April 28, when I arrived in Mr. Baxter’s classroom a little before 10:30 to continue a review of Spanish that I had started the previous week, the students were already watching an Español para ti video. The video ended about 10 minutes later, and I reviewed for 20 minutes. Next there was the Spanish baseball game against Mrs. Jackson’s class in the Tele Café, which lasted for almost half an hour (Field notes, 4/28/05).

I also asked Ciara in the January interview about his learning of Spanish. He told me that Mr. Baxter helped his class learn it by making them watch the videos and having them learn their numbers. What he liked about the Español para ti videos was where they “pick the words” and “show you what they mean” (Interview, 1/21/05).

When I asked Ciara if he felt he had learned a lot of Spanish, he told me, “It’s same; it’s the same thing, like other years, like other years I’ve been in this school.” He answered my question, “What are some things you’ve learned in Spanish?” with a list of Spanish words and phrases, English words, and words and syllables that he made up. In order to distinguish the Spanish from the
English pronunciations in the following excerpt, I have italicized the Spanish pronunciations. I have also underlined the Spanish words and phrases. I have not provided translations, however, because I believe that Ciara was unaware of the meaning of most of what he was saying:

**CN:** ¿Cómo estás tú? Por-de-via-cheque-queda-que [additional syllables that are unintelligible]. [He laughs.] **Español para ti, así** [additional syllables that are unintelligible] café real, castil [additional syllables that are unintelligible]. [He laughs.]

**AN:** [I laugh.]: I don’t. I understand some but not everything. Is there anything on [Ciara interrupts me here.]

**CN:** media, carmo, vale.

**AN:** Okay, yeah, now I’m understanding.

**CN:** brero, auto, adiós.

**AN:** Okay.

**CN:** coro, nueve, son las, diez [unintelligible], ocho, [unintelligible], y ocho.

**AN:** So, son las diez y ocho, was that, what’s it about?

**CN:** Well, it’s a number.

**AN:** Yeah, okay. So, that’s for time.

**CN:** Al-a, tuna, lonche-mqueda-macala-quechela, [unintelligible] familia [unintelligible] julio de la [unintelligible]. [I laugh.] (Interview, 1/21/05)

Besides Ciara’s limited explanation of “son las diez y ocho” [it’s 10:08] as a number, he provided further evidence at the end of the interview that he didn’t understand everything he said by asking me what “español para ti” [Spanish for you] means (Interview, 1/21/05).

In the January interview, Ciara also told me about his use of Spanish in different settings. He affirmed that he and his friends from Dolphin Point try to speak Spanish with each other. Outside of school, he tries to speak Spanish with his nieces and nephews. However, they don’t understand what he is saying, because they don’t have a Spanish program in their school (Interview, 1/21/05).

This section has presented information on Ciara’s learning of Spanish and on his contact with the language both in and out of school. As he observed, “Spanish countries,” or rather his interest in them, had helped him to accomplish as much as he had. In fact, his accomplishments were sometimes surprising. The next section will discuss how his interest in geography, his musical inclinations, and his eagerness to participate may have contributed to his performance in Spanish classes.

**Ciara’s Interests and Their Contribution to His Performance.** It wasn’t just in interviews that Ciara showed an interest in geography but also during Spanish lessons. On October 13, when the video teacher started talking about maps in an Español para ti lesson, Ciara exclaimed, “Ouuu, mapa!” In the special cooking session in celebration of Cinco de Mayo, as I was going by Ciara’s table, he grabbed my arm to ask me something about Nuevo México [New Mexico] in a map activity he was doing (Field notes, 5/5/05). When I was in Mr. Baxter’s classroom on May 11, Ciara grabbed my arm again and showed me a map of
Central America in a scholastic magazine that he and the other students were reading (Field notes, 5/11/05).

On the day of the Spanish baseball game to which Ciara refers in his May interview, he was wearing a T-shirt with “Argentina” written on it. He pointed this T-shirt out to me before I began the review with his class prior to the baseball game. He also pointed it out to Mrs. Ford during the game. When I joined Mr. Baxter’s class in the cafeteria soon after the game, Ciara again proudly showed me his T-shirt (Field notes, 4/28/05).

Before I went down to the cafeteria that day, Mrs. Ford and I talked about the game. In this conversation, she told me that she had been surprised by Ciara being able to answer the question that he had. I looked in my notes to see which one she meant and discovered that it was “¿Cuál es el país que está directamente al sur de México?” [Which country is directly to the south of Mexico?], to which Ciara had correctly answered, “Guatemala.” I mentioned having reviewed with the students and having asked, “¿Cuál es el país que está directamente al norte de Guatemala?” [Which country is directly to the north of Guatemala?] (Field notes & transcript, 4/28/05).

Probably Mrs. Ford wasn’t the only one to be surprised by Ciara’s performance in that Spanish baseball game. I later learned, through listening to my audio recording of the game, that a boy had commented, “Ciara don’t know,” before the latter had even chosen the homerun category for his question.

Sometimes I was the one to find Ciara’s success in answering certain questions a little surprising. This proved to be true toward the end of the final Spanish review that I conducted with Mr. Baxter’s class on May 4.

I started the review with animal flashcards and then went over time telling. Next I reviewed math. I went through the terms más, menos, and por [plus, minus, times], along with their meanings. I got students to come up and do math problems that I dictated in Spanish. Edward was eager to participate, and he did. I called on Ciara, because he had his hand raised. When I said what I wanted him to do, he told me that he had just been waving (Field notes, 5/4/05).

Later in the review, the teacher hired with Title I funds came to Mr. Baxter’s room and took about half of the students in the class with him, including Brittany. Among the students who were left were Edward, Claire, and Ciara. Mr. Baxter asked the remaining students to go to the front of the room. He wanted everyone to answer a question, so he said that they had to stay at the front until they had gotten an A (by answering a question correctly). He handed me the Español para ti Teacher’s Manual (Steele & Johnson, 1999), turned to one of the early pages, and suggested that I ask questions from there. While I was doing this, I asked Ciara, “¿Cómo estás?” [How are you?]. At first, he didn’t know what I was talking about, but then he caught on (Field notes, 5/4/05).

I used more of the Español para ti questions and then came up with others. When I couldn’t think of anything else, I started asking about capitals and countries of Latin America. It got to the point where all of the students in the room had answered at least one question correctly. Ciara and Elena (the native speaker of Spanish) were ahead, each having answered four correctly. Mr.
Baxter had me ask them something as a tiebreaker. I gave them Caracas, and they were supposed to tell me the country of which it is the capital. Ciara started out, “Ven, Vene.” After his first syllable, Elena quickly said, “Venezuela.” Even though she said it first, Mr. Baxter said that he thought Ciara had the right idea, and he gave them both an A for it (Field notes, 5/4/05).

Capitalizing on his interest in geography, Ciara was able to stand out in Spanish class. It is also possible that the way in which geographical information was taught through songs and chants in Español para ti lessons and in the Tele Café helped him to learn, because he had strong musical inclinations, even choosing as the first and last names of his pseudonym the names of two singers.

Sometimes Ciara would spontaneously begin to sing. During a cooking session on April 21 in which each student was given a sheet of paper with information about Chile on it, Ciara sang to himself, “The capital’s Santiago, oh, oh” (Transcript, 4/21/05). In the midst of my interviews with him on January 21 and May 2, Ciara repeatedly broke out in song. When I asked him in the first interview what he liked best about Spanish in the Tele Café, he sang one of the songs he had learned there, and I questioned him further about this response:

**CN** [sings]: Lunes, martes, miércoles, jueves, [clap] viernes, sábado, domingo [click, click]. [He hums instead of singing, “Es la.”] semana. [Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday. (It's the) week.]

**AN**: So, el calendario, that part of the lesson, or just all the songs?

**CN**: Yeah, all the song. (Interview, 1/21/04)

Ciara also discussed his interest in dance in the interviews. When I inquired in January as to whether he liked the dancing in the Español para ti videos, he compared his abilities with those of the character who does the dancing and reminded me of the occasions, after the majority of his classmates had gone to Chorus, when I had seen him sitting at a computer in Mr. Baxter’s room, wearing headphones and apparently moving to music (Field notes, 11/11/04, 1/13/05):

**CN**: Oh, yeah, I like that dancing, but she can’t dance though. [I laugh.] I can dance better than that. I could drop you like a pie, you know.

**AN**: [I laugh]: That’s pretty funny.

**CN**: You know. Say, [sings:] “Okay.” [He says:] And “Goodies,” “1-2 Step.” You know, I can do all that. Yeah. [I laugh.] You seen me on the computer, me dancin’ on, you know. (Interview, 1/21/05)

In the May interview, Ciara told me that he would like to take a dance class in middle school. I questioned him about whether he would take a class in music or one in dance if given the choice between them, and he responded that he would pick both (Interview, 5/2/05).

Another of Ciara’s assets was his eagerness to participate in lessons taught by Mrs. Ford in the Tele Café. In spite of his complaint to me that he couldn’t understand what was being said (Transcript, 1/6/05), Ciara often raised his hand and participated in these lessons, especially when geography was
involved. Mrs. Ford shared with me her evaluation of Ciara as a Spanish student, and I responded by commenting on Ciara’s ability to make me laugh:

LF: He would be the child that if you would, um, if we would give grades for participation and effort, he would certainly make an A, because he’s right there; he raises his hand; he’ll participate; but a lot of times; you know; he doesn’t know what to say. But he enjoys it. He really, truly enjoys it. So I’ve liked him. [I laugh.] I’ve liked him. I’ve liked him a lot.

AN: Yeah, sometimes he really makes me laugh. [I laugh.]

LF: He does. He does. ‘Cause if he doesn’t know it, he’ll make it up. [I laugh and say, “Yeah.”] It sounds good to him. (Interview, 4/21/05)

Ciara’s interest in places and his musical inclinations served him well in the Spanish instructional sessions without videoconferencing that were led by Mrs. Ford, in which his participation was quite good. In contrast, Ciara showed a lack of focus during video lessons, where he often interacted with other students and looked around, as will be seen in the next section.

My Observations of Ciara During Video Lessons. Although one of my early observations of Ciara was of the way in which he directed the attention of Laurie to a lesson in progress in the Tele Café (Field notes, 10/1/04), I soon realized that he himself had a hard time paying attention in certain settings, such as Mr. Baxter’s classroom when video lessons were being presented.

One day on which Ciara spent a lot of time visiting with another student during an Español para ti lesson was October 20, 2004. This was during the period when Ciara’s desk was part of a grouping in the front right of Mr. Baxter’s classroom, and on this day, Brittany, Cassandra, Amanda, and Minh were also seated at this grouping for Spanish class. As the video lesson began, Ciara was picking at his hand. Then he talked to Cassandra. Next he directed his attention to the video and wrote on his Saber es poder card from time to time. Then he talked to Cassandra again. When flashcards were shown on the video, Ciara and Brittany participated orally, giving answers. During a presentation on time telling, Ciara and Cassandra were visiting, but then Ciara turned his attention back to the video and correctly responded to the question, “¿Qué hora es?” [What time is it?] with “una” [one], although his answer lagged behind a little. When the video was over, Ciara showed his card to Cassandra and visited with her some more (Field notes, 10/20/04).

In the fall of 2004, Ciara paid special attention to Cassandra and was more likely to visit with her during Español para ti lessons than anyone else, although, as I mentioned in the section on Brittany and her friends, Brittany, Ciara, and Cassandra were all friends. Besides talking to Cassandra and, occasionally, Brittany during Spanish class, Ciara showed a preference for interacting with Colleen, another of his friends. Sometimes, however, it appeared that Ciara’s main consideration in sharing a comment during a lesson was proximity in seating. On December 7, for example, he turned and talked to Lucy, who was sitting to his right, twice during Español para ti Lesson 25 (Field notes, 12/7/04).
In addition to talking to his neighbors, Ciara showed other signs of inattention, as happened on February 9. On that day, he was sitting at his desk, which was now on the left end of the front row (where he had also been sitting on December 7). I positioned my chair to the left of and a little behind him. Edward came up and sat in a chair in front of me, so that he was also to the left of and a little behind Ciara, but closer to him than I was. About 4.5 minutes into the lesson, while the video teacher and LeeAnn (a puppet) were talking about who different people were, Ciara looked back at me. Later the video teacher talked about, as well as talked to, a firefighter. Ciara was looking at what Edward was doing. When el camión [the truck] was mentioned, Ciara looked back at Mr. Baxter and then wrote on his card. The video teacher mentioned la boca de agua [the fire hydrant]. I caught a glimpse of a book that Ciara had about Chyna. He said something to Edward, very briefly showed him the book, and then put it away. Later Ciara had out a paper about “basic form” that he held up for me to see, but I didn’t get a good look at it (Field notes, 2/9/05).

In spite of Ciara’s lapses in attention during Español para ti lessons, he was usually serious about working on his Saber es poder cards. He not only showed his cards to me from time to time (Field notes, 9/29/04, 10/13/04, 3/30/05), but I observed him showing a card to Cassandra on two different occasions and to Colleen and Minh on one occasion a piece (Field notes, 10/20/04, 10/27/04, 12/8/04, 3/30/05). In both of his interviews, he talked about how much he put on his cards (Interview, 1/21/05, 5/2/05). Looking at the area of his cards with his summary of the main idea of a lesson, however, his difficulties in writing English are obvious, as was explained in the section on Ciara’s Saber es poder cards in the previous chapter. In the next section, I will present information from Ciara’s academic record.

**Ciara’s Academic Record and Associated Difficulties.** Mr. Baxter talked about Ciara’s academic difficulties when I asked him what Ciara is like as a student in his other subjects:

Ciara has a very hard time reading. He’s a low academic achiever. He has a hard time focusing on what you’re doing. And I would guess that academically, or in Spanish, he grasps 50% of the words and vocabulary and maybe even less than that. (Interview, 3/16/05)

At the end of the school year, before the students’ final report cards were available to me, I asked Mr. Baxter if Ciara would be going on to middle school the next year. He said that yes, Ciara had just barely met the reading requirement to do that (Field notes, 5/12/05).

The following week, I got a copy of Ciara’s final report card for the 2004–2005 school year and saw the results of his assessments in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics, listed in the section on the County Instructional Assessment Plan. Ciara did not meet September expectations in any of the three areas. However, he met January expectations in all of them. He met April expectations in Reading and Mathematics but not in Writing. His SRI Lexile scores were 358 in September, 364 in January, and 838 in April. (These compare with Claire’s
scores of 1090, 1132, and 1105 and Brittany’s scores of 249, 689, and 772 for the same dates.)

In the classes Ciara took with Mr. Baxter, the following are the grades he received over the course of the three marking periods: a C, a B, and a C in Reading; three B’s in Science; two A’s and a B in Social Studies; three C’s in Writing; and two C’s and a B in Math. Mr. Baxter gave Ciara’s Work Habits, as well as his Conduct, a rating of S (Satisfactory performance) for the three marking periods.

Among Ciara’s other classes, the highest ratings he received were in Music in the first and third marking periods: E’s (Excellent performance) for both classroom work and conduct. In Marking Period 2, however, he received an S for his classroom work in Music and an N (Needs Improvement) for his conduct. He made all V’s (Very Good performance) in Art, except for an S for his conduct in Marking Period 1. In Physical Education, he received all S’s.

During the previous school year, Ciara and Brittany were in the same fourth-grade class, and neither of them met the requirements of the County’s policy on promotion. In Ciara’s cumulative folder, there is a copy of the same form letter that was used in Brittany’s case, stating in part: “We feel that it is in the best interest of your child for him/her to be promoted to the next grade level at the end of this school year” (Cumulative folder, 4/27/04).

As I have already written, Ciara was retained in the third grade. In January of the year of his third-grade repetition, it was recommended that he begin to attend an Exceptional Student Education (ESE) class in reading for 50 minutes a day, as well as an ESE class for speech and language therapy for 60 minutes a week, and that he continue to attend the these classes through the first half of the following school year (Cumulative folder, 1/31/03).

I believe that Ciara continued to display some difficulty with his speech in the fifth grade. There were a dozen occasions when he said something to me in English, and because I didn’t understand, I ask him to repeat it. On April 11, for example, he had to repeat a question several times before I understood. Later that day I observed in my field notes, “I think my lack of understanding had to do with both his speech pattern and the lack of context” for what he said (Field notes, 4/11/05). There were other times when I am sure that it was his pronunciation of certain words that caused me difficulty in understanding him. For example, at the end of the May interview, we had the following interchange:

AN: Do you want to say anything else about Spanish?
CN: [with a high-pitched voice]: Hey! [I laugh briefly.] Welcome to the English world, to the Spanish world. Oh, I like, mm, I didn’t like their flan, mm-mm.
AN: Oh, yeah. You didn’t like the flan.
CN: It tastes like porch, like with the Three Little Bears. [I laugh.] I like Jamaica’s better. (Interview, 5/2/05)

After some further discussion, I realized that he was talking about porridge but pronounced the word as “porch.”
Perhaps Ciara’s difficulties with his speech in English are related to the large percentage of his Spanish utterances that involved pronunciation errors. There are other ways in which Ciara’s difficulties in school may have been related to his performance in Spanish. The self-consciousness that he attributed to his retention is a case in point. The manifestations of this self-consciousness and other instances of nervousness will be discussed in the next section.

**Ciara’s Self-Consciousness.** Ciara showed some self-consciousness concerning his retention. In our last interview, he talked about having been nervous during videoconferencing sessions with students at Greenwood Park whom he already knew, because he had told them that he was going to be in the sixth grade. This came out after I asked him, “Have you ever known any of the students in a class at another school that you’ve had videoconferencing with?” He got me to explain the question further, and then he replied:

**CN:** Yeah, I know somebody [**AN:** Oh, really?] in Greenwood Park, yeah. Demetrius, Cedric, and all of them. I know all of them. Mm-hmm, I know all of them kids in Greenwood Park since about three years now.

**AN:** Oh, that’s interesting. Yeah. What’s it like to see them through the videoconferencing?

**CN:** Nervous. [He laughs briefly.]

**AN:** Oh. [I laugh.]

**CN:** ‘Cause they in sixth. [He laughs briefly. Pause.]

**AN:** What was that last part you said? Nervous because of what?

**CN:** I supposed to be in sixth, and I told them I was gonna be in sixth. (Interview, 5/2/05)

It is interesting to note that the average number of minutes between Ciara’s utterances is much greater in the videoconferencing sessions led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten (33 minutes) than in the instructional sessions without videoconferencing in the Tele Café (8 minutes).

Ciara also expressed nervousness about being videotaped for this research. Because there were a number of *Español para ti* lessons that I didn’t observe at the end of the year, I asked Ciara if anything were different when he was watching those lessons, and I wasn’t there. He named my not videotaping as a difference, and then we talked about his feelings toward being recorded:

**CN:** It is different, ‘cause you’re not recording your camera.

**AN:** Yeah. [I laugh, and Ciara laughs, too.] So, what do you think about having the Spanish classes recorded?

**CN** [very quietly]: Mm. [Pause.]

**AN** [with a laugh in my voice]: I’ve seen you get out of camera range before.

**CN:** What?

**AN:** Well, one time I saw you, that I had the camera pointing one way, and you went someplace else. [I laugh briefly, and so does Ciara.] Does it bother you at all?

**CN:** No, it make me nervous. (Interview, 5/2/05)
At the least, Ciara often seemed conscious of cameras. At the end of videoconferencing sessions, when each class was projected on a monitor, and they sang the closing song, Ciara would wave in different ways. On December 2, for example, he was looking at himself on the monitor, moving around, and waving in a circular motion (Field notes, 12/2/04).

In Mr. Baxter’s classroom, it was the camcorder I used to record his class that Ciara took notice of. (In this setting, I videotaped the students from the front, whereas in the Tele Café, I taped them from behind.) On October 26 before an *Español para ti* lesson, he looked over at the camcorder, smiled, and posed (Video recording, 10/26/04). In contrast, on the following day, he sat on the floor directly in front of the tripod, a position in which there was no possibility of being videotaped (Field notes, 10/27/04).

In spite of his self-consciousness about being videotaped, in general Ciara seemed to benefit from being a part of this research. Regarding his role as a research participant, he told a substitute teacher that he was one of the best (Field notes, 1/7/05). He was eager to be interviewed by me, and we even recorded a practice conversation (Transcript, 1/6/05) before our first interview. When I asked him in a later interview what had helped him to learn Spanish in his classroom, he told me that doing it all day had (Interview, 5/2/05). One of the activities included in the long period of Spanish to which he was making reference was a review I had led (Field notes, 4/28/05). He put to use something I had gone over in this review when he correctly answered a homerun question involving geography in the Spanish baseball game that followed (Field notes & transcript, 4/28/05).

Ciara told me that “Spanish countries” had helped him to accomplish as much as he had (Interview, 5/2/05). Capitalizing on his interest in geography, his strong musical inclinations, and his eagerness to participate, Ciara was sometimes able to exceed the expectations of others in his Spanish performance.

Edward Jones

During the 7 months of this study, Edward Jones produced 309 Spanish utterances in the different instructional settings, thus greatly exceeding the production of the other participants. As was the case for Ciara, I have taken into account both utterances that Edward produced as an individual and some that I could hear clearly that were part of a response that included one or more other people. Edward was equally productive in instructional sessions in the Tele Café without videoconferencing, in videoconferencing sessions led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten, and in the Spanish jeopardy game before the Thanksgiving Break, with an average of 3 minutes between his utterances in all three settings. His productivity declined somewhat during *Español para ti* videos and during the instruction led by Mr. Baxter after the videos, with an average of 5 minutes between his utterances in both of these settings. In cooking sessions there was an average of 6 minutes between Edward’s Spanish utterances. He was least
productive in the videoconferencing sessions led by Mr. Straten, with an average of 9 minutes between his utterances.

The majority of Edward’s utterances were three words in length or less, but he did produce 16 utterances that were longer, 7 of which were related to songs. I was able to hear 291 of his utterances well enough to determine whether they involved linguistic errors or not and found that 38 of them did. In 16 of these utterances, he did not provide the correct lexical item. There were 15 utterances in which his pronunciation was flawed, and 6 in which he made a grammatical error. One utterance involved both a pronunciation and a grammatical error.

Edward based his utterances on varied types of vocabulary and produced them in many types of activities. Number vocabulary was the basis for the highest number (55) of his utterances. Even providing more categories (22 in total, compared to Ciara’s 15) for the types of vocabulary on which Edward’s utterances were based, the catchall Other category came to contain 30 of his utterances, the second highest number for him. In addition, he based many utterances on date and calendar vocabulary, greetings, and saying yes and no in Spanish. Some of the activities in which he produced many utterances were practice activities during Español para ti videos, games, the calendar segment of lessons in the Tele Café, question-and-answer and number activities, and songs. He also produced many utterances that weren’t part of any activity.

Partly because he had been in the Spanish program for 2 years less than the other participants, Edward’s active participation in many Spanish lessons and the quantity of his oral Spanish utterances stood out to me, and I wanted to learn about him as a Spanish learner. I did this through interacting with him, interviewing him, and observing him. I also took into account his academic record.

*My Interactions with Edward.* Undoubtedly the best advice I received from Mrs. Ford during the course of this research was her suggestion on October 1, 2004, that I include Edward Jones, a small Black boy with an engaging smile, as one of my case study participants (Field notes, 10/1/04). Up to that point, I had only noted that Edward had had his Saber es poder card featured in the lesson that day and had given “veintitrés” [23] as the date on September 23 (Field notes, 10/1/04, 9/23/04). However, I soon came to appreciate Edward’s serious efforts to learn Spanish and ended up being impressed by his results, as I observed how his performance surpassed that of classmates who had already been in the Spanish program for 2 years when he entered it at the beginning of the fourth grade.

I enjoyed interacting with Edward and observing him as a language learner. Although I spent more time with Ciara and Brittany during the course of this research study, it wasn’t long before Edward and I established a friendly relationship. After a cooking session on October 11, I went over to Mr. Baxter’s classroom to get something. On my way out of the classroom, Edward smiled and held out his hand to me (Field notes, 10/11/04).
On November 10 before class started, I let Edward look at a children’s book in Spanish that I had brought and let him take it over to Mr. Baxter, to whom I was giving it so that it could be used by his class. It was soon thereafter that Edward asked me how to say Christmas in Spanish, as I described in Chapter 5. That was also a day on which Edward actively participated during the Español para ti lesson (Field notes, 11/10/04).

Another opportunity to interact with Edward arose on December 8. On that day, I took a position at a desk that was behind and slightly to the right of the one where Edward was sitting, and during the class, I took copious notes. After Mr. Baxter had finished a postvideo activity, Edward turned back to me, looked at my notes, and asked me if I was supposed to write messy. (He had previously pointed out his good handwriting to me; Field notes, 10/13/04.) I explained that it was easier for me to write fast if I let my writing be messy but said that I could write neatly. I turned to a blank page in my notebook and wrote, “Edward,” neatly in cursive. He asked me in a tone of wonder, “How do you know my name?” I paused and then said, “It was on your permission form” (Field notes, 12/8/04).

I followed up on this interaction the next day by giving Edward a copy of some notes on Renaissance literature in Spain that I had neatly written out when I was studying for Spanish comprehensive examinations. Edward had been very subdued during class in the Tele Café that day, but when I handed him the piece of paper, telling him that it was in Spanish and that I would explain what it meant sometime, a big smile appeared on his face, and he said that he knew some of the words (Field notes, 12/9/04).

My opportunity to explain my Spanish notes to Edward came the next week during a Spanish cooking session. After he had finished filling in the names of countries and capitals on a worksheet, I translated some of the words in my notes from Spanish to English and had him guess what other words meant. He said he knew the English word quatrain (the only English word on the page), because his teacher had taught him about it the previous year. When I had finished going over the notes, Edward pointed to héroe [hero] and asked Minh, who was sitting to his right, if he knew what it meant. Minh indicated that he didn’t, and Edward told him that it meant hero (Field notes, 12/15/04).

Edward took advantage of a cooking session in April to ask me about a word that he wanted to know in Spanish. It was the same word that he had asked Mrs. Ford about in a cooking session the month before. On that occasion, he had asked, “How do you say disgusting in Spanish?” after one of his classmates had commented on the effects of eating beans. Mrs. Ford had translated the first part of his question, “¿Cómo se dice?” but instead of giving the Spanish word for disgusting, she had objected, “Edward, no, no, no” (Field notes, 3/10/05).

Edward approached me during the cooking session in April, told me that he wanted to ask me something, drew me off to the side, and then questioned me about how to say disgusting in Spanish. I thought for a moment and told him that asqueroso is disgusting. He repeated the word and went back toward his table with his hand over his stomach, as if he really didn’t like the flan that the
class was eating that day. Later he asked me to say the word again. I repeated it slowly, and he said it after me (Field notes, 4/21/05).

When all of the students had tasted the flan, Mrs. Ford asked how they had liked it. Edward raised his hand and kept it raised as she took comments from other students. When she finally acknowledged him, he went over to her and said, “asqueroso.” She exclaimed in a tone of surprise, “¡Asqueroso! Where did you learn that word?” He laughed and said, “I don’t know” (Field notes & transcript, 4/21/05).

Edward and his friend, Willie, who had been in the Spanish program since the second grade, were the only students in Mr. Baxter’s class with whom I felt comfortable trying to communicate in Spanish. I had tried asking Ciara and Brittany, “¿Cómo estás?” [How are you?], but my question had been greeted with blank stares (Field notes, 12/15/04, 1/26/05).

On January 26, when I asked Edward, “¿Cómo estás?” he replied, “Bien,” [Well] and asked, “¿Y usted?” [And you?] I responded, “Bien,” and said I was going to try saying something to him in Spanish. In our interview the week before, he had told me that his mother had said they could try churros [fritters] that weekend, so I asked him, “¿Comiste churros este fin de semana?” [Did you eat fritters this weekend?] Willie, who was sitting by Edward, seemed to pick up on the similarity between comiste [you ate] and como [I eat], but Edward didn’t understand my question, so I tried asking, “¿Tú mamá preparó churros este fin de semana?” [Did your mom prepare fritters this weekend?] I pointed over toward the posters with the foods that had been prepared in the Tele Café and said, “churros,” which Edward then understood. I wrote preparó on the board and asked the question slowly. He looked like he understood it and said, “Sí.”

In my interactions with Edward, I observed his interest in Spanish and his desire to share what he knew with others. I also observed that he reacted well to the attention he got from me, an adult.

In the last chapter, I provided examples of Edward’s oral and written production in relation to video lessons. Some of the examples I gave showed him as very active during video lessons. However, I also noted that there were some occasions on which he was withdrawn during these lessons. In the next section, I will discuss Edward’s attitude toward Español para ti videos and Saber es poder cards. I will also discuss his behavior during Español para ti lessons, especially his negative reaction to having his behavior corrected.

Edward’s Attitude Toward and Behavior During Video Lessons. The pattern of Edward’s behavior during Español para ti lessons was noticeably different from that of my other case study participants. Whereas there were differences among Claire, Brittany, and Ciara; with Claire being the most focused and quietest during videos, Brittany sometimes showing active involvement in lessons and sometimes showing signs of distraction, and Ciara’s focus at times shifting back and forth between a given lesson and other people and things; all of these participants spent the majority of their time watching the videos and writing on their Saber es poder cards. Edward, on the other hand, spent very little time
writing during lessons. Sometimes he was very active in orally responding to
prompts on the videos. At other times, he watched the lessons in silence. There
were also occasions when he looked at a book or worked on a design instead of
watching a given Spanish lesson.

In our first interview, Edward explained to me his feelings toward the
Español para ti videos, toward the changes in them from the previous year, and
toward the Saber es poder cards. (The previous year, the fourth-grade students
had watched Level 3 of Español para ti, but now as fifth graders, they were
watching Level 5.) I initiated this part of the interview by asking him, “Are there
things you like about the Español para ti videos?” He told me frankly, “Well, I
don’t really like ‘em,” and also verified what he had previously told me about
preferring Spanish with Mrs. Ford (Field notes, 11/9/04). When I restated my
question about the videos, he named a Spanish song from the current year and
things from the previous year that he liked, including an activity with Rosco, a
wolf puppet:

AN: Is there anything you like about Español para ti?
EJ: Well, sometimes, yeah, like the song, like Chocolate,
AN: Mm-hmm.
EJ: and like, I like alphabet last year. Um, I like that about it and the
number game with Rosco. I like the animals. I don’t really like the people
this year. They changed it a whole, a lot. Last year I really liked it. And
plus I don’t like the fact that we have to write on the cards, but now Mr.
Baxter says we don’t have to. (Interview, 1/21/05)
The interview continued as I looked into Edward’s negative statement
about the Saber es poder cards, asking him: “Do you feel like doing them doesn’t
help you pay attention or anything?” He made the following response,
describing his frustrations:
‘Cause if you’re having to write so fast you can’t really get what they’re
saying. You don’t really learn nothing. That’s why I don’t learn nothing
from that, and the point is to learn Spanish, not to write it down and don’t
know what it means. (Interview, 1/21/05)
Edward’s dislike of writing Saber es poder cards was in no way associated
with an inability to produce good cards. For example, one of his cards from an
early lesson contained this statement of the main idea, including the correctly
spelled Spanish words for plate, pizza, and the cup: “I noticed that the lesson
was about, shopping. When she was in the store she mostly talked about
vegetables and fruits. I learned a few Spanish words like plato, pizza, and la
taza.”

As a student who was once described by Mr. Baxter as “very, very easy to
teach” (Interview, 3/16/05), Edward continued growing, learning, and changing
throughout the school year, and by May, his feelings toward Saber es poder
cards had changed. This came out in our last interview when I was asking him
questions about his reactions to communicating with students in the class at
Greenwood Park through videoconferencing. One of my questions was “When
your Saber es poder card is selected, how do you feel about it being shown to
Edward replied that he had never really thought of it in that way and said that he was just getting to like having his card selected, because Mr. Baxter gives him something. He continued, “and it’s like a good feeling for me to have my card selected out of 24 other kids. That means I’m doing good in Spanish.” (Interview, 5/2/05)

Along with Mr. Baxter’s praise of Edward as a student, he would also include comments to me about problems Edward had with a lack of self-control or with his attitude (Interview, 3/16/05; field notes, 5/12/05). I have come to believe that Edward’s lack of involvement in some Español para ti lessons was related to a negative attitude or, more specifically, an adverse reaction to having his behavior corrected, as the examples below illustrate.

Before the Español para ti lesson began on November 9, Edward was sitting on the floor at the front of Mr. Baxter’s classroom. I was also in that area of the room and was so busy getting my recording equipment set up that I wasn’t paying attention to what was going on around me. A little later, I realized that Edward was no longer at the front, and I looked for him. I saw that he was looking at a book, sitting at the back of the room, where he remained throughout the lesson. I was concerned that he might not be feeling well and after class asked him about this. He indicated that he was all right (Field notes, 11/9/04).

It wasn’t until later, when I listened to the CD recording of the class, that I realized that Mr. Baxter had been correcting the behavior of some of the students at the beginning of class and had sent Edward to his seat. But instead of sitting in his seat, Edward had gone to the back of the classroom. Mr. Baxter’s admonition to the students was as follows:

Now some of you today are having a little bit of a problem with your conduct. I think you need to take a deep breath [sounds of inhaling] and calm yourself down. [Background noise with more inhaling.] You see right now, what you’re doing right now by doing that is not doing the correct behavior. We’re not going to talk through this whole entire Spanish lesson. We’re going to take notes: main idea, two or three vocabulary words. [Background noise. Music starts on the video.]

Edward, go back, and sit at your seat. (Transcript, 11/9/04)

There were other occasions on which behavioral corrections seemed related to Edward’s withdrawal from or silence in Spanish classes. For example, on March 30, Mr. Baxter sent Edward back from the front of the room to sit at a desk, and he spent the class session sitting toward the back, using markers to work on a design (Field notes, 3/30/05). An earlier example is from November 16. That day I met most of Mr. Baxter’s class in the courtyard, where they had gathered following lunch. Brittany, Cassandra, and I began talking, and I asked where Edward was. Either Brittany or Cassandra said that he was still in the cafeteria and was in trouble. Later, in Mr. Baxter’s classroom before the video started, I noticed that Edward was sitting very close to the cord of the CD recorder I was using, and I asked him not to lean on it. Soon thereafter, I noted that he was stretched out on the floor, leaning on his left elbow. I did not observe
him participating during the video that day, but I did observe him wiggling around (Field notes, 11/16/05).

Edward’s involvement in Spanish lessons varied, but it was unusual for him to show no interest in them at all. On the contrary, there were some occasions when I was able to observe his enthusiasm for Spanish. The next section deals with Edward’s efforts to learn and use Spanish in and out of school and with his attitude toward the language

Learning and Using Spanish in and out of School. Edward liked Spanish and was able to reflect on his learning of it. He made an effort to practice it and to use it in and out of school. His friend Willie also liked the language, and they often worked in unison where Spanish was concerned. Outside of school, he told his mother what he had learned, and he practiced with his cousin. He also used his cell phone to practice Spanish. He took the initiative to participate in a competition at the County’s World Languages Field Day and won a blue Superior ribbon.

In interviews, I looked into Edward’s experiences as a language learner and into his perceptions of them. On January 21, Edward told me that he thought he liked Spanish more than when he first started learning it, because he understood it more (Interview, 1/21/05). On May 2, I asked him, “How did it feel when you started here last year, not knowing Spanish like the students who had been here before?” Edward answered,

I didn’t know as much as they did, ’cause they went here since like kindergarten. But then I just learned quick. And I tried to listen really hard so I could learn as much as the others. And then I just started liking it.

(I Interview, 5/2/05)

I also asked him how he thought he compared with other students in the amount of Spanish he had learned. He answered in terms of how much he liked the language: “I think other students don’t like it as much as I do. But, um, [slight pause] how do I compare? I guess I just like it more than the rest of them” (Interview, 5/2/05).

Edward was aware that there was still much more he needed to learn in Spanish, and he was also aware of the many things he had learned. When I asked him if he felt like he had learned a lot of Spanish, he replied, “not really.” Next I asked him what some things he had learned were, and he tried to explain the contrast between what he knew and what he didn’t know:

I learned a lot. I think I can’t say it in. I don’t think it’s a lot, but it’s a lot. ’Cause compared to how much more I have to learn it’s not a lot. But if you just compare that, it’s a lot. I learned numbers. I learned a lot of words. I learned how to say hello, goodbye, good morning, good afternoon, good night. It’s just a lot that I learned. I learned a few phrases, um, questions. I could probably write a sentence in Spanish [momentary pause] with five words in it. I learned countries, capitals of countries. (Interview, 1/21/05)
At Dolphin Point, I noticed that Edward enjoyed using Spanish words and communicating in Spanish. When a sandwich was mentioned in an Español para ti lesson in January, he spontaneously commented, “delicioso” [delicious] (Field notes, 1/11/05). A few days later, I heard him tell one of his classmates that he had been at something (used as the equivalent of trying to master something) for two years, but “you’ve only been at it for uno year” (1/14/05). After the cooking session on April 21, Mrs. Ford showed Edward and Alan a boat for the Recycle Regatta, el Barco Pez [the Fish Boat]. Edward asked what kind of fish Barco Pez was. He said that it should be a tiburón [shark], even though a tiburón isn’t really a fish. Alan commented that the boat could be a shark, and Edward told him that a tiburón is a shark (Field notes, 4/21/05).

Edward and Willie sometimes worked in unison where Spanish was concerned, raising their hands at the same time or responding to the same questions in Spanish classes (Field notes, 10/11/04, 11/11/04, 1/11/05, 1/20/05, 3/17/05). In an Español para ti lesson in December, Willie and Edward carried on a brief conversation about their lack of familiarity with one of the pictures being used as prompts (Field notes, 12/8/04). During a class in the Tele Café on January 20, Willie requested the song, Soy una pizza [I am a pizza], and Edward voiced his agreement with “Sí” (Field notes & transcript, 1/20/05). Edward and Willie also got together after a cooking session on January 26, returning to the Tele Café to ask Mrs. Ford to fix fiesta taco salad in the next cooking session and even providing her with a recipe (Field notes, 1/26/05). (Both the request for Soy una pizza and the request for fiesta taco salad were granted.) On March 3, Edward and Willie again returned to the Tele Café after class. This time Edward asked Mrs. Ford how to spell Juan (the name of a character in Muzzy). She spelled it for him in English, and he repeated, “J-U-A-N” (Field notes, 3/3/05).

In our interview in January, I asked Edward whether he tried speaking Spanish with his friends at school. He told me about speaking Spanish with both his mother and Willie:

AN: Do you and your friends at school ever try to speak Spanish with each other? How often?
EJ: And I do it to my mom.
AN: Oh, with your mom. Does she?
EJ: She doesn’t speak Spanish, but I speak Spanish to her. I’ll be like, gracias [thank you]. When she took me out to eat last week, I was like gracias, my mom.
AN: So you were teaching her some Spanish and using it with her. Okay.
EJ: I always practice Spanish with Willie.
AN: Yeah, I’ve noticed that you two say about the most for answering. So, do you like doing that with him?
EJ: Yes. (Interview, 1/21/05)

In that interview, I also asked Edward, “What are some things you like about Spanish?” and he came up with quite a list:
EJ: Well, it’s fun, and plus Mrs. Ford makes it even funner, like play the games in Spanish, like yesterday when we played the math game
[concentration, matching capitals and countries]. And I just like the countries and plus the way it sounds, like México.

AN: Aha.

EJ: And the songs in Spanish. It's just all nice. (Interview, 1/21/05)

Besides using Spanish with his mother and Willie, Edward had a cousin with whom he practiced Spanish. He first mentioned this cousin, who was taking Spanish in the seventh grade, toward the end of the school year (Field notes, 4/21/05). He talked about her again in his May interview, describing how they practiced Spanish together: “cause she’s in seventh, we do like practice our Spanish. She tell me how to say you and your and no me canta [he/she doesn’t sing to me], me canta [he/she sings to me]” (Interview, 5/2/05).

As I have already mentioned, Edward liked to share his knowledge in Spanish with his friends, telling Willie what Feliz Navidad means and telling Minh the English translation of héroe (Field notes, 11/10/04, 12/15/04). Besides these incidents, there were other occasions when Edward took on the role of a teacher.

I have already explained how Mrs. Ford convinced Edward to be maestro [teacher] and lead the Buenas tardes [Good afternoon] song in Spanish on January 13. Two weeks later he volunteered to take on the same role (Field notes, 1/13/05, 1/27/05). Before leaving the Tele Café on February 3, Edward stood at the front of the room and held the pointer he had used in leading the song, as if doing this again. He put it down, however, when he was caught holding it without permission (Field notes, 2/3/05).

Edward was recognized for his leadership ability and was chosen to be captain of one of the teams in the Spanish jeopardy game before the Thanksgiving Break (Field notes, 11/19/04). He was also the captain of Mr. Baxter’s team in the Spanish baseball game against the other fifth-grade class (Field notes, 4/28/05). On January 19, after Mr. Baxter had assigned numbers for students to name in Spanish, he told them that they could ask him how to pronounce them, ask me, ask Elena (a native speaker of Spanish), or “find someone like Edward” to ask (Field notes, 1/19/05). Before the Spanish lesson started on March 30, Mr. Baxter was talking to his students about what they would be doing in their Marine Science lab. He told them, “As Edward said this morning, we are not coloring in the ocean anymore” (Field notes, 3/30/05).

Edward liked to challenge himself. He described to me how he practiced Spanish on his cell phone:

When I have my cell phone, like, um, I try to test myself, and maybe like a day or maybe an hour I just put my cell phone on Spanish language, and I have to figure out what it means. [Unintelligible.] Then I go look through my cell phone, play the games, and I learn different things like that. Like if I press something that’s wrong, and it’s not what I want to go to, I’m like, oh, now I know what that means. (Interview, 5/2/05)

In his May interview, I asked Edward how he would feel about competing in games against the class with which his class meets through videoconferencing. He talked to me about his competitive nature and told me about putting together good teams for different competitions:
AN: What do you think would be better in games with the class at the other school: adding the points for both classes together or adding the points separately for each class so that you’re playing against each other?
EJ: Well, I’m competitive, but I would say adding the points separately, but I know what I should say, just adding the points together so it can be fair, and no one’s losing or winning, but I’m really competitive.
AN: That’s fine. [With a laugh in my voice:] No, I wanted to know what you thought yourself, so that’s good. What about in your own class, do you like doing things all together; or in teams; or sometimes together, sometimes in teams?
EJ: I like teams in class, like especially when we win, and I try to get like the best kids in the class. For like math, I would get some special people; science and sports; and I know what everyone’s good at, so.
AN: You get to be the captain a lot?
EJ: Mm-hmm. (Interview, 5/2/05)

I had the privilege of observing Edward take part in a Spanish competition outside of Dolphin Point. This happened when I was a judge of memorized speech for beginning Spanish at the County’s World Languages Field Day. In judging this category, I was teamed with a native speaker of Spanish named Cecilia. We had seen middle school and high school students, as well as some elementary school students, and were standing outside of our classroom, thinking that we had completed our duties, when Edward and another student from Dolphin Point came up to us and indicated that they were there to take part in the competition (Field notes, 2/26/05).

We all entered the classroom, and Edward and the girl (Margarita, from Dolphin Point’s other fifth-grade class) sang Febrero [February], doing some motions with it. They did a really good job and only faltered on the words once. I gave them 4 out of 5 points for reciting the whole piece and 5’s for pronunciation, intonation and rhythm, and creative expression, totaling 19 out of 20 points. Cecilia also gave them 19 points, but the point she took off was in a different category. We gave them each completed judging forms and a blue Superior ribbon (the highest one). Edward thought that on the forms, they hadn’t done so well. Cecilia explained how well they had done, and Edward seemed really pleased (Field notes, 2/26/05).

I asked Edward and Margarita if they had been practicing the song in the Multicultural Club, and Edward said no, that it was the song from class. It turned out that they knew the song from class, and they hadn’t done any special practices to prepare to present it. Edward was curious about why I was asking them how they had prepared. He said he thought I was asking because I was supposed to ask (Field notes, 2/26/05).

Mrs. Ford later explained to me how Edward’s involvement in this competition had come about:

He went to Field Day, and we’re sitting there during the assembly, and he’s looking through his passport, and he points to the memorization part of it, and he’s saying, “Señora Ford, what’s this?” ‘cause I had shown
him all the activities that he could go to in the morning. And I said, “Well, that’s where boys and girls, usually middle school and high school, go in, and there’s a room; I explained to him there’s a room and two judges; and you have to say something, just memorize something in Spanish, and go in there, and say it. And so, he looks at me with those eyes, and he says, “Oh, I like to do that.” And I said, “Well, you certainly can.” I said, “You know Febrero,” ‘cause it was in February. I said, “You know that song. You can go in there and do the song.” And so, while the assembly is going on, he’s practicing his Febrero song.

And I go off to do my activity with my students, and little bit, about an hour later, he walks in, and he did it. He showed me his ribbon, and he went in and did it. It wasn’t so much that he, yeah, it was nice that he got [unintelligible], but I think the major thing here was that (a) he wanted to do it, (b) he wasn’t timid in doing it. I mean, another child would be very timid to doing it. And just the fact that he, it was his initiative. I didn’t have to tell him to do it. He took the initiative in doing it. I thought that was phenomenal. I just thought that was absolutely phenomenal with Edward, and I was very proud of him that he did that. He likes it. Bottom line, he just likes it, and he just is a very good Spanish student. (Interview, 3/8/05)

I agree with Mrs. Ford’s assessment of Edward as a good Spanish student who showed a lot of initiative. He was eager to learn Spanish, to use it to communicate, and to share his knowledge with others. However, Spanish wasn’t the only subject at which Edward excelled. In the next section, I will consider Edward’s academic record.

Edward’s Academic Record. Mr. Baxter had high praise for Edward as a student, but as I have mentioned, he also pointed out Edward’s problems with a lack of self-control and with his attitude (Interview, 3/16/05; field notes, 5/12/05). I put the same question to Mr. Baxter in regard to what Edward was like as a student in his other subjects as I had posed for each of my other case study participants. Mr. Baxter described Edward, and I added my own observations:

**LB:** Fantastic. High academic achiever. Terrific.

**AN:** He seems to remember things that teachers tell him.

**LB:** Very, very easy to teach. Only problems are his, uh, lack of self-control.

**AN:** Ah.

**LB:** You know, but he is a terrific kid, academically, in all areas. And he grasps subjects very quickly. (Interview, 3/16/05)

As I have already written in regard to Claire, she and Edward received identical grades in the five subjects that they took with Mr. Baxter: Reading, Science, Social Studies, Writing, and Math. These grades were all A’s, except for a B in Writing in Marking Period 2. The grades that Edward received from Mr. Baxter for his Conduct, however, were lower than Claire’s grades in the first two marking periods: two S’s (Satisfactory performance). Edward also received an S for his Work Habits in Marking Period 1, but in Marking Period 2, his grade in this
area had improved to a V (Very Good performance), the same grade that Claire received. Edward’s report card for Marking Period 3 contains no grades for Conduct and Work Habits.

In his other classes, Edward’s grades for his classroom work and conduct ranged from an N (Needs Improvement) to E’s (Excellent performance). The two E’s that he received were for classroom work and conduct in Music in Marking Period 1. By Marking Period 2, his grades in Music had gone down to a V for his classroom work and an S for his conduct. In Marking Period 3, he received a V for his classroom work and a V for his conduct in Music. In Art, Edward received V’s for both classroom work and conduct in the first two marking periods, and in the third, he received S’s. Edward received V’s for his “classroom work” in Physical Education in each of the three marking periods. For his conduct in Physical Education, he received an S, an N, and a V.

In the section of Edward’s report card on the County Instructional Assessment Plan, the results of his assessments in Reading, Writing, and Mathematics are given for September, January, and April. Edward met or surpassed expectations in all three areas in September and January, as he did for Reading and Mathematics in April. He did not meet April expectations in Writing, however. Edward’s SRI Lexile scores, listed under “Reading Common Assessment,” aren’t as high as Claire’s but are still above the expected Lexile range of 700 to 1000 for the fifth grade. Edward’s SRI Lexile scores were 1007 in September, 1003 in January, and 1006 in April. These compare with Claire’s scores of 1090, 1132, and 1105 for the same testing dates.

Because Edward had not been at Dolphin Point as long as the other participants in this study, transferring there from another County elementary school at the beginning of the fourth grade, his cumulative folder was much less extensive. It did include his date of birth: June 1994 (Cumulative folder). No information appeared in the spaces for number of brothers and of sisters, but through questioning him, I was able to ascertain that he has three brothers and one sister (Field notes, 5/5/05). I also asked him if he got lunch at school, and when he said yes, I asked if he paid full price, reduced price, or if he received lunch for free. He replied, “Free” (Field notes, 5/11/05).

Edward’s report card for Marking Period 3 lists his number of absences for the year as zero. However, like Claire, he missed a number of Spanish classes. Taking into account all of the occasions on which I observed Español para ti lessons, Edward was absent from one of these on a Tuesday in December and from another one on a Wednesday in April. He missed Thursday Spanish classes in the Tele Café twice: once in December and once in April. He was also absent from four Friday supplemental video lessons. This occurred once in January, twice in February, and once in April. On the first three of these occasions, Muzzy was being shown. On the fourth, Edward missed a Familia Contenta video.

Edward’s absence from the Español para ti lesson on Tuesday, December 7, 2004, can be explained by his participation in Chorus. This participation also meant that he would leave the Tele Café before Spanish lessons were over,
beginning on November 4. On January 20, however, he didn’t leave the Tele Café with the other students who were going to Chorus, nor did he on any Thursday thereafter.

At the end of March, I asked Mrs. Ford why Edward wasn’t in Chorus anymore, and she said that Mrs. Buchanan, the Chorus teacher, was really strict, and some of the students had dropped out (Field notes, 3/31/05). I later asked Edward about his reasons for not being in Chorus anymore. He said that Mrs. Buchanan prefers fourth graders to fifth graders. He also said that she was always yelling at the students (Field notes, 4/21/05).

Edward’s attitude toward Chorus was profoundly impacted by his perception of the teacher. Because of the importance to Edward of his perceptions of and relationships with teachers, the next section will be devoted to the special relationship between Mrs. Ford and Edward.

The Relationship Between Edward and Mrs. Ford. A special relationship existed between Mrs. Ford and Edward. I often heard her making positive comments about him, both in and out of his presence. She often called on him in the Tele Café, and although sometimes he was quiet there, he often participated to a great extent, sometimes taking on a leading role.

I first noticed Mrs. Ford’s affection for Edward when she recommended him to me on October 1, fondly saying that he loves everything that has to do with Spanish (Field notes, 10/1/04). In the Spanish jeopardy game in November, after Edward had stated his group’s selection for category and number of points, Mrs. Ford commented about him, “Este niño me parece tan simpático” [This boy seems so nice to me] (Transcript, 11/19/04). After class one day in January, she talked to me about how popular she thought he would be in high school with that smile of his (Field notes, 1/26/05).

During the cooking session on April 21, Mrs. Ford went over to Edward and told him that she thought he would have all kinds of girlfriends in high school. As she said this, she touched his cheek. Mr. Baxter, who was close by, commented, “That’s only if you can get his behavior straightened out, and he’s gonna have to stay out of detention.” Mrs. Ford asked incredulously, “Are you sure you’re talking about Edward?” In reply, Mr. Baxter said, “Once in a while he goes off the deep end” (Field notes & transcript, 4/21/05).

Mrs. Ford’s fondness for Edward was obvious in her response to my interview question, “Would you describe Edward as a Spanish student?”:

Oh, Edward. Physically I think [with laughter in her voice:] he’s so cute. [She continues laughing, and I join in.] He’s just so sweet and that big grin of his, it’s just so sweet. I think Edward has this love for Spanish.

Mrs. Ford went on to talk about Edward’s participation in World Languages Field Day. Then, after commenting on his love for Dolphin Point, she said, “He’s great,” and affirmed that she will encourage him to continue his studies in Spanish (Interview, 3/8/05).

Edward responded well to Mrs. Ford’s attention. In the videoconferencing session on November 4, he provided the correct month as “noviembre” when
Mrs. Ford gave a choice between “el cuatro de octubre o noviembre.” It was also on this day that Saber es poder cards from Jane and Claire were used in the lesson, as I have previously explained. After Mr. Straten finished his demonstration of the action phrases on Jane’s card, Mrs. Ford told him how good that had been and put her hands together lightly. Edward picked up on that and started clapping. Then Mrs. Ford prompted the rest of the students to clap (Field notes, 11/4/04).

The lesson continued as Mrs. Ford talked about the students’ fieldtrip to see una familia [a family] the previous week. She showed photographs of different members of the family, asked who each was (giving a choice between two names), and asked about a notable characteristic of the family member (again giving a choice). After doing this for Papá, she showed the picture of Tía [Aunt] (who has a long nose and likes to smell garbage). Laurie started to move her hand out from her nose, and then Edward made the same motion. He answered, “nariz grande” [big nose], moving his hands apart and together. When Mrs. Ford showed the picture of Bebé [Baby] (who has big ears), Edward put his hands at the sides of his head. When the answer, “las orejas grandes” [big ears], came up, he pulled on his ears (Field notes, 11/4/04).

Edward’s participation in the lesson continued until Mrs. Ford told the students who had Chorus with Mrs. Buchanan that it was time for them to leave. On his way out, Edward gave Mrs. Ford a hug (Field notes, 11/4/04).

I even noted toward the end of the school year that Edward helped to complete one of Mrs. Ford’s sentences. Before the first Spanish baseball game on April 14, Mrs. Ford was telling Mr. Baxter’s class how the game would be set up:

Mrs. Ford: And what I need is; we’re gonna turn this into a baseball field; so I’m gonna need as many of you on the carpet as possible. In other words, some of you might be walkin’ around here, so we’re gonna make this like first base, second base, and third base, so I need as many of you on [Mrs. Ford hesitates slightly, and within a second Edward continues.]
JT: the carpet
LF: as possible. (Transcript, 4/14/05)
Sometimes during instruction, Mrs. Ford made reference to Edward or addressed him specifically. During a videoconferencing session on November 18, after the classes had sung the Noviembre song, Mrs. Ford asked the class at Dolphin Point if they would like to sing the next day as part of the school’s morning announcements. She hesitated slightly and added, “con Eduardo” [with Edward]. Both Edward and Claire raised their hands. To give another example, on December 9, a day when Edward was subdued, Mrs. Ford asked him if he wanted to take the part of the reindeer in the Spanish version of Jingle Bells: “Eduardo, Eduardo, ¿quieres hacer el reno?” but he declined (Field notes & transcript, 12/9/04).

Under Mrs. Ford’s teaching and attention, Edward grew as a language learner. He also sought Spanish input from other sources, such as his cousin and me. He liked Spanish and used it to communicate. He made an effort to
learn and shared his knowledge with others. As he used Spanish, took risks, and taught others, he learned even more.

In my exploration of different learner factors that might help to explain differences in the participants' Spanish output, certain factors came to the fore. These factors are degree of enjoyment of and participation in Spanish classes, amount of practice of Spanish both in and out of school, level of academic achievement, attitude toward competitiveness, and level of leadership and initiative. These factors were inductively derived from repeated observations and interviews of the participants, as well as from informal interaction with them and scrutiny of their academic records.

Participants’ Preferences and Perceptions Concerning the Spanish Program

In the interviews that I conducted with each of my case study participants, I had the opportunity to ask them questions about different aspects of the Spanish program at Dolphin Point and to learn about their preferences and perceptions, thus addressing the fourth point of focus of this research.

The interviews revealed that Brittany, Claire, Edward, and Ciara all had a generally positive attitude toward Spanish. Brittany told me that it was her favorite class and said, “Spanish helps me more often than the other classes” (Interviews, 1/21/05, 5/2/05).

Claire and Edward each told me in January that their favorite class was math (Interviews, 1/21/05). In May, I posed the following question to each of them: “How do you feel about Spanish compared to your other classes?” Claire, who in another part of the May interview talked about preferring Spanish with Mrs. Ford to the Spanish videotapes, focused on these in answering my question: “I don’t think it’s as fun, because you have to sit down and actually watch the tape, but I think it’s fun when you have to say the words, because it’s a little funny when other people are trying to say it, because sometimes they mess up” (Interview, 5/2/05). Edward, who asked me to clarify my question before he responded, also made the comparison on the basis of what he thought was fun:

EJ: Spanish is the most fun, especially going with Mrs. Ford.
AN: Yeah, that’s just what I meant.
EJ: It’s better, because it’s not like bookwork, and you’re still learning. And it’s fun, educational. (Interview, 5/2/05)

On January 6, Ciara told me that his favorite classes were Lunch and Physical Education but 2 weeks later added Spanish to these (Transcript, 1/6/05; interview, 1/21/05). Like Claire and Edward, Ciara talked about what was fun when I asked him how he felt about Spanish compared to his other classes: “Spanish get us, español class get us more like, more time not to do work a lot and stuff, yeah. And much funner when we play baseball in español, and we caught up with Miss Jackson class” (Interview, 5/2/05).

In comparisons of watching the Spanish videotapes and going to the Tele Café for Spanish class, Spanish in the Tele Café was preferred by the students. I asked Brittany, who earlier had mentioned liking it “when we talk to Greenwood Park in Spanish,” whether she preferred the Spanish videos or going to the Tele Café.
Café. When she didn’t immediately respond, I went on to ask her if she likes it when there is videoconferencing with Mr. Straten. She quietly answered, “Yes.” After I had obtained confirmation that she likes that better than the videos, my next question to her was “What are the main differences between the videos and Spanish in the Tele Café?” She told me, “Sometimes we have fun over there, and over here we just sit down and write things, what we see, what we see on video” (Interview, 1/21/05). In spite of her preference for Spanish in the Tele Café, in her last interview Brittany said that if Spanish were taught at Dolphin Point just by watching the videotapes, she would still want to take it (Interview, 5/2/05).

Ciara’s preference was to have a Spanish lesson done in “real life” by Mrs. Ford, who knows who the students are, as opposed to watching a video lesson taught by a lady who “don’t even know who we is” (Transcript, 1/6/05). Later he elaborated on the differences between the two teaching situations, saying that it’s much better in the Tele Café, “cause I don’t understand on TV. Cause she doing it all by herself, and she can’t even hear us” (Interview, 1/21/05). When I asked him if he would want to take Spanish if it were just taught by watching the videotapes, he told me that he’d try to learn it that way (Interview, 5/2/05).

Edward, who very much preferred Spanish in the Tele Café with Mrs. Ford to watching the videotapes, explained the differences between the two teaching situations in terms of rewards, first making reference to Spanish with Mrs. Ford: “Well, you have something to work for, ‘cause with Mrs. Ford: four stars, you can get food, and I’m sure a whole bunch of people like the Spanish cooking. I know I do.” He felt that in the video lessons there was no reward that was worthwhile: “All it is is putting your card up on the board. That’s not really worth working for.” He suggested that there be a prize at the end of the year for the person who has the most cards on Mrs. Ford’s Knowledge Wall (Interview, 1/21/05). He told me that he would still take Spanish if it were just taught through watching the videotapes, but he said, “It wouldn’t be as fun, or it wouldn’t be the same without Mrs. Ford” (Interview, 5/2/05).

Because Claire at first didn’t voice a preference for either having the Spanish videos in her classroom or going to the Tele Café for Spanish with Mrs. Ford, I asked her if she liked both, and she said, “Yeah.” When I asked her about the main differences between the two teaching situations, however, her answer favored the Tele Café: “I think that it’s like you learn more things at the Tele Café, because we kind of talk about more stuff, and we don’t spend as much time on one thing” (Interview, 1/21/05). If Spanish were only taught by watching the videotapes, Claire probably wouldn’t take it. As she explained, “I kinda wouldn’t want to, because Señora Ford, she helps you learn better, because before we start the Spanish, she’ll be talking in English, and she’ll tell us some words” (Interview, 5/2/05). Table 14 summarizes the opinions of the participants about Spanish in the Tele Café and the Spanish instructional videos.
Table 14  
Participants’ Opinions in January and May About Spanish in the Tele Café and Spanish Instructional Videos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>January$^a$</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Likes both videos and Spanish in the Tele Café. They learn more in the Tele Café, because they talk about more things and don’t spend as much time on any one thing.</td>
<td>If Spanish were only taught by watching videos, probably wouldn’t take it. Mrs. Ford helps them learn better, because she tells them some words in English. Videos aren’t as fun as other classes, because you have to sit and watch, but they’re fun when you have to say the words. However, Claire said there’s really nothing she doesn’t like about the videos. Through the videos, learned some words that Mrs. Ford uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittany</td>
<td>Likes going to the Tele Café better than the videos. Sometimes they have fun in the Tele Café, but during the videos, they just sit and write things. The best thing about Spanish in the Tele Café is the more you learn it, the better you’ll get at it. In the Tele Café, likes singing Tic tac and Enero and turning the signs, indicating which language is being spoken.</td>
<td>If Spanish only taught by watching videos, would want to take it. In Español para ti, they’re answering questions and learning new words. In the Tele Café, they review the words. There’s nothing she doesn’t like about Spanish in the Tele Café, and there’s nothing she doesn’t like about the videos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>January&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciara</td>
<td>Prefers Spanish in the Tele Café – it’s more fun because Mrs. Ford is doing it in real life, and she knows who they are. The video teacher is “doing it bad” and doesn’t even know who they are. (1/6/05)</td>
<td>If Spanish only taught by watching videos, would try to learn it that way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The main difference between Spanish in the Tele Café and the videos is that in the former they do it live.</td>
<td>Likes everything about Spanish in the Tele Café.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s much better in the Tele Café, because he can’t understand the videos; the video teacher is doing it by herself and can’t even hear them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Likes Spanish with Mrs. Ford better than the videos, because Mrs. Ford tells them what things mean or explains in other ways. If you don’t understand something on the videos, they keep going, because they don’t know you don’t understand.</td>
<td>If Spanish were only taught by watching the videos, he would take it, but it wouldn’t be as much fun, and it wouldn’t be the same without Mrs. Ford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One of the main differences between Spanish in the Tele Café and the videos is that the cooking sessions in the Tele Café are a reward worth working for. Doing cards with the videos to have them put on the board isn’t really worth working for.</td>
<td>Doesn’t like having to write about the videos, but otherwise they have been okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would rather have more questions with Mrs. Ford than more questions about the videos.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the Tele Café, likes the games and songs and how Mrs. Ford tells them the words.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>All January comments were made in interviews on January 21, 2005, except for one comment from Ciara, which is followed by its date.
I also asked the students about their preferences in regard to the different video series they watched. In January, I asked if they liked Español para tí or Muzzy better. In May, I included the choice of La Familia Contenta, as well. When a preference was expressed, it was usually for Muzzy. I consider all of my participants qualified to talk about Muzzy, even Claire and Edward who missed a number of showings, because they had seen these videos the previous year.

In January, Edward said that he liked Muzzy better than Español para tí. When I asked him why, he said that it was fun and mentioned having seen it before: “Because Muzzy is fun, and then, plus we saw it more than once, and I’d started to know most of the words that they’re saying.” After I confirmed that he was talking about having seen it in the fourth grade, he went on: “And then I know what they’re saying. That’s like a movie. Well, a song. If you listen to the song once, and then you keep listening to it, you’ll start memorizing what they’re saying. That’s like with Muzzy.” Although Muzzy is all in Spanish, he explained his comprehension of it, upon seeing it again, by saying that he can kind of “tell what they’re saying in English” (Interview, 1/21/05).

By the end of the school year, Edward’s preferences had changed. His favorite video series in May was Español para tí, followed by Muzzy. He said that he liked the play at Halloween (that includes members of a family of monsters) but implied that he didn’t really like La Familia Contenta videos (Interview, 5/2/05).

In both January and May, Claire told me that her favorite video series was Muzzy. In January when I asked her why she liked it better than Español para tí, she said, “It’s like an adventure, and it’s kinda funny” (Interview, 1/21/05). She explained further in May, when I asked her why it was her favorite of the three video series:

Because, um, it’s more characters. Like the animations, they’ll do something funny, [with a laugh in her voice:] and then you can laugh about it. It’s like watching a cartoon on a Saturday or a Sunday, but you’re in school watching it, and it’s in Spanish.  (Interview, 5/2/05)

There was an episode of La Familia Contenta, ¡Galletas, no! [Cookies, No!], that Claire talked about in positive terms. When I asked her if she had a favorite character in this video series, she named her favorite and went on to describe in detail part of ¡Galletas, no!, an episode that was shown a month before:

CM: I like Abuela [Grandmother].
AN: Oh. [I laugh.]
CM: because one time she was saying, um, I think the cookies are, I think cookies are called gallas,
AN: Galletas.
CM: uh, and, “¡Galletas, no!” And she said it three times, and he [Uncle] woke up, and she took [I laugh.] the packet, and then he left, and she was [with a laugh in her voice:] eating ‘em.  (Interview, 5/2/05)

In January, Brittany told me that she liked Muzzy better than Español para tí, because it taught her more Spanish. When asked how it did this, she
explained, “They’re countin’ in Spanish. I count with them, and it help me more to learn how to do my Spanish” (Interview, 1/21/05). By May, however, when I gave her a choice between Muzzy, Español para ti, and La Familia Contenta, she indicated that she liked them all the same.

Like Brittany, Ciara didn’t prefer any one video series in May, replying to my question about his favorite of the three, “No, they’re all the same” (Interview, 5/2/05). In January, however, he had at first said that he liked Español para ti better than Muzzy, but when I had asked him why, he had changed his answer to Muzzy, “‘Cause we don’t got to say nothing and just watch it” (Interview, 1/21/05). Table 15 summarizes the opinions of the participants about the different Spanish instructional videos.

As far as lessons in the Tele Café were concerned, I looked into whether my participants preferred being taught through videoconferencing or being taught by Mrs. Ford without videoconferencing. When given a choice between the two teaching situations, all of my participants said that they preferred being taught by Mrs. Ford.

At the beginning of my January interview with Brittany, after she had said that Spanish was her favorite class, I asked her, “What do you like about Spanish?” She told me that she liked it “when we talk to Greenwood Park in Spanish.” In view of this response, I was a bit surprised when Brittany later said that she liked Spanish better when Mrs. Ford was teaching by herself, without the videoconferencing. I asked her why that was, and she replied, “Because we can concentrate better and not have people joking around and not messin’ with us” (Interview, 1/21/05). Brittany’s preference for being taught by Mrs. Ford was confirmed to me in May when she responded, “No,” to the following question: “If a Spanish teacher wasn’t here at this school, would you want to take Spanish with a teacher teaching you from the other school?” (Interview, 5/2/05).

Ciara, like Brittany, answered my question, “What do you like about Spanish?” with a reference to talking to the other school, possibly in this case, meaning talking to them on fieldtrips:

**CN:** I like when we go to like, the other school and speak to the other school, yeah.

**AN:** Oh, yeah.

**CN:** And learn Spanish with the other school and stuff like that. (Interview, 1/21/05)

Also like Brittany, he later said that he preferred being taught by Mrs. Ford without the videoconferencing. He explained to me the reasons for this choice, describing what he had to do during videoconferencing: “‘Cause we got to look on the TV and can’t look nowhere else” (Interview, 1/21/05). He maintained his preference for being taught by Mrs. Ford when I asked him if he would want to take Spanish if he were being taught by a teacher at another school with no Spanish teacher at his school. His response was “That’d be kind of foreign. I like when Señora Ford teach better” (Interview, 5/2/05).
Table 15  
*Participants’ Opinions in January About Muzzy and Español para ti and in May About Muzzy, Español para ti, and La Familia Contenta*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td><em>Muzzy</em> – Favorite because an adventure and funny</td>
<td><em>Muzzy</em> – Favorite because more characters, funny, and it’s like watching a cartoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em> – Likes descriptions of clowns and talking about fruit</td>
<td><em>La Familia Contenta</em> – Likes ¡Galletas, no! episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittany</td>
<td><em>Muzzy</em> – Favorite because it teaches her more Spanish, and she can count along with the videos</td>
<td><em>Español para ti, Muzzy, and La Familia Contenta</em> – She likes them all the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em> – What she likes best is when they teach her how to do the large numbers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciara</td>
<td><em>Muzzy</em> – Favorite because students don’t have to say anything; they just watch it</td>
<td><em>Español para ti, Muzzy, and La Familia Contenta</em> – They’re all the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em> – Likes when they pick the words and show you what they mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td><em>Muzzy</em> – Favorite because fun and familiar</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em> – Favorite, followed by <em>Muzzy</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em> – Liked it last year but doesn’t really like it this year. The <em>Chocolate</em> song, countries, and practicing times and action words are things he likes this year.</td>
<td><em>La Familia Contenta</em> – Doesn’t really like the videos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Claire was consistent in her preference for having Mrs. Ford teach her class by herself, as opposed to receiving lessons through videoconferencing. In January, she talked about communication difficulties in videoconferencing: “Like if the other teacher asks us a question, sometimes we don’t know what he’s talking about, and, with Miss Ford, we can, she shows us what we’re talking
about, and we can actually learn what she’s saying” (Interview, 1/21/05). In May, she said that she really wouldn’t want to take Spanish if there were no Spanish teacher at her school, and she were being taught by a teacher at another school through videoconferencing, “because a Spanish teacher here, she could ask you to come in any time and teach you some words. And someone from another school, they would have to call in, and they would have to have a schedule when to.” I followed up by asking her if she thought it would be harder for the teacher at the other school to know if she had a problem in class, and she answered, “Yes, because they’re not really teaching you, so they wouldn’t know” (Interview, 5/2/05).

Edward liked being taught by Mrs. Ford without the videoconferencing, because he got to answer more questions: “Yeah, and then we can answer all the questions ourself instead of like, Straten and then Dolphin Point” (Interview, 1/21/05). But he told me that he would take Spanish even if there were no Spanish teacher at his school, and he were being taught by a teacher at another school (Interview, 5/2/05). Table 16 summarizes the opinions of the participants about Spanish instructional sessions with and without videoconferencing.

Beyond being interested in my participants’ preferences in regard to receiving instruction through videoconferencing or not, I was also interested in how they felt about the students in classes at the schools with whom they had videoconferencing. I asked if they knew any of them, whether they preferred communicating with them or with students in their own class, and how they felt about competition between their own class and the class at the other school.

Of my participants, only Ciara and Claire said that they had ever known any of the students in a class at another school they had had videoconferencing with. Ciara told me, “Yeah, I know somebody in Greenwood Park, yeah. Demetrius, Cedric, and all of them. I know all of them. Mm-hmm, I know all of them kids in Greenwood Park since about three years now.” Because of the timeframe of his answer and his reference to “all of them,” I wondered if it were only through videoconferencing that he knew these students. I asked him what it was like to see them through videoconferencing, and he replied that he felt nervous because he had told them that he was going to be in the sixth grade that year. It didn’t seem possible that he could have told them this during a videoconferencing session, so I didn’t pursue the matter of his relationship with them any further (Interview, 5/2/05).

Claire gave an affirmative answer to my question, “Have you ever known any of the students in a class at another school that you’ve had videoconferencing with?” When I asked her what it was like to see them through videoconferencing, she answered in terms of the quality of the transmission received on the television monitor:

I think it’s a little [brief pause] weird, because when they talk, it, um, for it to come onto the TV, it takes a while, because it kind of like makes ’em freeze, and then it lets ’em go. So like, they would move to the side, and they would freeze, and then they would keep on moving. (Interview, 5/2/05)
### Table 16
Participants’ Opinions in January and May About Spanish Instructional Sessions With and Without Videoconferencing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>Prefers Spanish without VC, because sometimes they don’t know what Mr. Straten is talking about. Mrs. Ford shows them what she’s talking about, and they can learn what she’s saying.</td>
<td>Wouldn’t really want to take Spanish if just taught through VC with no teacher at her school because of scheduling difficulties. It would also be harder for the teacher at the other school to know if you had a problem, because that teacher isn’t really teaching you. What she doesn’t like about Spanish in the Tele Café is VC. She doesn’t like VC because it’s harder to learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittany</td>
<td>Likes VC with Mr. Straten and Greenwood Park. Likes Spanish better without VC – they can concentrate better and not have people joking around and not messing with them.</td>
<td>Wouldn’t want to take Spanish if just taught through VC with no teacher at her school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciara</td>
<td>Likes going to and speaking to the other school. Likes it when Mrs. Ford is teaching without VC, because with VC they have to look at the TV and can’t look anywhere else.</td>
<td>Says that if Spanish just taught through VC with no teacher at his school, it would be kind of foreign. He likes Mrs. Ford better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Likes being taught by Mrs. Ford without VC, because his class can answer all the questions themselves without having to wait for students at Greenwood Park to take turns.</td>
<td>Would want to take Spanish if just taught through VC with no teacher at his school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* VC = videoconferencing
In the area of communicating with students at another school through videoconferencing, I mistakenly asked the question, “How do you feel about saying things in Spanish to students in the class at the other school?” This was not a good question, because Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten led the classes and asked the questions of the students, and my participants did not feel like they were talking to the students in the other class.

Edward was the first student to whom I posed the question concerning how he felt saying things to students in the class at the other school. His reply was “I don’t know.” I conceded that in communicating with the other school, he mostly said things to that teacher, and I rephrased my question: “How do you feel about the other students hearing it?” He answered, explaining his perceptions of what goes on in class:

“It’s okay. I never really thought of it like that. I just like try to impress the class, and then raise my hand real quick, and then [unintelligible] she always picks on me, and then I just know [unintelligible; background noise].” (Interview, 5/2/05)

Edward confirmed that it was his own class he was trying to impress and told me that he would rather say things to students in his class than to students in the class at the other school.

Like Edward, Ciara told me that he didn’t know, when I asked him how he felt about saying things in Spanish to students in the class at the other school. After he confirmed that he mostly said things to the teachers, I asked him, “Would you rather say things in Spanish to students in your class or to students in the class at the other school?” He responded that he preferred saying things to students in his class (Interview, 5/2/05).

Claire responded as follows to my statement that she mostly said things to the teacher at the other school and not to the students: “Yeah. ‘Cause the kids aren’t really asking the questions.” I followed up by asking, “What about them listening?” She thought that was all right, because “they don’t laugh if we mess up.” She also told me that she would rather say things to students in the class at the other school than to students in her class, because students in her class would not realize that she was trying to speak in Spanish (Interview, 5/2/05).

The question I asked Brittany was “If you ever have a chance to say things to the students in the class at the other school, how do you feel about that?” She replied that she feels comfortable (Interview, 5/2/05).

Given a choice of listening to what students in their class or in the class at the other school had to say, three of my participants told me that they preferred listening to students in the class at the other school. Brittany was the exception to this, saying that she would rather listen to students in her class, “because they know how to teach me the words without laughing at me” (Interview, 5/2/05). Ciara told me that he wanted to listen to students in the class at the other school “to figure out what they got to say about it” (Interview, 5/2/05). Edward said that he wanted to listen to students in the other school in order to “know like whose school is better, because I already know how our school is good in Spanish.”
All of my participants were in favor of competing against the class at the other school in games (Interviews, 5/2/05). I first thought about looking into the area of competition between classes after I observed a videoconferencing session involving two fourth-grade classes on April 5, 2005. A teacher who was being mentored by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten led the session from the Tele Café at Dolphin Point. Mr. Straten, who was present with the fourth grade class at Greenwood Park, offered to keep score. After the class session was over, Mr. Straten reestablished a videoconferencing connection with Dolphin Point and apologized profusely for setting up a competition between the two classes by adding the points for each class separately instead of adding them together. He had started adding the points separately without thinking and said that he would never do it intentionally (Field notes, 4/5/05).

The question that I asked Edward, Ciara, Claire, and Brittany was “What do you think would be better in games with the class at the other school: adding the points for both classes together or adding the points separately for each class so that you're playing against each other?” All of my participants said that it was better to add the points separately (Interviews, 5/2/05).

I also sought to find out if my participants liked competitions within their own class. I phrased my question in this way: “What about in your own class, do you like doing things all together; or in teams; or sometimes together, sometimes in teams?” Whereas Brittany and Ciara told me that they liked doing things all together, the preference of Claire and Edward was for doing things in teams (Interview, 5/2/05).

To sum up the inductively derived findings of this section, Brittany, Claire, Edward, and Ciara all had a generally positive attitude toward Spanish. Each of them told me that they preferred receiving Spanish instruction in the Tele Café to watching the Spanish videotapes. Muzzy was the video series that was usually chosen as the favorite when a preference was expressed. When the four students were directly questioned about whether they preferred being taught through videoconferencing or being taught by Mrs. Ford without videoconferencing, they all indicated that what they liked better was being taught by Mrs. Ford without videoconferencing. However, all of them had at least some interest in the students in the class with whom they had videoconferencing sessions. This interest was expressed in terms of saying things to the other students, if given the chance; listening to them; or simply competing with them.
Chapter 7. Themes and Supporting Evidence

During the course of this research, certain themes emerged. In this chapter I present three and provide supporting evidence for each. These themes are (a) the importance of the on-site Spanish teacher, (b) contributions of the video lessons, and (c) limitations in interaction and output. The discussions of the first and third themes are more extensive than the treatment of the second. I found that the longer discussions subsumed some minor themes that I had noted. For example, the role of English in Spanish instruction in the Tele Café is included in the discussion on the comprehension of input.

Importance of the On-Site Spanish Teacher

Evidence of the importance of the on-site Spanish teacher to the FLETT program can be found by taking both a wide and a narrow view. The evolution of the FLETT program itself points to the central role of Mrs. Ford, Dolphin Point’s on-site teacher, as do the words of Mr. Baxter and the students who were participants in this research. The pattern of the participants’ Spanish output in the different instructional settings is also worth considering in this regard.

Having observed Spanish classes at Dolphin Point in the 2003–2004 school year, at which time Spanish teachers at different schools alternated on a weekly basis in assuming sole teaching responsibility for matched classes in videoconferencing sessions, I was struck by the change in the following school year to the use of team teaching for videoconferencing. Until March of that year, there were no instances of either Mrs. Ford at Dolphin Point or of Mr. Straten at Greenwood Park assuming sole responsibility for teaching the paired classes of Mr. Baxter and Mr. Allen from the two schools. On the occasions when Mr. Straten was absent from Greenwood Park, Mrs. Ford taught Mr. Baxter’s class without videoconferencing, not providing instruction for Mr. Allen’s class at Greenwood Park. On the occasions when Mrs. Ford was absent from Dolphin Point, Mr. Baxter’s class did not receive Spanish instruction through videoconferencing. Even during the two videoconferencing sessions that Mr. Straten taught in March, Mrs. Ford remained in the Tele Café with Mr. Baxter’s class.

I was surprised by the shift to team teaching for videoconferencing in the 2004–2005 school year, because it meant that the schools involved were not taking advantage of one of the most obvious potential benefits of this teaching technology. Mrs. Ford emphasized this benefit to me when I asked her, “What do you consider the advantages of teaching through videoconferencing?” and she said, “Well, the first thing, of course, is reaching more children. That’s the
number one advantage of videoconferencing: that you can teach more children with less staff” (Interview, 3/8/05).

Although Mrs. Ford could articulate benefits of team teaching for videoconferencing, these benefits did not involve reaching more children with less expense. In fact, her answer to my question, “Are there any cost benefits to team teaching via videoconferencing?” only made reference to the cost benefits of the teaching technology itself. She talked about the expense of the videoconferencing units but said that in the long run they were much more economical than paying the salary of another teacher. She also pointed out the County’s difficulty in filling foreign language teaching positions and said that videoconferencing covers a lot of issues. She concluded, “it’s trying to reach more children; it’s what we’re trying to do” (Interview, 3/8/05).

Mrs. Ford talked about the advantages of team teaching with Mr. Straten, the World Languages Curriculum Coordinator at Greenwood Park, in very positive terms:

Oh, it’s very good. We feed off each other’s strengths. Sometimes one is very strong in a particular lesson, so the other one just kind of lets the other coordinator take that lesson, and that’s their strength. So, yeah, we kind of just feed off of each other’s strength, and that’s the one greatest advantage. Also with planning, because we do have to meet and plan. (Interview, 3/8/05)

I witnessed the positive collegial relationship between Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten throughout the school year. For example, toward the beginning of the Spanish jeopardy game in Mr. Baxter’s classroom on November 19, Mrs. Ford sent Colleen to the Tele Café to get Mr. Straten, who had been meeting with Mrs. Ford there: “Colleen, would you go to my room, and Señor Straten is in my room. Invite him over. He needs to see this.” When he entered Mr. Baxter's classroom with a FLES teacher from yet another school, Mrs. Ford greeted them, “Los invito a ver este juego tan fantástico” [I invite you to see this game that is so terrific] (Transcript, 11/19/04).

Another example of the friendly relationship between Mr. Straten and Mrs. Ford can be seen toward the end of a brief consultation they had prior to the first videoconferencing session in March that Mr. Straten assumed responsibility for teaching:

Mr. Straten: OK. Tan pronto lleguen el, la clase de señor Baxter, empezamos, y gracias, señora. [As soon as Mr. Baxter’s class arrives, we’ll start, and thank you, ma’am.]
Mrs. Ford: OK.
Mr. Straten: Un placer siempre trabajar contigo. [Always a pleasure to work with you.]
Mrs. Ford: Igualmente. [And with you, too.] (Transcript, 3/17/05)

Team teaching not only afforded Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten the opportunity to engage in joint lesson planning and to capitalize on each other’s strengths during instructional sessions, it also provided the opportunity for them to engage each other in conversation during videoconferencing so that the students were
able to listen to two adult speakers of Spanish interacting in this language. These advantages of team teaching, however, do not fully account for the shift in teaching procedure from the previous school year. Other evidence points to the importance of the on-site Spanish teacher and a desire for her continuing presence during videoconferencing sessions.

On November 11, 2004, Mrs. Ford provided me with a copy of the results of a survey on the Spanish program at Dolphin Point that had been completed by 24 teachers. (The Dolphin Point “Personnel Directory – 2004/2005” lists 22 regular classroom teachers in kindergarten through the fifth grade.) Respondents were asked to answer two open-ended questions, rate the effectiveness of different program components on a scale of 1 (not effective) to 5 (highly effective), and provide additional comments or suggestions. As will be discussed below, several items touch on or address videoconferencing. In some responses perceptions concerning Mrs. Ford are shared, as is the case in this additional comment: “Lissette is wonderful.”

In the survey, videoconferencing with the coordinator (Mrs. Ford) present received much higher effectiveness ratings than videoconferencing without a coordinator present at both sites. The first item to which I am referring here is worded “PolyCom/PicTel with Coordinator present.” It received 3 ratings of 3, 1 rating of 4, and 13 ratings of 5 (highly effective). (A choice of “N/A” is also provided on the survey, but the summary of results states that no tally was made for this type of response.) The second item to which I am referring is worded “PolyCom/PicTel without Coordinator present on both sides (classroom teacher only).” It received 2 ratings of 1 (not effective), 4 ratings of 2, 6 ratings of 3, and 1 rating of 5.

Some of the responses to the two open-ended questions are also pertinent to this discussion. The first question asks, “What was most effective or helpful about the Spanish program start-up at our school?” Of the 21 responses, 5 make reference to Mrs. Ford or Spanish in the Tele Café: “Having a World Lang. Coordinator,” “Having Mrs. Ford as coordinator,” “Estb. Initial year of the lab,” “Coordinator Enthusiasm,” and “Tele Café for students, then the extra Spanish classes just for teachers.” (Other comments have to do with the instructional videos and other materials, teacher training, use of the target language, and inability to provide a response to the question.)

The second open-ended question asks, “How would you recommend starting the Spanish program differently at future sites?” There were 12 responses to this question, of which 3 make reference to Spanish in the Tele Café: “Start with Tele Café before going to videos to generate excitement at the very beginning of the year”; “Model the facilitation of the videos . . . remain in room during Spanish lab” [ellipsis points appear in original summary of results]; and “No video conferencing [sic].” (Other responses have to do with teacher training, instructional videos, and inability to answer the question.)

In our first interview, I asked Mrs. Ford to comment on the results of the survey that “indicated that teachers felt that PolyCom/PicTel with the coordinator present is more effective than without a coordinator present on both sides.” She
expressed her belief that teachers’ comfort levels with not having a coordinator present at their site influenced their ratings of the effectiveness of this situation. She also shared her belief that the teachers with more experience in the program were more comfortable. She continued:

I think it’s something that has to be built on. You have to take baby steps in order to do this. The problem would be the new teachers joining the staff. They are learning the program. They’re learning the videos [slight pause] program. They’re learning so much, even the language, and then to add that to them [not having an on-site coordinator with them] just really raises their anxiety. (Interview, 3/8/05)

She commented that these teachers were not comfortable with language learning and that “some of them may have even had a bad experience in high school with learning language.” She concluded, “So, yeah, I think the longer they’re here, the longer they’re in the program, the more comfortable they feel with just the other coordinator at the other site” (Interview, 3/8/05).

Although Mrs. Ford’s answer explained why she and Mr. Straten would use team teaching with the classes of new teachers, it did not address the question of why they would use it with the class of an experienced teacher like Mr. Baxter. However, I learned from the latter that new teachers weren’t the only ones who might have looked to Mrs. Ford as the mainstay of the Spanish program at Dolphin Point.

When I asked Mr. Baxter, “Are there benefits to videoconferencing versus just having Mrs. Ford teach?” he replied, “I tell you what, that’s a hard one for me to say, because I love Miss Ford.” He next observed, “The kids love her,” and described her at the front of the class: “She has all that energy, and she does an awful lot of neat things.” He continued his answer:

We don’t get the same feeling off a TV. I think maybe that has to do with kids watching television and not participating with the TV and things like that. You know, TV’s not a big deal anymore. But Miss Ford is a fantastic teacher. She just has all this energy, you know, she loves the language, and the kids can see this. And when she’s in front of them, she can pull out whatever she wants. But videoconferencing, . . . the TV doesn’t get the same feeling as having Miss Ford live in front of you. (Interview, 2/17/05)

Mr. Baxter also praised Mrs. Ford in comparison to the Español para ti videos, which he didn’t believe to be a great device (Interview, 2/17/05). He shared his thoughts with her on April 28 after the Spanish baseball game between his class and Mrs. Jackson’s class. On his way out of the Tele Café, he told Mrs. Ford that the students had learned a lot in her class that day and that it was good for them to be there with her. He said that they were tired of the “Para ti” videos (Field notes, 4/28/05).

The influence of Mrs. Ford and Mr. Baxter on the attitudes of the students in his class seemed a real possibility to me. Mrs. Ford herself shared her observations on a case of possible teacher influence after a cooking session on April 21 that had featured flan. Mrs. Ford told me that there had been two
classes in which the teachers wouldn’t take or said they didn’t like flan. It seemed that in those classes less students said they liked flan than in a class in which the teacher had eaten it (Field notes, 4/21/05).

Besides the possible influence of Mr. Baxter’s belief that Spanish with just Mrs. Ford teaching was superior to both Español para ti and videoconferencing, I considered the possible influence of several statements that Mrs. Ford made on days when there would be no videoconferencing. In these statements, she frames not having videoconferencing on a given day as advantageous. On December 9, for example, she told Mr. Baxter’s class, “Oh, by the way, we’re not going to be calling Señor Straten, because their school is having like a tornado drill, and it won’t be part. That’s good, because I really want to practice with you the countries” (Transcript, 12/9/04). On January 20, after Mrs. Ford had explained to Mr. Baxter’s students why Mr. Allen’s class wouldn’t be able to take part in a videoconferencing session with them, she said, “So here’s what we’re gonna do today, which turns out actually better, ’cause we have a concentration game, and that way you get all the points. We don’t have to share any points with them” (Transcript, 1/20/05). Again on April 14, Mrs. Ford highlighted for Mr. Baxter’s students an advantage of not having videoconferencing when she said, “Greenwood Park is having their field day today. We have it tomorrow; they’re having theirs today. So we’re not calling. Okay? So that’s why we’re able to play baseball” (Transcript, 4/14/05).

It is interesting that on January 21, the day after Mrs. Ford talked about not having to share points from a concentration game with Mr. Allen’s class, Edward Jones told me that he liked it better when Mrs. Ford taught his class without videoconferencing, expressing himself in terms of not having to share with the class at Greenwood Park. In Edward’s case, however, he was talking about not having to share opportunities to answer questions:

**AN:** Do you like it better when Mrs. Ford teaches you by herself, just the class with her, or when there’s videoconferencing with Señor Straten and the other class; which do you like better?

**EJ:** When she teaches our class, [**AN:** You like that.] like yesterday.

**AN:** Yeah. Do you feel like you get more attention; what’s the reason?

**EJ:** Yeah, and then we can answer all the questions ourself instead of like, Straten and then Dolphin Point.

**AN:** Oh, yeah, back and forth.

**EJ:** And then you want answer the question, but you can’t ‘cause of Straten’s side.

**AN:** Uh-huh.

**EJ:** I like it better with our, just our class. (Interview, 1/21/05)

Returning now to Mrs. Ford’s statements that the program is “something that has to be built on” and that “you have to take baby steps in order to do this” (Interview, 3/8/05), it would seem to me that this type of building would imply experiences with the Spanish teacher/curriculum coordinator at one site taking responsibility for teaching the matched classes at some time earlier than March. It was in March, however, that she described to me what she and the curriculum
coordinators at two other schools were doing in order to help the classroom teachers feel more comfortable in videoconferencing sessions without an on-site Spanish teacher. She said that each coordinator was taking responsibility for teaching the paired classes from one grade level. The coordinator who wasn’t teaching the paired classes would sit with the classroom teacher in order to help him or her feel comfortable. As Mrs. Ford said,

I am now sitting with the classroom teacher back here, and now they’re having to call on students. They’re having to answer. And so it’s needed. I’m here with them so that, hopefully, maybe even after Spring Break, I’m gone. (Interview, 3/8/05)

As I have pointed out elsewhere, the only occasions on which one Spanish teacher assumed responsibility for teaching both Mr. Baxter’s class at Dolphin Point and Mr. Allen’s class at Greenwood Park were on March 17 and March 31. Of my case study participants, both Claire and Brittany were absent on the first occasion, and Claire was again absent on the second occasion. Because of the brevity of the time involved in these videoconferencing sessions compared to the time my participants spent in Spanish instructional sessions led by Mrs. Ford, it might be misleading to merely compare the average number of minutes between utterances for the participants in these two settings. For example, Brittany produced 1 utterance (“Jueves” [Thursday]) in the 22-minute videoconferencing session led by Mr. Straten on March 31 (Transcript, 3/31/05). In the 4 hours and 21 minutes that I observed Brittany in instructional sessions led by Mrs. Ford without videoconferencing, she produced 11 utterances; therefore, the average number of minutes between her utterances was 24, making her less productive in this setting (where she produced her highest number of utterances) than in the 22 minutes of the videoconferencing session led by Mr. Straten.

A description of some of the things that happened and excerpts of some of the things that were said during and after the videoconferencing sessions led by Mr. Straten provide a better idea of how Mr. Baxter’s class reacted.

I have mentioned elsewhere Edward’s reaction in the videoconferencing session led by Mr. Straten on March 17. During a song about Florida, he was sitting with his head in his hands, was frowning, and wasn’t singing. In answering questions about Florida, he whispered, “Tallahassee,” to Mrs. Ford, who directed him, “Dícelo [sic] a señor Straten” [Tell it to Mr. Straten]. Then he said, “Tallahassee,” more loudly. He also answered a question with Willie. During the closing song, however, he sat with his hands in front of his face (Field notes, 3/17/05).

The words to the closing song had appeared on one of the television monitors in the Tele Café before Mr. Straten said anything about them. When they appeared, Ciara said, “Tic tac,” the first two words. Mrs. Ford chided him: “Ah, excuse me!”

After Tic tac had been sung and the videoconferencing connection had ended, Mrs. Ford addressed the whole class:
Boys and girls, I think you noticed that I wasn’t involved in this lesson, that I was also receiving this lesson, and that’s because we’re going to be doing more and more of this as the year goes on, where one of us will teach, and the other one will not be in the room at all.

And I thought that was very, very, very rude, and it wasn’t just him. There were three of you that kept reminding me what time it was. I am very aware of what time it is, and so is Señor Straten. You don’t have to tell us what time. So please, don’t ever do that again, ‘cause you’re just sending him the message that you want him off, and you want it to be over, and that’s rude. (Transcript, 3/17/05)

After Mrs. Stephens, who was substituting for Mr. Baxter that day, had reminded the students that she had told them not to get up to leave class until it was over and after there had been a brief discussion about releasing students for Chorus, Mrs. Ford returned to rebuking the students: “Never, never, never, never do that again, where he can hear you do ‘Tic tac’ like that. That’s not, that’s, that’s rude. We know what time it is. We’ll let you know when you can go to Chorus” (Transcript, 3/17/05).

Before the students left the Tele Café, I heard Glenn, a large boy who often teased other students, whisper to Ciara, “Tic tac!” Ciara replied, “I thought he was just talkin’” (Transcript, 3/17/05).

Two weeks later Mr. Straten again led Mr. Baxter’s class and Mr. Allen’s class in a videoconferencing session, but Mrs. Ford apparently didn’t remember that there had been another such session before Spring Break, because she asked Mr. Baxter’s class after this one was over what they thought about their “first experience” with only Mr. Straten teaching them. Mr. Baxter responded, talking about needing to listen more closely:

Mr. Baxter: I think they had the same problem that I had at the very beginning, which was we need to listen closer to Señor Straten when he is doing it than when you are in front of us.

Mrs. Ford: Yeah.

Mr. Baxter: So sometimes I, when he asks a question, then he says, “Baxter,” you know, then I’m saying to myself, “Now what was the question?”

Mrs. Ford: Right.

Mr. Baxter: You know, because I’m not listening that closely to it, because usually you are the one [Mrs. Ford: That I would ask the question.] that I would answer.

Mrs. Ford: So it’s kind of different. So maybe something like this needs to start at the beginning of the school year, so that they get used to it.

Mr. Baxter: Mm-hmm. (Transcript, 3/31/05)

Mrs. Ford then addressed Edward, for whom I have no utterances recorded on that day: “You were very quiet today, Edward. [Brief pause.] Usually you’re raising your hand and then Spanish. Any reason why? No?” He shrugged his shoulders but continued to remain silent. Mr. Baxter offered Mrs. Ford his own interpretation of this silence: “I don’t think it had anything to do with
Spanish. It’s been kind of a little bit of a rough day” (Field notes & transcript, 3/31/05). Perhaps Edward’s “rough day” contributed to his silence in this videoconferencing session led by Mr. Straten, but in general he was much more eager to participate in classes that Mrs. Ford had a part in teaching, whether she was teaching by herself or in videoconferencing sessions with Mr. Straten.

Edward told me that he liked being taught by Mrs. Ford without videoconferencing the best. However, his relationship with her (which I discussed more fully in the previous chapter) seemed to encourage his production of Spanish utterances, whether videoconferencing was involved or not. Claire, Brittany, and Ciara, also told me that they liked being taught by Mrs. Ford without videoconferencing the best. These three students were much more productive of Spanish utterances as individuals in instructional sessions led by Mrs. Ford than in videoconferencing sessions led by both Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten. Although the presence or absence of videoconferencing should not be ignored as a factor affecting their productivity, the role of Mrs. Ford as their Spanish teacher and their relationship with her was important to all of them.

Spence Rogers, from whom Mrs. Ford has received training in her school district, and coauthor Lisa Renard have written about using relationship-driven teaching to enhance motivation to learn (1999). One of their six standards for this type of teaching is “Caring,” which involves letting students know that they are liked and accepted. Rogers and Renard state, “Simply using students’ names correctly on the first day of school sends a powerful ‘you count to me’ message” (p. 37).

At Dolphin Point, I observed various examples of the effects of using students’ names. On December 8, after an Español para ti video, Edward saw my messy notes and commented on them. I turned in my notebook to a blank page and wrote his name neatly in cursive. He asked me in a tone of wonder, “How do you know my name?” I paused and then said, “It was on your permission form.” Some other students had gathered around us by then, and one of them pointed to Elena and asked me if I knew her name. I replied, “Elena,” and someone started spelling it (Field notes, 12/8/04). On January 13, as students were coming into the Tele Café, Mrs. Ford said, “Hola. Hola, Colleen.” Colleen happily exclaimed, “You know my name!” (Mrs. Ford had actually used it in the past.) Mrs. Ford drew in her breath and replied, “You’re famous” (Transcript, 1/13/05). Mrs. Ford strengthened her relationship with Edward by often using his name during classes in the Tele Café, sometimes inviting him to participate and sometimes directing her comments to him in particular.

In this section, the evolution of the FLETT program to a team teaching mode has been shown to be related to the importance of the on-site Spanish teacher, Mrs. Ford. The results of a survey of teachers showed that most felt that videoconferencing sessions in which she was present were more effective than those without her. Mr. Baxter’s comments also showed how important he felt her to be to the Spanish program. The possibility of his attitudes influencing those of his students was presented, as was the possibility of Mrs. Ford’s
comments influencing them. Next in this section, student reactions to and teacher comments on the two videoconferencing sessions led by Mr. Straten were presented. The productivity of the four case study participants in terms of individual Spanish utterances in the instructional settings under discussion was considered. The section ended with comments on the importance of Mrs. Ford’s relationships with the students.

**Contributions of the Video Lessons**

Although the video lessons were not the favored mode of instruction of the case study participants, the role they played in the FLETT program should not be discounted. Neither should the role played by Mr. Baxter in the facilitation of the video lessons be discounted. This section will take a brief look at the contributions of both.

I got the clearest sense of what the videos contributed to student learning from Claire and Brittany. In May, I asked Claire, “So outside of the Tele Café, in your classroom, have there been certain things that have helped you in learning Spanish?” She answered by talking about learning words from the videos and how this related to Mrs. Ford’s use of the words:

Yeah, because some of the words, they would be new when we would watch the videos. And then we would learn those. And it would help, because Señora Ford, we would learn more; we would learn what the words [are] Señora Ford is using when she’s talking to us in Spanish, so it’s a little more helpful. (Interview, 5/2/05)

In January, Claire had told me that one of the things she liked about **Español para ti** was “talking about the fruits.” Later in this interview, when I asked her what some of the things she had learned in Spanish were, she mentioned having learned how to say apple and orange (Interview, 1/21/05).

Beyond her learning of words, Claire provided evidence to me that she had taken in what was happening in a **La Familia Contenta** video by giving an accurate description of its plot (Interview, 5/2/05).

Brittany talked about learning from the videos in both of her interviews. In January, she said that she preferred **Muzzy** to **Español para ti**, because it taught her more Spanish. When I asked her how it did this, she said, “They’re countin’ in Spanish. I count with them, and it help me more to learn how to do my Spanish.” In the same interview, she told me that what she liked best about **Español para ti** was “when they teach me how to do the large numbers” (Interview, 1/21/05).

In May, Brittany talked about the relationship of what she learned from videos and what she did in the Tele Café. She said that in **Español para ti**, “you’re answering questions and stuff and learning new words. And then in Tele Café, you have, you like review the words” (Interview, 5/2/05).

Ciara was quick to point out the deficiencies of the videos, such as the fact that the video teacher in **Español para ti** had no awareness of who the students were (Transcript, 1/6/05). He did tell me, however, that he likes the part of
Español para ti where they pick the words and show you what they mean (Interview, 1/21/05).

Edward didn’t really like Level 5 of Español para ti as a whole but did name a few things from it that he liked: the Chocolate song, countries, and practicing times and action words (Interview, 1/21/05). He preferred Muzzy, saying that it was fun and that because he had seen it more than once, he had started to know most of the words in it. He went on to explain: “And then I know what they’re saying. That’s like a movie. Well, a song. If you listen to the song once, and then you keep listening to it, you’ll start memorizing what they’re saying. That’s like with Muzzy” (Interview, 1/21/05).

The four participants varied in their production of Spanish utterances during Español para ti videos. Edward was the most productive with an average of 5 minutes between his utterances. Brittany and Ciara occasionally produced Spanish utterances during these videos (with an average of 39 and 49 minutes between their utterances, respectively). Claire did not produce any utterances.

Taking into account all of the instructional settings, the participants were most similar in the number of Spanish utterances they produced and in the frequency with which they produced them during the activities that Mr. Baxter sometimes led after Español para ti videos. Edward produced utterances with an average of 5 minutes between them, as he did during the videos from this series. There was an average of 6 minutes between Ciara’s utterances during the postvideo activities and an average of 7 minutes between those of both Claire and Brittany.

Mr. Baxter only facilitated a limited number of activities. He explained to me his hesitancy to lead some types of activities because of his lack of a background in Spanish:

A lot of times I won’t do activities like that [activities that reinforce what is being done in class] from the teacher’s edition, because I don't have a background, and I get caught into situations where I don't feel at ease, and then I’ll just skip it. (Interview, 2/17/05)

When I asked him what he liked going over in Spanish with his class, he mentioned geography and math (Interview, 2/17/05).

All of the participants mentioned going over or learning numbers when I asked, “How does Mr. Baxter help you learn Spanish?” (Interviews, 1/21/05). Claire elaborated a little more: “Sometimes he talks about the calendar, and he makes us say the numbers and the month in Spanish.” (Most of Claire’s Spanish utterances as an individual were based on number, date, and calendar vocabulary.) She also talked about how they had prepared for the concentration game that had taken place in the Tele Café the previous day: “Yesterday he was making us say numbers in Spanish so we could know about the number board for, um, in the Tele Café” (Interview, 1/21/05).

Like Claire, Edward talked about how Mr. Baxter had helped his class prepare for the concentration game:
We were ready for that. I had my paper in my desk, but we had practiced our words and numbers, and that’s how he helps us. He tell us ahead of time what our lesson is gonna be about. (Interview, 1/21/05)

Edward also gave credit to Mr. Baxter when he talked about how he thought knowing Spanish would help him:

Mr. Baxter said knowing Spanish will help you get a job easier, ‘cause you know both languages, and you have a customer coming in who is Spanish, and then you know the Spanish. Then you could speak to the customer, and then the other, more Spanish people could come in your business, and you can get more money, and then you could earn the profit. (Interview, 1/21/05)

Mr. Baxter told me that he avoided facilitating activities in which proper Spanish pronunciation was important (Interview, 2/17/05). I asked him about this later, and he explained: “It’s quite hard for me to hear the correct pronunciation of Spanish words, and I worry that if I don’t say them correctly, you know, this will affect the children in the classroom” (Interview, 3/16/05). In spite of his concern, the only instance I noticed of a student pronouncing something incorrectly in the same way Mr. Baxter did was when Ciara used “piquiño” instead of pequeño (Transcript, 12/15/04).

In talking about Dolphin Point’s fifth-grade students, Mrs. Ford observed, “But I do find that the pronunciation is very good.” She gave credit to Español para ti and the opportunities the students had to listen to her and listen to other Spanish teachers at other sites. She continued her praise of the students, “Their pronunciation is very good, excellent, native-speaking pronunciation” (Interview, 3/8/05).

Mr. Baxter recognized his shortcomings in the area of Spanish and only facilitated certain types of activities, but he did contribute to the Spanish program and to his students’ learning of Spanish. The instructional videos had certain limitations, as well, and were not the participants’ favorite part of the Spanish program, but they also contributed to the program and to the students’ learning of Spanish.

Limitations in Interaction and Output

The discussion in this section is framed in terms of the influence of the Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) on the Spanish Program at Dolphin Point and includes reflections on the comprehension of input and on the affective filter and anxiety. However, in terms of the primary focus of this research, the most important part of the discussion is that dealing with limitations in interaction and output. These limitations are, in fact, one of the major themes that emerged during the course of this study. The section’s preliminary discussion is offered in part to set the stage for this theme.

The influence of the Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) and of the related Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1985) can be seen in Dolphin Point’s FLETT program. In Chapter 3, I described a summer Spanish institute, attended by Mr. Baxter, Mrs. Ford, and other classroom and FLES/FLETT teachers from.
different County schools, at which the Natural Approach principle of stages in students' language development was highlighted. In Chapter 4, I explained the relationship of the Natural Approach to the Español para ti video-based language program. Later in this section, I will add my observation that the influence of the Natural Approach and Input Hypothesis could be observed in Mrs. Ford's speech when she talked about lowering students' affective filters (Field notes, 4/14/05; interviews, 3/8/05 & 4/21/05).

With the purpose of elucidating some of the implications of the Natural Approach’s influence on the Spanish program at Dolphin Point, I will now turn to a discussion of my participants’ perceptions of how well they understood in different instructional settings. This relates to the Natural Approach’s emphasis on comprehending input. As Krashen and Terrell (1983) explain: “We acquire (not learn) language by understanding input that is a little beyond our current level of (acquired) competence” (p. 32). Although the first point of focus around which this dissertation is organized deals with instances of interaction and output rather than input, in the discussion of the fourth point of focus, dealing with the participants’ preferences and perceptions, some of their comments on how well they understood in different settings were included. These comments and related ones will be brought together and given fuller treatment here before I move on to a discussion of limitations in the participants’ interaction and output.

There was variation among the participants in the comments they made about how much they understood. In our first interview, I asked Claire if there were many times in the Tele Café when she didn’t understand something in Spanish, and she indicated that there were. Prior to that question she had compared how well she could understand Mr. Straten and Mrs. Ford: “If the other teacher asks us a question, sometimes we don’t know what he’s talking about, and with Miss Ford, we can; she shows us what we’re talking about, and we can actually learn what she’s saying” (Interview, 1/21/05). Claire made similar comments several months later about Mrs. Ford helping them understand words but Mr. Straten not knowing that they “don’t really know those words” (Interview, 5/2/05).

Claire talked about understanding more Spanish than she did when she started learning it. As she explained,

When we first started Spanish, it was kind of new to us, so we didn’t even know what she was saying. And now, since we’ve been through the classes, we understand some of the stuff. And the new things, [it] just starts coming to us. (Interview, 1/21/05)

She also told me that she liked Spanish better at that time than in the beginning.

Brittany, in comparing her Spanish classes when she first started learning and at the present time, told me, “Each time they get better and better.” At my prompting, she agreed that she had learned more Spanish as she went along, which helped her to understand more (Interview, 1/21/05).

Unlike Claire, Brittany responded, “No,” to my question, “In Tele Café, are there many times when you don’t understand something in Spanish?” Her reply was affirmative when I asked if she understood a lot of Spanish. I also inquired,
“When you don’t understand something, what helps you understand?” She replied, “At the end when we ask, or she say, she tell us to turn the sign to English, and then I ask her, ‘What does it mean?’” (Interview, 1/21/05). Apparently, the opportunity to ask what something meant was important to Brittany, although she never took advantage of that opportunity herself in the 2004–2005 school year.

Not understanding Spanish was a recurring theme for Ciara. In our conversation on January 6, he explained to me that the reason he just “kinda” liked Spanish was that “I don’t understand what she’s sayin’.” At my prompting, he continued, “Once you get it, and then the next moment she change the word. You’ll get confused by her.” At that time, Ciara commented about Mrs. Ford talking back and forth with Mr. Straten, “Well, I say it’s not confusing. We’ve been doing that for years” (Transcript, 1/6/05). However, 15 days later when I asked him if there were many times he didn’t understand something in Spanish in the Tele Café, he told me, “Yes. What they’re sayin’ back and forth, like a word I never heard of.” I wanted to know if there were anything that helped him understand; he told me that there wasn’t (Interview, 1/21/05).

Ciara’s complaints of not understanding extended to the Spanish videos. He explained the reasons for this, referring to the video teacher, “‘Cause she doing it all by herself, and she can’t even hear us” (Interview, 1/21/05). (Ciara also talked about not understanding Spanish on television away from school: “If I don’t understand one word they saying, child, please, I’m gonna turn the channel”; Interview, 1/21/05.)

Unlike Claire and Brittany, Ciara told me that he liked Spanish about the same as when he started learning it. He elaborated, talking about being able to understand at some times and not being able to understand at other times. He did concede that Spanish was harder for him when he first started learning it (Interview, 1/21/05).

After all of Ciara’s complaints about not understanding, I was somewhat surprised when he told me what would make him want to try harder in Spanish class: “If everybody speakin’ Spanish, and I don’t understand one word” (Interview, 5/2/05).

Like Claire, Edward told me that Mrs. Ford helped him understand. In his interview prior to the excerpt that follows, he had been talking about things he liked about Spanish with Mrs. Ford and had mentioned songs and games. He continued his list of what he liked:

. . . how she tells us the words, and then, like yesterday, she drew the house, la casa, and the apartments, ‘cause I didn’t know what she was talking about. And then she drew it out . . . . So then, now I know. Now I memorized la casa. (Interview, 1/21/05)

Upon my questioning him further about what helped him understand, Edward recalled an activity associated with Muzzy that Mrs. Ford had used in the previous school year:

EJ: Last year on Muzzy, um, you know her bag?
AN: Uh-huh.
EJ: Well, she had take a whole bunch of stuff out of her bag, and then she showed us, and she showed us a picture so that we’ll know what they were. And like if we had another video about how Muzzy, about some of the stuff in her bag, then we’ll know what they meant. She had pictures of each one, everything in her bag. (Interview, 1/21/05)

Like Edward, I recalled this activity that Mrs. Ford had used the previous January. (I included a brief description of it in Chapter 3.) Edward contrasted the situation in the Tele Café, where, he said, there wasn’t really anything he didn’t understand because Mrs. Ford explained things, to the Español para ti videos in which, “If they say something [that you don’t understand], they’ll just keep going ‘cause they don’t know you don’t understand” (Interview, 1/21/05).

Some of the comments of the participants point to the need for the person who is speaking Spanish to be able to recognize a student’s lack of understanding. The comments referred not only to the videos, with which there is no possibility of this recognition, but also to videoconferencing.

Mrs. Ford talked in March about the difficulties of using the document camera at the other site and not being able to see the students there while this camera was in use. As she explained, because “you lose that touch with those kids, ... you really can’t do the document camera for too long.” She told me, however, that having a camera on the students at the other site, “you can realize that they’re enjoying the lesson, that there is a problem, that there’s questions, or anything like that” (Interview, 3/8/05).

Claire’s comments concerning students in her class not always knowing what Mr. Straten is talking about (Interview, 1/21/05) and concerning his lack of awareness when they didn’t know something (Interview, 5/2/05) seem to imply either that Mr. Straten is not good at making input comprehensible or that the use of videoconferencing creates greater difficulties in understanding than Mrs. Ford’s comments in the previous paragraph indicate. I would guess that the latter is the case. Like Mrs. Ford, Mr. Straten is an experienced, well-educated, and professionally active FLES teacher whom I have known and respected for years. Among the techniques he uses to make input more comprehensible is acting out different Spanish words.

Summing up the discussion on the comprehension of input, the participants did not always understand the Spanish input, but Mrs. Ford helped them through showing them what she meant during the Spanish-only portion of lessons or through telling them what she meant in English afterwards. Participants said they were able to understand more than when they first started learning Spanish. However, complaints about not being able to understand in many settings were voiced by Ciara. Difficulties in understanding the videos and in understanding during videoconferencing were mentioned by different participants. The role of input and its comprehension in the Spanish program at Dolphin Point is an area that could be researched in the future in order to build a base of empirical data and move beyond the observations that I offer here.
Turning now to the area of interaction, I will focus on my observation that students in the FLETT program did not interact much with each other in Spanish. I was aware of this lack of interaction but was not thinking about it when I mistakenly phrased a question for my participants as follows: “When you’re in the Tele Café, how do you feel about saying things in Spanish to students in the class at the other school?” I needed to rephrase the question in terms of students in the class at the other school hearing my participants. As Claire pointed out, “the kids aren’t really asking the questions” (Interview, 5/2/05). This lack of student interaction was apparent not only in videoconferencing sessions but also in instructional sessions in the Tele Café without videoconferencing. The only activity I observed that involved students saying things to each other occurred in Mr. Baxter’s classroom when he directed students to share an action word and “ask a person in the classroom to do that action” (Transcript, 10/26/04).

Students occasionally used Spanish with each other on their own. This happened when one was prompting another on how to answer a question or one was telling another how to say a word in Spanish. Once during a cooking session, I observed two of Edward’s friends trying to communicate with each other in Spanish. The students were not required to speak Spanish to each other at that time, but I heard Calvin say, “español, español,” to Damarcus, who replied, “I’m trying to say it in español.” Calvin commented, “ay, ay, ay,” with multiple repetitions, and then Damarcus did the same (Field notes, 3/10/05).

Damarcus had been in the Spanish program since the second grade, and his Spanish abilities were categorized by Mrs. Ford as being in the mid to high range in comparison to those of his classmates (Field notes, 4/28/05), but he showed limitations in his ability to express himself in Spanish. I have already discussed limitations in the output of my participants, all of whom for the most part produced utterances that were three words or less in length.

Mrs. Ford was careful to provide her students with a lot of Spanish input, which she tried to make comprehensible. As far as students’ output was concerned, I believe she was influenced by the Natural Approach principle that students’ production of the new language should be “allowed to emerge in stages . . . : (1) response by nonverbal communication, (2) response with a single word . . . , (3) combinations of two or three words . . . , (4) phrases . . . , (5) sentences, and finally (6) more complex discourse” (Krashen & Terrell, 1983, p. 20). Although she had probably relied on certain patterns of questioning for many years, the advice (based on the Natural Approach principle of stages in language development) that she and other teachers received at the summer Spanish institute in June 2003 bears repetition here. Keeping in mind students’ stage of language development, the teachers were advised to (a) elicit nonverbal responses and student names, (b) ask yes/no [si/no] questions, (c) ask either/or questions, and (d) ask questions that would prompt students to produce language on their own, such as the question, “¿Qué es esto?” [What is this?] (Field notes, 6/23/03).

I observed Mrs. Ford ask many either/or questions, even at times when certain students looked eager to answer before a choice was given. She
seemed satisfied with student responses that were limited to several words and didn’t seem to expect the language development of her students to progress much beyond that stage. Although the FLETT program at Dolphin Point involves goals and an investment of time that are much more limited than those in an immersion program, an observation by Swain (1985) about immersion students is pertinent here. These students, Swain noted, are only given limited opportunities to produce output and are not ‘pushed.’ In Swain’s observation, the students were not pushed “to be more comprehensible than they already are” (p. 249). In the case of the students at Dolphin Point, they were not pushed to produce utterances that were more than a few words in length. The lack of complexity of their utterances is reflected in the small number of these utterances that involved grammatical errors.

There were few opportunities for students as individuals to produce utterances based on action words in Spanish instructional sessions in the Tele Café. (I have maintained action words as a designation, because this term is used instead of verbs in Español para ti. In my vocabulary categories, I also distinguished utterances based on Me gusta [I like] from those based on action words.) Of the 173 Spanish utterances that Edward produced in Spanish instructional sessions with and without videoconferencing only 3 were based on action words, and only 1 was based on Me gusta. Edward was the only participant who produced any utterances based on action words in the Tele Café. As far as utterances based on Me gusta were concerned, Edward and Brittany (with two utterances) were the only participants who produced any utterances of this type in Spanish instructional sessions in the Tele Café.

Returning to my observation that the students at Dolphin Point were not pushed to produce utterances that were more than a few words in length, I believe that Mrs. Ford did not push in this way because of her desire to foster a low affective filter in the students. In my discussion of the relationship of the Natural Approach to Español para ti in Chapter 4, I presented information on the Natural Approach principle that “the activities done in the classroom aimed at acquisition must foster a lowering of the affective filter of the students” (Krashen & Terrell, 1983, p. 21). In explaining this principle, Krashen and Terrell state, “An environment which is conducive to acquisition must be created by the instructor – low anxiety level, good rapport with the teacher, friendly relationship with other students; otherwise acquisition will be impossible” (p. 21).

I heard Mrs. Ford talk about students’ affective filters on several occasions. In her interview on March 8, she told me about her idea of having students who were new to Dolphin Point and the Spanish program come into the Tele Café during the first 2 weeks of the following school year to teach them “colors, and a few songs, and the calendars, and the days of the week, just so that their affective filter is lowered, and that they get used to the room, and they get a little acclimated with second language learning” (Interview, 3/8/05). In another interview, Mrs. Ford mentioned the affective filter in talking to me about Brittany as a Spanish student:
So she’s very afraid to make a mistake. And even though I lower that affective filter a lot in here, and hopefully I make them all feel comfortable, there’s always that competitive mode. And she would not fit in that mode at all. She would rather stay quiet than volunteer. (Interview, 4/21/05)

After the first Spanish baseball game, Mrs. Ford also told me that when students got up to answer a question she could tell that their affective filters went up (Field notes, 4/14/05).

The teacher-centered instruction that predominated in Spanish lessons in the Tele Café did, in fact, often bring with it the need for students to answer questions in front of their class and, in the case of videoconferencing sessions, in front of the class at the other school, as well. When confronted with such situations, students may well experience greater anxiety than when working in dyads or in small groups.

A number of grouping possibilities (including dyads, small groups, and large groups) are offered by the Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) in order to facilitate “activities in which the student has the opportunity to produce the target language” (p. 124). Mrs. Ford apparently did not take advantage of these possibilities because of her conception of the limitations of teaching through videoconferencing. As she explained to me, “There are certain activities that you can’t do. Of course; it’s obvious. Cooperative-learning type of activities, where you put kids in groups; that is something that we can’t do (Interview, 3/8/05). It should be noted, however, that even in the instructional sessions that she led without videoconferencing, Mrs. Ford relied on whole-group activities, choosing not to push students to produce output in order to keep their affective filter low, instead of using the small-group activities in which a raised affective filter might not have been as much of a concern.

Turning now to a consideration of anxiety in relation to my participants, I would like to share some of my observations and reflections. Because I heard Claire and Brittany express concerns about being laughed at and heard Claire and Ciara talk about being scared or nervous, I know that such concerns were real to three of the participants. However, in the course of this study, I did not become convinced that anxiety was always detrimental to their development as Spanish students.

For example, Claire told me that she feels embarrassed when her Saber es poder card is selected and shown to students in the class at the other school, “because sometimes a word could be written wrong, and she [Mrs. Ford] would have to correct it. And I just always think that they’re gonna laugh” (Interview, 5/2/05). I also heard her tell Mr. Baxter, “I’m scared,” when he signaled to her to raise her hand during the first Spanish baseball game (Field notes, 4/14/05). However, in her interview several weeks later (after the second game), she talked about the Spanish baseball games in positive terms:

AN: What do you think you’ll remember the longest about Spanish here over the years you’ve taken it? [Pause.]  
CM: The baseball games.
AN: Oh, I think that there may be one more. That’s what Mr. Baxter told me, maybe the last week.

CM [very quietly]: Oh, cool. [I laugh.]

AN: Do you want to say anything else about Spanish?

CM: Uh. [Pause.] Just that I [with a laugh in her voice] hope they do have another baseball game. (Interview, 5/2/05)

Claire also had a positive attitude toward the Spanish jeopardy game in which she had been team captain/spokesperson and had produced more Spanish utterances as an individual than she did in any other setting. When I asked her about the game in her first interview she said, “That was fun” (Interview, 1/21/05).

Brittany told me she feels comfortable when her Saber es poder card is selected and shown to students in the class at the other school, when she repeats Spanish phrases after the teacher, and if she ever has a chance to say things to the students at the other school (Interview, 5/2/05). She explained to me, however, that she would rather listen to students in her class than to students in the class at the other school, because the former “know how to teach me the words without laughing at me” (Interview, 5/2/05). Brittany produced less Spanish utterances as an individual than any of my other participants. As I pointed out, Mrs. Ford expressed the belief that she was “very afraid to make a mistake” (Interview, 4/21/05). Brittany, however, was able to help Colleen name colors in Spanish when she was called upon to do this (Field notes, 2/24/05).

Ciara told me he feels nervous when his Saber es poder card is selected and shown to students in the class at the other school and when, through videoconferencing, he sees students at the other school whom he knows. He also told me that it made him nervous when the camcorder I used for this research was pointed at him and that he felt nervous the first time he saw the Spanish teacher from the other school in person. Ciara, however, was often eager to participate, especially in Spanish instructional sessions led by Mrs. Ford, in which he produced 41 of his 83 utterances. (It is possible that anxiety may have contributed to the much lower oral productivity of Ciara, as well as of Claire and Brittany, during videoconferencing sessions.) Like the role of input and its comprehension, the occurrence and influence of anxiety in the Spanish program at Dolphin Point is an area that could be examined in more detail in future research.

Returning to a consideration of the influence of the Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) on the Spanish program at Dolphin Point, I would like to point out that Terrell himself, in an interview (D. J. Young, 1995), expresses concern about the possibility that anxiety might sometimes be reduced too much in the implementation of this approach:

If a teacher is too good at reducing anxiety and getting the students really relaxed into the Natural Approach and so forth, what happens with some of the students some of the time (and probably much more than I would like) is that they don’t attend to the input very carefully. That is, they learn to attend to the input just enough to understand what the question is, or
Terrell further states that for acquisition to take place there must be “a positive drive to go after something” (D. J. Young, 1995, p. 109). In his view, this drive includes both communicative need and some sort of identification with a target language group.

In the Spanish program at Dolphin Point, the case study participants received input that wasn’t always comprehensible to them, but Mrs. Ford helped them to understand. Concern was expressed about Mr. Straten not being able to recognize a lack of understanding on the part of the students at Dolphin Point. There were also comments about difficulty in understanding him and understanding the videos.

Students at Dolphin Point rarely interacted in Spanish with the students at Greenwood Park or with each other. The Spanish output of my participants was limited to utterances that were rarely longer than three words in length and were not syntactically complex. Mrs. Ford did not seem to expect their language to progress much beyond this point while they were at Dolphin Point, limiting her expectations to the early stages of language development described in the Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). She did not push her students to produce Spanish output, not wanting to raise their affective filters. Nevertheless, I observed that Claire, Brittany, and Ciara did not seem to suffer as Spanish students when put in situations where they were called upon to produce individual utterances in spite of feelings of anxiety or nervousness that they expressed.
Chapter 8. Summary and Discussion

Case studies of four fifth-grade students learning Spanish through interactive videoconferencing and video-based lessons have been presented in this dissertation. In Chapter 8, I will review the methods that were used in this study and reflect on the quantity and quality of the data. The points of focus with which this research was begun will be restated, and I will discuss how these subsequently evolved in response to changes in the implementation of the Spanish program under study and based upon my ever-increasing familiarity with both the setting and the participants. I will list the final points of focus and will summarize the findings associated with them. I will also explain how these points of focus relate to the themes presented in the previous chapter. A final discussion will be offered.

Methodology and Quantity and Quality of the Data

The research reported in this dissertation was conducted in the 2004–2005 school year. It is an interpretive, qualitative, multi-case study involving four participants. (I alternately describe the research as consisting of four case studies.) The design of the study was emergent; additional design decisions were made as data from multiple sources were collected and analyzed. The data collection techniques consisted of observations, videotaping and audio recording of lessons with subsequent transcription, field notes, informal conversations, and interviews of students and teachers that were audio recorded and subsequently transcribed. This use of triangulation strengthened the objectivity of the study and its results.

From the beginning of October 2004 to the beginning of May 2005, I spent 27 hours 13 minutes observing my participants in the different instructional settings. (Their attendance in these class sessions varied.) I spent additional time with them that is not included in this total: I observed them in August and September 2004 and later spent time with them in interviews, in the school cafeteria, between classes, at special events, and in three Spanish reviews that I provided for Mr. Baxter’s class at the end of the school year.

I recorded what the participants said in Spanish in my field notes and wrote about other things that I observed, as well. I carefully transcribed audio recordings of class sessions and referred to video recordings for additional information. Although the possibility exists that I occasionally missed something a participant said in Spanish in instructional sessions, I feel that omissions of this kind would only have a very slight effect on my findings.
Some of the questions I asked in interviews might not have been phrased in the best way. However, I learned a lot from the interviews, and I was accurate in my transcriptions.

Having reviewed the methodology of this study and reflected on the quantity and quality of data, I will now move on to a consideration of the points of focus.

**Evolution of the Points of Focus**

Prior to presenting the points of focus that guided this research, I will explain how they were formulated, beginning with a description of what I learned during the previous school year about the Spanish program at Dolphin Point Elementary School.

In the 2003–2004 school year, I observed 33 Spanish class sessions at Dolphin Point. During that time, I became familiar with the School’s FLETT (Foreign Language in the Elementary School Through Technology) program, the basic components of which are interactive videoconferencing and video-based lessons. I learned that each class at Dolphin Point was matched with a class of the same grade level from one of two other elementary schools for weekly videoconferencing sessions. The Spanish teachers at the different schools alternated on a weekly basis in assuming sole teaching responsibility for the matched classes. The program component of video-based lessons relied on classroom teachers as facilitators, and I was able to gain an understanding of what this facilitation involved.

For the case studies that I proposed conducting the following school year (the basis of this dissertation), I was interested in the acquisition of Spanish by fifth-grade students, who had been in the Spanish program the longest. Although the possibility existed of beginning the research with another focus, I chose to examine interaction and output, because there is a theoretical basis for their study (see “Input, Interaction, and Output” in Chapter 2), because they are easily observed if present, and because of my prior experience studying interaction in a Spanish FLEX program (see “Researcher Background and Perspectives” in Chapter 3). Besides differences in interaction and output in different settings, I was interested in possible patterns of change in language production over time. The points of focus with which I began this research study early in the 2004–2005 school year are presented below in question form. In them, the term *learners* is applied to the case study participants.

1. In videoconferencing lessons that are taught by the FLES teacher in the research site, what instances of interaction and output are observed?
2. In videoconferencing lessons that are taught by the FLES teacher in the remote site, what instances of interaction and output are observed?
3. In video-based lessons and in activities that are facilitated by the classroom teacher, what instances of interaction and output are observed?
4. Are patterns of change observed in learners' language production during the period under study?

When I returned to Dolphin Point Elementary early in the 2004–2005 school year, I learned that team teaching during videoconferencing sessions had replaced the alternation of teaching responsibilities between the FLES teacher in the research site and the FLES teacher in the remote site that I had observed the year before, thus making the first two points of focus untenable. However, I maintained an interest in instances of interaction and output in different instructional settings.

The first Spanish instructional settings that I was able to distinguish in August and September 2004 were *Español para ti* video lessons and associated activities facilitated by Mr. Baxter (the classroom teacher of my participants), Spanish instructional sessions taught by Mrs. Ford (Dolphin Point’s FLES teacher) without videoconferencing, and videoconferencing sessions taught by both Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten (the FLES teacher at Greenwood Park Elementary). As time went by, I also observed cooking sessions, Spanish plays, a modified jeopardy game, supplementary video lessons, and two videoconferencing sessions for which Mr. Straten assumed sole teaching responsibility. I decided to group the settings together in replacing my first three points of focus, not only for the sake of brevity but also to reflect the process through which I observed my participants in the different settings and came to realize that verbal output on the part of individual students was not encouraged in all of them. Thus, I stated the new point of focus in this way:

- What instances of interaction and output are observed in the different instructional settings?

I maintained an interest in patterns of change in the language production of my case study participants over time and felt that my original fourth point of focus was worth retaining:

- Are patterns of change observed in learners' language production during the period under study?

A careful consideration of the oral Spanish output of my case study participants and of possible patterns of change in their language production over time revealed notable differences among the participants. My growing interest in the reasons for the differences led me to explore the following point of focus:

- What individual learner factors help to explain differences in the participants’ Spanish output?

In reporting my findings on this point of focus, I devoted a separate section to each participant. However, I chose to bring together in one section the participants’ preferences and perceptions in regard to different aspects of the FLETT program, because I felt that the patterns of preferences that could be discerned in this way were important and could further an understanding of the FLETT program and not just of the individual participants. In exploring this area, I relied on the following point of focus:

- What are the participants’ preferences and perceptions concerning different aspects of the Spanish program?
In order to clearly present the points of focus on which this dissertation is based, I list them together here:

1. What instances of interaction and output are observed in the different instructional settings?
2. Are patterns of change observed in learners' language production during the period under study?
3. What individual learner factors help to explain differences in the participants' Spanish output?
4. What are the participants' preferences and perceptions concerning different aspects of the Spanish program?

I summarize my findings in regard to these points of focus below.

**Summary of the Findings**

As I addressed the first point of focus (What instances of interaction and output are observed in the different instructional settings?), I learned that the participants differed among themselves in the amount of oral Spanish output each produced and that individual participants showed differences in productivity in the different instructional settings. The basic measure that I used to gauge output was an **utterance**, which I defined as anything said in Spanish that ranged from a word to a sentence in length.

During the 7 months of this study, Brittany produced 31 utterances, Claire 45, Ciara 83, and Edward 309. In arriving at these totals, I only considered individual utterances, not participation in group responses, except in a limited number of cases where the timing or volume of an individual’s utterance was different enough from those of the group to make the utterance stand out.

Because the participants varied in the amount of time they were present for Spanish classes, I calculated the average number of minutes between their utterances; for Brittany this was 39 minutes, for Claire 23, for Ciara 17 and for Edward 4.

The average number of minutes between Spanish utterances was also calculated for each participant in each of the instructional settings. Claire and Edward were very productive in the Spanish jeopardy game before the Thanksgiving Break (with an average of 2 and 3 minutes between their utterances, respectively). Brittany and Ciara did not produce any utterances in this setting. Equaling Edward’s productivity in the jeopardy game was his productivity in Spanish instructional sessions facilitated by Mrs. Ford and in videoconferencing sessions led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten. Next in decreasing order of productivity for Edward were the **Español para ti** video lessons and the activities that Mr. Baxter facilitated after them (with 5 minutes between his utterances in both). In fact, the participants were most similar in their productivity in these postvideo activities. (There were 6 minutes between Ciara’s utterances in this setting and 7 minutes between Claire’s and Brittany’s.) Unlike Edward, the other participants were much more productive of Spanish utterances in Spanish instructional sessions led by Mrs. Ford than in videoconferencing sessions led by Mrs. Ford and Mr. Straten (Claire: 16 versus
48 minutes between her utterances; Brittany: 24 versus 84; Ciara 8 versus 33). Caution should be exercised in interpreting the results for the two videoconferencing sessions led by Mr. Straten (Claire: not present; Brittany: 22 minutes between utterances; Ciara: 15; Edward 9) because of the small amount of time they involved. Claire did not produce any utterances during *Español para ti* videos, and Brittany did not produce any during cooking sessions. The other participants varied in their productivity in these two settings.

Most of the Spanish utterances of the participants were three words in length or shorter. The participants’ linguistic errors involved mispronunciations and incorrect lexical selections for the most part. The small number of grammatical errors coincides with the lack of complexity of most utterances.

I classified the utterances of the participants according to the type of vocabulary on which they were based. The names of numbers in Spanish were the basis for the highest number of utterances (97) from any one category of vocabulary. Geography vocabulary was the basis for the next highest number of utterances (55), followed by the vocabulary categories Date & calendar (42), Action word (34), and Greeting (32).

I also looked at the types of activities in which utterances were produced. Edward and Ciara not only produced more utterances than Claire and Brittany, they also produced them during more types of activities. All four students produced utterances in the calendar segment of lessons and in number and line-up activities. Edward, Ciara, and Claire, produced utterances in question-and-answer activities and concentration and baseball games. During *Español para ti* videos, Edward, Ciara, and Brittany practiced time telling and practiced action words.

Instances of interactions in which the participants were involved in Spanish lessons were considered, and excerpts of some of these were given in order to help place the participants’ utterances in context.

The detailed study of the participants’ utterances helped me to address the second point of focus: “Are patterns of change observed in learners' language production during the period under study?” I was unable to discern any patterns of change in the language used by Claire and Brittany, partly owing to the small number of utterances that they produced. Ciara showed evidence of learning the Spanish names of capitals and countries as time went by. I also noted growth in his use of Spanish greetings, which occurred toward the end of the school year.

Edward was the student in whom I saw the most growth in Spanish. At the beginning of the school year (before his selection as a participant), his friend Willie took an active part in Spanish classes, while he remained fairly quiet. When he did respond to video prompts, I noticed various things that he hadn’t yet mastered, but he was willing to make mistakes in the process of learning. By the end of the school year, Edward was able to take an active part in lessons, and he used Spanish to communicate.

In looking for patterns of change in the participants’ language production, I also calculated the average number of minutes between the utterances of each
of them in each month from October 2004 through April 2005. The participants varied in their production of individual Spanish utterances from month to month but did not show consistent patterns. One thing I noted was that the last individual utterance that Brittany produced occurred in March.

Before summarizing the findings associated with the third point of focus (about learner factors), I would like to repeat Met and Rhodes’ (1990) statement that it is important to ensure that “all students regardless of learning style, achievement level, race/ethnic origin, socioeconomic status, home language or future academic goals” be given the opportunity to “begin language learning early” (p. 438). I do this because of the differences in learning style, achievement level, race, and socioeconomic status that existed among my participants.

The third point of focus was: “What individual learner factors help to explain differences in the participants’ Spanish output?” In summarizing the findings associated with this point of focus, I will write about each participant separately, beginning with Claire.

Claire Montgomery was a small, White, middle-class girl who was 9 years old when I began observing Mr. Baxter’s class in August 2004. She had been in the Spanish program at Dolphin Point since the second grade. Overall, she produced few Spanish utterances but produced them with a high degree of accuracy. Both in Mr. Baxter’s classroom and in the Tele Café, her attention was very focused during Spanish lessons. She listened attentively and produced good written work on her Saber es poder cards. She spoke quietly and told me that she didn’t always feel like answering questions in Spanish. I got the impression in Claire’s interviews that her attitude toward Spanish was somewhat ambivalent. She told me that she and her friends didn’t try to speak Spanish with each other in school, and there were only a few isolated occasions on which I heard her say anything in Spanish to them. Her mother told me that Claire practiced Spanish with her sister, who had been in the Spanish program at Dolphin Point before going on to middle school. Claire didn’t seem to remember such practice when I asked her about it.

Although Claire expressed concern to me about being laughed at if she were wrong, she sometimes took on a leadership role and became a spokesperson for her peers. I found that she could express herself well. She was a high academic achiever and at the end of second grade had shown the majority of the characteristics of a gifted child.

Brittany Johnson was a large Black girl who was 10 years old when I began observing Mr. Baxter’s class in August 2004. She was economically disadvantaged and participated in the federal meal program. She had been studying Spanish at Dolphin Point since the second grade. Although Brittany took part in songs and group responses during Spanish lessons, as did all of my participants, she produced fewer Spanish utterances as an individual than any other participant. She exhibited extroverted behavior in informal settings but tended to remain quiet in certain situations, such as interviews and competitive games. Mr. Baxter described her as academically
challenged but said that she loved school and worked hard. She had been considered for retention in the third grade and again in the fourth but was not retained in either grade.

Brittany told me that Spanish was her favorite class. She showed interest in learning the language and said that sometimes she taught her mother how to say things in Spanish. During Español para ti lessons, she usually watched the video and wrote on her Saber es poder card. She sometimes responded orally and physically to prompts and music on the videos, answering, singing, and moving her shoulders around. She was more likely to produce Spanish utterances in instructional sessions led by Mrs. Ford than in videoconferencing sessions.

Ciara Nivea was a tall, thin Black boy who was 11 years old when I began observing Mr. Baxter's class in August 2004. He was economically disadvantaged and participated in the federal meal program. Like Claire and Brittany, he was in his fourth year of Spanish while this study was being conducted.

Ciara had a hard time focusing, and sometimes his attention would shift back and forth between a lesson and other people and things. He was academically challenged and had been retained in the third grade. In January of the year of his third-grade repetition, it was recommended that he begin to attend an Exceptional Student Education (ESE) class in reading, as well as one for speech and language therapy, and that he continue to attend them through the first half of the following school year (Cumulative folder, 1/31/03).

Although Ciara talked about being nervous in Spanish lessons, he actively participated, producing 83 Spanish utterances, more than twice as many as Brittany. A higher percentage of Ciara's utterances involved linguistic errors than did the utterances of the other participants, partly owing to the fact that he sometimes used English pronunciation for Spanish words. However, it was also true that sometimes his performance exceeded others' expectations for him.

Ciara often demonstrated an interest in different places. He told me that "Spanish countries" had helped him to accomplish as much as he had in Spanish (Interview, 5/2/05). Capitalizing on his interest in geography, his strong musical inclinations, and his eagerness to participate, he was able to take an active part in Spanish classes, and he showed evidence of growth in Spanish.

Edward Jones, a small Black boy with an engaging smile, was 10 years old when I began observing Mr. Baxter's class in August 2004. He was economically disadvantaged and participated in the federal meal program. He began learning Spanish when he entered Dolphin Point at the beginning of the fourth grade.

Edward produced far more oral Spanish utterances (309) than the other participants. When I asked him how he thought he compared with other students in the amount of Spanish he'd learned, he said, "I think other students don't like it as much as I do" (Interview, 5/2/05). Edward and his friend Willie practiced Spanish together, and outside of school he practiced Spanish with a cousin who was taking Spanish in the seventh grade.
Edward had a special relationship with Mrs. Ford, who encouraged his growth in Spanish. He used the language to communicate and enjoyed learning new words and sharing them with his friends. He enjoyed competing, and he was willing to take risks in his language learning.

My final point of focus was “What are the participants’ preferences and perceptions concerning different aspects of the Spanish program?” I collected data to address this question through interviews. In these, I learned that all of my participants preferred receiving Spanish instruction in the Tele Café to watching the Spanish videotapes. *Muzzy* was the video series that was usually chosen as the favorite when a preference was expressed. When the four students were directly questioned about whether they preferred being taught through videoconferencing or being taught by Mrs. Ford without videoconferencing, they all indicated that they liked the latter better. However, all of them had at least some interest in the students in the class with whom they had videoconferencing sessions. This interest was expressed in terms of saying things to the other students, if given the chance; listening to them; or simply competing with them.

*Themes and Their Relation to the Points of Focus*

In Chapter 7, I identified three themes that emerged during the course of this research. These themes are (a) the importance of the on-site Spanish teacher, (b) contributions of the video lessons, and (c) limitations in interaction and output. In this section, I will discuss how the points of focus relate to these themes.

Evidence of the importance of Mrs. Ford, Dolphin Point’s on-site Spanish teacher, to the school’s FLETT program comes from various sources. This theme is substantiated by findings on the preferences and perceptions of the participants, the fourth point of focus. Consideration of the first point of focus revealed the pattern of the participants’ Spanish output in different instructional settings, which also points to this theme.

Perhaps the strongest evidence for the importance of the on-site teacher is provided by the circumstance that necessitated the alteration of the original points of focus. This was the adoption of team teaching for videoconferencing sessions, which took the place of the weekly alternation of teaching responsibilities between Spanish teachers at different schools. Mrs. Ford’s idea of taking “baby steps” with teachers who were new to the school was perhaps encouraged by a teacher survey in which videoconferencing with the coordinator (Mrs. Ford) present received much higher effectiveness ratings than videoconferencing without a coordinator present at both sites.

The case study participants voiced their preference for Spanish in the Tele Café over watching the Spanish videotapes. They also said they preferred being taught by Mrs. Ford without videoconferencing to being taught through videoconferencing. The latter preference was reflected in the pattern of the participants’ oral Spanish output. Claire, Brittany, and Ciara were much more productive in Spanish instructional sessions taught by Mrs. Ford without videoconferencing than in videoconferencing sessions led by both Mrs. Ford and
Mr. Straten. Edward was equally productive in both types of instructional setting but was less productive in the videoconferencing sessions led by Mr. Straten.

Evidence for the contribution of the video lessons, the second theme, again comes from both the fourth and first points of focus. Although the participants expressed a preference for Spanish in the Tele Café to watching the Spanish videos, some of their comments indicated that they learned things from the videos that were reinforced in Spanish lessons in the Tele Café.

The participants also told me the ways in which Mr. Baxter helped them learn Spanish. All of them mentioned the way in which he helped them learn numbers. During the postvideo activities that Mr. Baxter facilitated, the participants were all fairly productive of Spanish utterances as individuals.

Evidence for the third theme, limitations in interaction and output, is primarily provided by the first point of focus (about interaction and output). The discussion is framed in terms of the influence of Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) on the Spanish program at Dolphin Point. This discussion is supported by evidence from the fourth point of focus (about preferences and perceptions).

The emphasis of the Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) on comprehending input prompted an examination of the participants’ perceptions on how well they could comprehend in different settings. The participants told me that they did not always understand the Spanish input but that Mrs. Ford helped them through showing them what she meant during the Spanish-only portion of lessons or through telling them what she meant in English afterwards. Ciara complained about not being able to understand in many settings. Difficulties in understanding the videos and in understanding during videoconferencing were voiced by different participants.

Based on the instances of interaction and output that I observed in the course of this study, I found that students at Dolphin Point rarely interacted in Spanish with the students at Greenwood Park or with each other. The Spanish output of my participants was limited to utterances that were rarely longer than three words in length and were not syntactically complex. Mrs. Ford did not seem to expect their language to progress much beyond this point while they were at Dolphin Point, limiting her expectations to the early stages of language development described in the Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). She did not push her students to produce Spanish output, not wanting to raise their affective filters, another Natural Approach concept.

The thick descriptions that have been offered in this dissertation, along with the grounding of its conclusions in the data of the study, provide a basis for extension of its findings, where appropriate. Whereas it is not appropriate to offer generalizations based on qualitative research findings, the applicability of findings to similar situations, or the possibility of extending them, is both appropriate and desirable. As McMillan and Schumacher note (2001, p. 414), the extension of findings “enables others to understand similar situations and apply these findings in subsequent research or practical situations.” Each new situation must be thoroughly examined on an individual basis to ascertain if it is
similar enough to the original situation that was studied to justify the extension of findings.

Discussion

In this section, I will first offer some general reflections on the findings of this study. Next I will relate the latter to theories of input, interaction, and output that were covered in the review of literature. Additional connections will be made to studies of video-based language programs and videoconferencing. After some recommendations for further research, I will conclude with a few further reflections.

What I learned about the FLETT program at Dolphin Point disappointed me in some ways. The use of team teaching in videoconferencing may take advantage of the strengths of two teachers, but it cannot be justified financially. Considered from a financial point of view, the change to team teaching seemed a step backward instead of forward in the fourth year of the program’s implementation. It made sense, however, in view of the preferences of classroom teachers and of students for Mrs. Ford to teach without videoconferencing or at least to be present in the Tele Café during videoconferencing.

I was also somewhat disappointed that the participants’ abilities to express themselves in Spanish hadn’t progressed farther. None produced syntactically complex speech, using one to three word utterances and occasionally a slightly longer chunk of speech. I was unable to discern patterns of change in the language production of Claire or Brittany, but I could see growth in Edward’s language production over time. I also saw growth in Ciara’s language production, this growth being more pronounced at the end of the school year. I wondered what other changes I might have seen in the participants’ language if the school year had lasted longer.

In considering the participants’ language in relation to the Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1985), it is always possible to say that the reason they had not progressed farther was that the input to which they were exposed was not comprehensible enough. However, they said that they had grown in comprehension over time, and Ciara, who complained the most about not understanding, was able to comprehend a question like “¿Cuál es el país que está directamente al sur de México?” [What country is directly to the south of Mexico?] (Field notes, 4/28/05).

It is also possible to consider the participants’ language in relation to the Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996). Here I would observe that although there were instances of negotiation for meaning between Mrs. Ford and the participants, on many occasions she gave students a choice between two alternative answers through asking either/or questions. When students were prompted to produce Spanish on their own, their utterances were usually so brief that the scope for negotiation for meaning was relatively restricted. In keeping with the Interaction Hypothesis, it is certainly possible to say that more negotiation for meaning could have facilitated language acquisition.
The findings of this study may also be interpreted in terms of the Output Hypothesis, in which Swain (1985) argued for comprehensible output as “a necessary mechanism of acquisition independent of the role of comprehensible input” (p. 252). There were limitations in what was expected of the students at Dolphin Point in terms of oral Spanish output. Although there could be other explanations for Edward's growth as a language learner, such as his motivation, I observed that as he used the language, he continued to make progress. However, only in Español para ti lessons did he have much chance or encouragement to practice using verbs, referred to in those lessons as action words.

Not only is it appropriate to consider the findings of this study in relation to theories of input, interaction, and output, but also in relation to prior studies on the use of videos and videoconferencing, as these relate to foreign language education.

In Morris' (2000) study of the implementation of the Elementary Spanish Program of videotapes, classroom teachers' knowledge of and rapport with their own students were found to be advantageous. This was also the case at Dolphin Point, where Mr. Baxter's knowledge of and rapport with his students positively contributed to the implementation of the video-based component of the FLETT program.

It should be observed, however, that the video-based component of the Dolphin Point's FLETT program is not the sole basis of the school's foreign language instruction but is used in conjunction with instruction that involves an on-site Spanish teacher. This is in consonance with the recommendations of the Center for Applied Linguistics (Rhodes & Pufahl, 2003). The contributions of the different program components at Dolphin Point have been described in this dissertation.

Lopes' (1996) study exposed the extent to which instruction contained in the Spanish version of the Elementary Language Fundamentals (ELF) video-based language program was teacher centered. Spanish instruction at Dolphin Point also tended to be teacher centered. In the cases of the Spanish plays and the supplementary video lessons, my participants produced no Spanish utterances as individuals (with the exception of Edward's “uvas” [grapes] during a Muzzy video; field notes, 1/7/05). In other instructional settings, the participants availed themselves of opportunities to produce Spanish utterances as individuals to different extents. The cooking sessions were the one Spanish instructional setting where students were routinely given an opportunity to interact with each other. Their interactions at that time, however, were rarely in Spanish.

Cavanaugh (1998) conducted a meta-analysis of interactive distance education technologies in the K-12 setting. Three foreign language studies (Gray, 1996; R. E. Smith, 1990; Wick, 1997) were included. Their average effect size was –0.801, a large negative effect size. In view of the potential advantages of videoconferencing for foreign language instruction, Cavanaugh recommended further study in this area.
In the research conducted at Dolphin Point, the results associated with videoconferencing in comparison to instruction offered by the Spanish teacher without videoconferencing were also disappointing. Three out of the four participants in this study showed much greater oral production of Spanish as individuals in sessions taught by the Spanish teacher without videoconferencing, and all four participants preferred instruction without videoconferencing.

Baker and his colleagues (1992) conducted an evaluation of different elementary school classes taught through videoconferencing in which a preference for face-to-face instruction was also expressed by the majority of students.

In the previous chapter, I made several specific suggestions for further study. One was for study of the role of input and its comprehension in the Spanish program at Dolphin Point. This area of study could also be pursued in other research settings. In the same way, my suggestion for the study of the occurrence and influence of anxiety in the Spanish program at Dolphin Point could be pursued more broadly. Another area that might be fruitfully investigated in the future involves the relationship of individual learner differences to oral Spanish output and language development.

Returning to my reflections on the research reported in this dissertation, I should state that it is not my desire to leave the impression that my overall feeling toward the Spanish program at Dolphin Point is one of disappointment or disapproval. On the contrary, I was pleased to find that my participants were learning and using Spanish and had a positive attitude toward the language, expressing a desire for further language study. They also displayed a heightened awareness of and interest in Spanish speakers and their culture. I feel that this Spanish program at Dolphin Point provides an opportunity for early language learning to many students who wouldn’t otherwise have one, preparing them for future language learning and broadening their horizons. I say this because Dolphin Point’s student population differs from the “elitist” image associated with foreign language study during much of the last century (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. 265). In October 2004, 72.3% of the students at the school were economically disadvantaged, and 34.7% were Black.

I enjoyed the time I spent at Dolphin Point and gained many insights there. I am grateful to my participants for sharing their early language learning experiences with me and to Mrs. Ford and Mr. Baxter, who welcomed me into their classrooms and facilitated this study.
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Appendices
Appendix. Schedule of My Research at Dolphin Point Elementary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday August 3, 2004</td>
<td>First day of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday August 9, 2004</td>
<td>I met with Lloyd Baxter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday August 12, 2004</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 1. Mrs. Jackson’s class was with Mr. Baxter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday August 16, 2004</td>
<td>I attended a meeting with Dennis Newberry, Lissette Ford, and Joyce Nutta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday August 19, 2004</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday August 20, 2004</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday August 25, 2004</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday September 1, 2004</td>
<td>I went to observe, but no one was in Mr. Baxter’s classroom. I waited from 2:00 to 2:15 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday September 2, 2004</td>
<td>There was no lesson in the Tele Café. Mr. Baxter was doing curriculum writing. The substitute teacher did not send his class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday September 15, 2004</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday September 16, 2004</td>
<td>Mrs. Ford taught a lesson in the Tele Café. There was no videoconferencing; Mr. Straten was sick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday September 22, 2004</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday September 23, 2004</td>
<td>Videoconferencing session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday September 24, 2004</td>
<td>I met with the data preparation clerk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday September 29, 2004</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday September 30, 2004</td>
<td>There was no lesson in the Tele Café. Mrs. Ford was away.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Friday October 1, 2004  Mrs. Ford taught a lesson in the Tele Café at a special time. There was no videoconferencing.

Wednesday October 6, 2004  *Español para ti*, Lesson 12

Thursday October 7, 2004  Videoconferencing session

Monday October 11, 2004  Cooking session

Wednesday October 13, 2004 *Español para ti*, Lesson 13

Thursday October 14, 2004  There was no lesson in the Tele Café. Mrs. Ford was away at a conference.

Tuesday October 19, 2004 *Español para ti*, Lesson 14

Wednesday October 20, 2004 *Español para ti*, Lesson 15

Thursday October 21, 2004  There was no lesson in the Tele Café. Mrs. Ford was away.

Tuesday October 26, 2004 *Español para ti*, Lesson 16

Wednesday October 27, 2004 *Español para ti*, Lesson 17

Thursday October 28, 2004  Fieldtrip to see presentation of *La Familia Cicatriz*

Tuesday November 2, 2004 *Español para ti*, Lesson 18

Thursday November 4, 2004  Videoconferencing session (This was the first time the Chorus students left before the end of the lesson.)

Tuesday November 9, 2004 *Español para ti*, Lesson 20

Wednesday November 10, 2004 *Español para ti*, Lesson 21

Thursday November 11, 2004  Mrs. Ford taught a lesson in the Tele Café. There was no videoconferencing; Mr. Straten was sick.
Appendix (Continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>November 16, 2004</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>November 17, 2004</td>
<td>There was no <em>Español para ti</em> lesson because of the Great American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teach-In.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>November 18, 2004</td>
<td>Videoconferencing session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>November 19, 2004</td>
<td>Spanish Jeopardy game in Mr. Baxter’s classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/20/04 – 11/28/04</td>
<td>Thanksgiving Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>November 30, 2004</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>December 1, 2004</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>December 2, 2004</td>
<td>Videoconferencing session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>December 7, 2004</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 25 (Chorus Road Trip 9:45-1:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>December 8, 2004</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>December 9, 2004</td>
<td>Mrs. Ford taught a lesson in the Tele Café. There was no videoconfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>encing because of a tornado drill at Greenwood Park Elementary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>December 14, 2004</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 27 (Season’s Greetings Program, 7:00 p.m.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>December 15, 2004</td>
<td>Cooking session. Afterwards, I ate lunch with Mr. Baxter’s class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>December 16, 2004</td>
<td>Mrs. Ford taught a lesson in the Tele Café. There was no videoconfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rencing, because something special was happening at Greenwood Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12/17/04 – 1/2/05</td>
<td>Winter Holidays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>January 4, 2005</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Thursday January 6, 2005  Videoconferencing session
Friday January 7, 2005  Muzzy
Tuesday January 11, 2005  Español para ti, Lesson 31
Wednesday January 12, 2005  Español para ti, Lesson 32
Thursday January 13, 2005  Videoconferencing session
Friday January 14, 2005  Muzzy (I came at 9:00 a.m. but had to come back at 2:00 p.m. to see it.)
Tuesday January 18, 2005  Español para ti, Lesson 33
Wednesday January 19, 2005  Español para ti, Lesson 34
Thursday January 20, 2005  Mrs. Ford taught a lesson in the Tele Café. There was no videoconferencing; Mr. Allen’s class was doing a special activity for the presidential inauguration.
Friday January 21, 2005  Muzzy (I came at 9:00 a.m. but had to come back at 2:00 p.m. to see it.) I interviewed Ciara, Edward, Brittany, and Claire.
Wednesday January 26, 2005  Cooking session
Thursday January 27, 2005  Videoconferencing session
Thursday February 3, 2005  Videoconferencing session
Friday February 4, 2005  I came at 9:00 a.m. to see Muzzy, but Mr. Baxter’s class wasn’t seeing it at that time.
Wednesday February 9, 2005  Español para ti, Lesson 39
Thursday February 10, 2005  There was no lesson in the Tele Café. Mrs. Ford was sick.
Friday February 11, 2005  Muzzy
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Wednesday February 16, 2005  *Español para ti*, Lesson 41

Thursday February 17, 2005  I interviewed Mr. Baxter.  Videoconferencing session

Thursday February 24, 2005  Videoconferencing session

Friday February 25, 2005  *Muzzy*

Saturday February 26, 2005  World Languages Field Day

Wednesday March 2, 2005  *Español para ti*, Lesson 44

Thursday March 3, 2005  Videoconferencing session

**3/7/05 – 3/17/05** Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test administered (March 11, 16, 17: make-up testing)

Tuesday March 8, 2005  I interviewed Mrs. Ford.

Thursday March 10, 2005  Cooking session

Wednesday March 16, 2005  I interviewed Mr. Baxter.

Thursday March 17, 2005  Videoconferencing session taught by Mr. Straten

Friday March 18, 2005  I came to see *La Familia Contenta*, but it wasn’t shown.

**3/19/05 – 3/27/05** Spring Holiday

Wednesday March 30, 2005  *Español para ti*, Lesson 47  (Principal’s List Bowling Party 9:00-12:00)

Thursday March 31, 2005  Videoconferencing session taught by Mr. Straten

Friday April 1, 2005  *La Familia Contenta*

Tuesday April 5, 2005  I observed a videoconferencing session that involved fourth-grade classes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>April 6, 2005</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>April 7, 2005</td>
<td>Videoconferencing session (Mr. Baxter’s class and a fourth-grade class were together in the Tele Café.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>April 8, 2005</td>
<td><em>La Familia Contenta</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>April 11, 2005</td>
<td>A Spanish play in honor of Ocean Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>April 14, 2005</td>
<td>Mrs. Ford taught a lesson in the Tele Café. There was no videoconferencing because of a Field Day at Greenwood Park Elementary. (This was the first time Mrs. Ford led a Spanish baseball game.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>April 21, 2005</td>
<td>Cooking session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I interviewed Mrs. Ford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>April 22, 2005</td>
<td>I observed Edward making morning announcements and led Mr. Baxter’s class in a review of Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>April 28, 2005</td>
<td><em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I led Mr. Baxter’s class in a review of Spanish and observed a Spanish baseball game between Mr. Baxter’s class and Mrs. Jackson’s class in the Tele Café.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>April 29, 2005</td>
<td>I attended a Chorus party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>April 30, 2005</td>
<td>I attended the Recycle Regatta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>May 2, 2005</td>
<td>I interviewed Edward, Ciara, Claire, and Brittany. I ate lunch in the teachers’ lounge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>May 4, 2005</td>
<td>Part of <em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 53; <em>Español para ti</em>, Lesson 55. I led Mr. Baxter’s class in a review of Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>May 5, 2005</td>
<td>Cooking session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>May 10, 2005</td>
<td>I gave out Informed Consent forms for interviews for Dr. Nutta’s study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>May 11, 2005</td>
<td>I interviewed David for Dr. Nutta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>May 12, 2005</td>
<td>A Spanish baseball game between Mr. Baxter’s class and Mrs. Jackson’s class. I missed it because of an unannounced change in its time. I interviewed Cassandra and Amanda for Dr. Nutta. I also interviewed Mr. Baxter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>May 17, 2005</td>
<td>Last day of school. Students helped me dramatize a <em>Curious George</em> story. I interviewed Shaquila for Dr. Nutta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>May 19, 2005</td>
<td>Retirement luncheon for Mr. Baxter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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