ABSTRACT

The vision of the New Zealand Curriculum (2007) for young New Zealanders is that they will be creative, energetic and enterprising young people, used to learning in classrooms where they are the centre of teaching and learning, and where they experience engagement and challenge as part of the everyday curriculum. Teachers are expected to conceptualise their teaching as inquiry, based on knowledge of their students in their teaching context. Such inquiry allows the teacher to investigate the results of the teaching learning sequence and to explore the implications for future teaching. This article explores the fit of this paradigm with Learning Languages. Evidence from Teacher Professional Development Languages (TPDL) (2005 – 09) demonstrates that when challenged to rethink teacher and learner roles, and to provide opportunities for their students to initiate meaningful interaction in the target language (TL), teachers can and do challenge and engage their students to be creative, energetic and enterprising in Learning Languages.

INTRODUCTION

Learning Languages in the New Zealand Curriculum places communication at the core of the learning area. Communication is to be achieved through language and cultural knowledge in use, which would mean that at Levels 1 and 2, for example, students would have opportunities to be creative, by using familiar language in new ways, energetic and enterprising by initiating and sustaining conversations, and inquiring into and discussing language and cultural features which they notice in the course of receiving and producing the target language (TL).

While it could be argued that a communicative approach has always been at the core of the various language specific curricula (New Zealand language specific curriculum documents, 1995 – 2003), evidence from classrooms tells a different story: a story of teacher-led lessons where the learning occurs in very small increments. To effect a change towards challenging and engaging students to be creative, energetic and enterprising, especially at beginner language levels, requires new ways of conceptualising (a) teacher and student roles; and (b) pedagogical approaches.

Teacher and student roles

For several years there has been talk about learner-centred approaches in Learning Languages, for example, French in the New Zealand Curriculum, 2002. (p.17) states that "teachers should make sure that interactive learner-centred activities are central to the programme." Chinese in the New Zealand Curriculum, 1995, (p.12) describes the communicative approach as “activity-based, interactive and learner centred..."Learners are expected to become competent communicators in the language, able to convey meaning to others.” In reality, research indicates that, especially at junior levels, languages classrooms are generally teacher-centred places where:

- over two thirds of the classroom talk is done by teachers
- teachers ask all of the questions and learners are mostly restricted to a responding role
- PPP (Present, Practice and Produce) and IRF (teacher Initiates, students Respond, teacher Follows up, generally with praise or a re-cast or correction of the student’s response) are the predominant teaching and learning approaches

- lessons are largely input focused
- text manipulation rather than text construction is the norm
- language teaching takes an incremental skills-building approach based around rote learning of vocabulary and the application of grammatical rules
- the assumption is that learners need to be taught language before they can use it to communicate (Ellis, 1996; Ellis, 2003; Erlam & Sakui, 2006; Gibbs & Holt, 2003).

In summary, these researchers report that students are not so much taking ownership of their language learning, producing unique utterances, initiating conversations, discussing, comparing and making connections between languages, as being led by the teacher to absorb and reproduce a pre-determined set of structures and vocabulary. Furthermore, when the teacher is constantly at the front of the classroom doing all of the talking, there is little opportunity to inquire into what the students could do if they were allowed to take control of their learning.

Pedagogical approaches

The language specific curriculum documents for Learning Languages (1995 – 2003) advocated a communicative language teaching approach. This was described as an approach which involves (among other factors) developing fluency as well as accuracy, while students are “actively engaged in the language, that is when they are taking part in activities that involve listening, speaking, reading and writing about subjects that they find genuinely interesting and relevant” (French in the New Zealand Curriculum, 2002, p.16).

Some of the characteristics of a communicative approach, listed in SLA literature (Nunan, 1987; Savignon, 1991; Whitley, 1993; In: Mangubhai, Dashwood & Howard, 2000, p.22), are:

- There is an emphasis on language use over language knowledge.
• Attention is given to fluency
• Group and pair work are employed
• Form focused exercises need to be integrated with meaning focused experience
• There is an emphasis on negotiation of meaning
• TL is used as a medium of classroom communication
• The teaching method is learner-centred
• Learners are active and autonomous and are given choices of topic, words and structures to use, ways to present language use
• Learners are encouraged to be risk-takers

The dilemma with a communicative approach for teachers appears to be finding the balance between fluency and accuracy. It would appear to be this dilemma that makes it difficult for teachers to hand over control to students whom they perceive as having not enough language knowledge to communicate accurately or fluently. Mangubhai et al. (2000) reported data about communicative language teaching from six primary school teachers of languages covering a range of teaching contexts. The data were gathered from questionnaires, interviews and video-tapes of lessons that the teachers considered to be examples of best communicative language lessons. The researchers found that while teachers self-reported that they used a communicative approach, their language teaching actions did not support the generally accepted characteristics of a communicative approach as outlined above. Teachers reported a dilemma between maintaining fluency and accuracy and ambivalence about which of the two should be the focus of a lesson. When questioned about this disparity between generally accepted tenets of communicative language teaching and her teaching methods, the teacher of the article title reported that sometimes she just couldn’t help herself, she had to “jump in” and correct students’ pronunciation (p. 24).

Informed by a best evidence synthesis of effective instructed second language acquisition (Ellis, 2005), the year-long Ministry of Education funded Teacher Professional Development in Languages (TPDL) has focused on enabling teachers to provide students with opportunities for meaningful communication in TL through planning and teaching aligned to Learning Languages in the New Zealand Curriculum. Such an approach focuses on engaging learners in interactive tasks to develop “interactional authenticity” through negotiation of meaning. Speakers traditionally negotiate meaning when they are required to solve a problem or complete an engaging task (Bachman, 1990, in Ellis, 2005, p. 5).

Ellis (2005) discusses the need for provision of opportunities for meaningful interaction in the classroom, and suggests a task-based teaching approach as a way to achieve this. Such an approach has been well documented over the last twenty years (Ellis, 2003; Nunan, 1989; Willis, 1996). In essence, task-based language teaching puts meaningful communication as the main goal of language learning. The teacher’s role is to plan and design, or help students design, tasks which require meaningful communication, to provide opportunities for students to produce language (output focus), and to stand back and observe students so as to collect evidence of attainment of the learning outcomes. This evidence then informs future planning and a focus on form.

Learners are assisted in the negotiation of meaning by the provision of formulaic expressions in TL, which can be used as language chunks or formulae to be used in particular contexts, for example, “Could you repeat that, please?”; “I’m sorry, I don’t understand.” “Do you mean ….. or ……..?” Beginner learners are encouraged to use and learn (without analysis) formulaic expressions which under the previous language specific curriculum documents might have been seen to contain structures suitable for learners at more advanced levels. Learners are also encouraged to ask for the TL expressions they would like to use. By using such formulaic expressions and being given opportunities to interact in TL, learners can begin to develop fluency and take ownership of their learning.

METHOD

Evidence for this paper was gathered from transcript data of classroom observations of teachers on TPDL (2005-2009). Refer to Appendix 1 for a description of the TPDL model). The transcripts are taken as part of the In-School Support component of TPDL. Participating teachers are visited four times (Visits 1-4). During these visits verbatim transcripts of teacher and student use of TL (Visits 1&2) and student use of TL (Visits 3 & 4) are taken. The transcripts are taken by trained TPDL In-School Facilitators, and visits are moderated by the TPDL Project Director to ensure consistency. Baseline data are collected at Visit 1, before the TPDL programme has commenced. At this visit a transcript of teacher and student use of TL is taken. Subsequent visits (Visits 2 – 4) have particular foci and scaffolded expectations, especially in terms of TL input, student TL output and the use of tasks to enable meaningful student interaction in TL. Figure 1 (below) shows the observation foci for Visits 1 – 4.
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**Figure 1 - Observation foci for TPDL Visits 1 – 4**
Transcript data are discussed with the teacher and transferred to an Evidence of Principles and Strategies (EPS) sheet. (Refer to Appendix 2). The evidence from the EPS is then summarised and entered on a Progress Summary (Refer to Appendix 3). Teachers are involved in the discussion and analysis of the evidence at each step. Each year an analysis of the Progress Summaries is presented to the Ministry of Education as part of the final Milestone Report for the year. Figure 2 below shows the steps of data collection and analysis.

Data for this paper comprise a generalisation from summaries of the evidence presented in Milestone reports to the Ministry of Education (2005 – 2009), and specific excerpts from three participating teachers in TPDL 2009.

Figure 2: Data collection and reporting process

The specific illustrative transcripts quoted in this paper were taken from excerpts from 2009 transcripts three languages teachers: Teacher G, a generalist Year 8 teacher and an experienced teacher of Spanish; Teacher J, a Year 7 generalist teacher, new to teaching French; and Teacher N, a Year 10 native speaker specialist teacher of German.


FINDINGS

Early data: Teacher-centred lessons and a focus on input

Evidence from the verbatim transcripts at the start of each TPDL (from 2005 to 2009) reinforced the research findings reported above. What seems to come naturally to language teachers in New Zealand are teacher-centred approaches. These first lessons were typically characterized by a dominance of teacher talk and teacher involvement, lack of challenge for students and very little opportunity for real formative assessment, inquiry or reflection on learning. Typically, it was the teacher who got most practice in using the TL: the teacher asked many questions, often repeated students’ utterances and made comments (usually with praise whether or not praise was necessary or justified), presented new language (many times). In addition to those teacher TL utterances, the teacher would also talk about and explain in great detail (usually in English or, if TL, then translate as well – just in case someone didn’t understand) what the students were to do. If students were working individually or in groups, the teacher moved around the class ‘helping’ students, and involving him/herself in what the students had been asked to do. Time for the student-centred work, if it existed, was frequently interrupted or curtailed so that the teacher could re-explain instructions or language features to the whole class.

What follows are excerpts from a transcript from Teacher G’s Visit 2, the first of three visits for which there are scaffolded expectations to support teachers to develop an inquiry approach with a focus on student outcomes. At Visit 2, it is expected that there is evidence of teachers using TL for social goals, classroom management and instruction. This teacher had some knowledge of Spanish, had prior experience in teaching Spanish, and had previously participated in in-service workshops in languages. This excerpt from the start of a lesson is typical of many observed early in TPDL.

(Teacher calls roll, greets, settles students and asks the date: ¿Cuál es la fecha hoy? Students copy numbers in numerals and Spanish into their books.)

Teacher: In Spanish the numbers are grouped together for example: once, veintiocho……

(Teacher gives explanation of task in English. Students write numbers in books).

Teacher: We have some questions working with numbers we use. Can anyone remember some of those questions we use with numbers in Spanish?

(One hand goes up)

Student: ¿Cuál es tu número de teléfono?

Teacher: ¡Muy bien! ¿Cuál es tu número de teléfono? ¿Otra pregunta?

(No hands go up).

Teacher: Otra—other pregunta—question?

(One hand goes up).
Student: ¿Cuántos años tienes?
Teacher: ¡Sí, muy bien! ¿Cuántos años tienes?

(Students are looking through their books).

Teacher: ¿Qué fecha es hoy?
Student (reading from his book): ¿Qué fecha es hoy?

Student (after looking in her book): Diecinueve de agosto.

Teacher: ¡Si! ¡Diecinueve de agosto! ¡Si! ¿La pregunta es..? (Two students’ hands go up).

Student: ¡Cuándo es tu cumpleaños?

(Students write.)

Teacher: ¡Si! ¡Si! ¡Muy bien!, mi cumpleaños es.....I want each of you now to, with the person beside you or behind you, ask the question “¿cuándo es tu cumpleaños? and give the answer – la respuesta – Mi cumpleaños es...

Student 1: (reading from the board and asking the boy opposite her) ¿Cuándo es tu cumpleaños? (He replies and asks her the question.)

Student 1: Mi cumpleaños es......

(The students have said it once each and now chat quietly in English or doodle in their books. Some are copying from the board. The observer can now hear only one student speaking in Spanish and this is the student the teacher is talking with. All students have finished copying and writing now and all are now chatting as the teacher goes from student to student listening and correcting).

There follows the alphabet song and then reading and repeating classroom vocabulary from the ‘¡Si! video’. The teacher hands out plastic bags of cards. The teacher talks for two minutes in English about the task – matching pictures with words. The students are to complete this task in groups of four. Below are excerpts from the transcript of the group work.

Student A: Got a donkey, anyone?
Student B: Who took my cat one?
Student C: What’s this? I need a door.
Student B: Cat, a cat, I really want a cat. Give me the cat, D! Stop it! Who stole my cat?
Student D: I’ve got two pictures.

(At this stage students began to chat about other things.)

(Teacher is now at this group)

Teacher: D: ¿Qué es? ¿Qué es, señora?
Teacher: Las guitarras, ¿Qué son? Student B: Pizarra, la pizarra, el gato, la gato. What’s this? Teacher: (pointing to cards) la oveja, la jarra, el pez, los peces, la puerta, el caballo

(Teacher moves from this group)

Student D: There are two dogs here. There should be two dogs; I’ve only got one dog.

Student A: Is there a la pizarra?
Student B: No, she had it.
Student C: I gave it to him.

(Students begin to chat off task).

This excerpt exemplifies common features of teaching seen at the start of TPDL.

- The teacher asks lots of questions to the whole class.
- The teacher asks routine questions with little meaning or purpose other than to practise the question or provide input. Typically one student answers.
- The teacher repeats what students say and comments, usually with excessive praise.
- The teacher explains the new language to the whole class, regardless of who already understands.
- The teacher talks about the task (“Now what I am going to get you to do is……”) usually in English and this often takes longer than the task itself.
- As soon as the students/groups commence the task, the teacher interferes. It is typical that the teacher again asks questions of the students in order to ensure on-task behaviour or to check they know what they are required to do. Typically the teacher does not stop to observe or give students time to think things through, to make mistakes or even to begin.
- Once the task begins the expressions students really want to use are uttered in English.
- The TL spoken consists mostly of single words (or article plus word).
- Little time is given for the task. Reasons for this are:
  - the pre-task setting up and explanation takes so long that there was not much time left
  - or the task is not sufficiently challenging and therefore does not take very long to complete or the task does not lead on to anything meaningful but is an end in itself.
- The teacher does not take the opportunity to formatively assess the students’ language use. In the above extract, if the teacher had stopped and listened she could have noticed the formulaic expressions that the students were using in English, “Got a donkey, anyone?”

Challenging students to be creative, energetic and enterprising - a focus on output

Critical to enabling students to be productive with their language, sustain conversations and take ownership of their interactions in the TL is a professional planning capability on the part of the teacher and a style of lesson delivery that focuses on removing teacher dominance and increasing student-centred tasks.

In the learning environment of the New Zealand Curriculum, language teachers need to talk less themselves, ‘hold back’, be less dominant. Teacher use of TL can be a way of motivating students to see that they too can use the TL. ‘Holding back’ means letting the students be challenged without continual ‘help’, forcing the students to take risks, make errors, and letting them try to express something that is meaningful to them (which may be different from what the teacher had intended). Five years of experience of working with teachers on the TPDL and data gathered of teacher and student talk over four visits tell us that this shift is one that experienced and inexperienced teachers of languages alike find particularly difficult.

However, evidence collected during lessons in the final school term at the end of the year-long TPDL show that it is
possible for teachers to plan and run lessons in such a way that students are given the opportunity to initiate and sustain unique conversations. Below are two summaries of lesson observations at the beginning and end of TPDL (2009).

**Teacher J, 2009 – baseline data summary and excerpt from endpoint data transcript**

Teacher J is an intermediate school teacher from the 2009 TPDL, teaching French for the first time. She was observed teaching French to her Year 7 homeroom class. At Visit 1, Teacher J’s talk was entirely in English for social goals and classroom management. The new learning (farewells) and the word ‘répétez!’ were the only French words used. (Refer to Appendix 3 for Teacher J’s Progress Summary.)

At the fourth visit, Teacher J used French for all social goals and classroom management; most of her instruction was also in French – using English to explain cultural elements. Her talk did not dominate the lesson. After brainstorming and discussion of prior knowledge, students’ attention was drawn to pre-prepared lists of expressions, conjugated new verb forms, phrases, questions and possible responses taped to the whiteboard for their reference during the subsequent task. In groups of three, the students then prepared and presented original role-plays using some of the new language with previously learnt language. During the presentation of the role plays, Teacher J took note of points that she would highlight/teach/remind the class of at the start of the next lesson – points of form and of intercultural knowledge.

During the lesson (Visit 4), students were heard to utter 29 formulaic expressions in meaningful contexts as well as several phrases, structures and vocabulary items that were new in this lesson. Students took ownership of their interactions, conversing in French during the rehearsal stage about the task as well as composing the role-play and then in the role-play performance to the rest of the class.

Excerpts from student talk while composing the role play follow. Students’ A and B were working in a group of three:

**Student A:** Bonjour. Comment dit-on ‘waiter’ en français? Merci.

**Student B:** Tu l’appelles comment?

**Student A:** (replies).

**Student B:** Pardon?

**Student A:** Comment ça s’écrit?

**Student B:** (gives name).

**Student A:** D’accord! Pardon!

**Student B:** Je voudrais, je voudrais des légumes.

**Student A:** Légumes? Non, non.

**Student B:** C’est (points), oui?

**Student A:** D’accord!

(Student swap roles)

**Student B:** Bonjour.

**Student A:** Bonjour.

**Student B:** Je voudrais, je voudrais qu’est-ce que c’est ‘some’?

**Student A:** des

**Student B:** Je voudrais des escargots.

**Student A:** Et? What else?

**Student B:** le (sic) baguette. Pardon? Comment dit-on, qu’est-ce que c’est: ‘Let’s leave’ en français?

**Student A:** Let’s… sortez.

**Student B:** Like ‘let’s go, or something. Sortez. No, no, like, let’s leave, and then when you go……..we’re like jokers, we’re playing around. Oh.. Allons-y! and then we, like, walk away. I thought of it, which is why we… I’m ordering escargots. Allons-y.

**Teacher N, 2009 – baseline data summary and excerpt from endpoint data transcript**

Teacher N is a specialist teacher of German and was observed with a Year 10 class. Teacher N’s first visit showed she used some German for instructions or social goals, and that students uttered one greeting in German at the beginning of the lesson, and then worked in pairs to practice the greetings (Refer to Appendix 4 for Teacher N’s Progress Summary).

At Visit 4, Teacher N used German for all her talk with students, with the exception of appropriate use of English for discussion of culturally different attitudes to a common question: “’Wie geht’s?’.” Teacher N’s talk did not dominate the lesson; she planned the lesson to incorporate three main tasks which offered students opportunities for sustained meaningful interaction in German related to the learning intentions: say what’s wrong with you and give advice on how to keep fit and well. The tasks comprised a matching task, a reading comprehension task where patients described what was wrong with them, and transfer of information to a table, and preparing and performing a unique role play. Students worked in groups of three. Students conversed meaningfully with each other and with the teacher as appropriate, combining the new language with their rich repertoire of formulaic expressions (56 were heard) while completing the tasks. (Examples of the formulaic expressions can be found in Appendix 5.)

Students rather than the teacher took the lead in many points of the lesson (e.g. marking a quick vocab exercise and calling the roll). Students worked in small groups on tasks which catered for individual differences. Teacher N was free to reflect on student progress and monitor on-task behaviour; she also could assess student learning through their presentation of role-plays, students’ responses to questions and their individual written task at the end of the lesson. Teacher N’s high expectations of on-task behaviour and comprehension and her planning of a lesson which catered for all the principles of effective instructed language learning, resulted in high student engagement and meaningful use of German.

Below is an example of the language used during a matching task. Students were working in groups of four (only two students’ utterances were transcribed).

**Student A:** Ich fange an.

**Student B:** Du kannst anfangen.

**Student A:** Ich fange an.

**Student B:** Du kannst anfangen, yeah. Du kannst anfangen.

**Student A:** OK, du kannst anfangen.

**Student B:** You have to say, Ich tange an.

**Student A:** I did.

**Student A:** OK, ich bin dran.

**Student B:** Right, so they go like this.

**Student A:** Nein, auf deutsch.

**Student B:** Ich habe…..Karten.

**Student A:** OK. Ja. Du bist dran.

**Student B:** Nein, ich weiss das nicht.

**Student A:** Mir geht es sehr gut.

(A latecomer joins the group).

**Student A:** Danke schön.

**Student A:** Ich habe das (sic) Hals

**Student B:** Ach, mein (sic) Halsschmerzen.

**Student A:** Mist.

**Student B:** Nein!

**Student A:** Du bist dran. Halt die Klappe, C.

**Student B:** Die Nase, der Kopf, der Hals. Mein (sic) Nase tut weh.
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Teachers such as J and N were able to achieve creative, energetic and enterprising student use of TL through:

- modelling meaningful use of the TL – using it themselves for social goals, classroom management and instruction
- planning real tasks (where the focus is on communicating something the students want or need to say)
- being clear themselves (and being able to express) what the learning intentions are
- aligning success criteria to the learning intentions
- providing the new learning in terms of language patterns rather than vocabulary
- structuring the lesson so that students are given the opportunity to start a meaningful task early in the lesson
- introducing the task as briefly as possible – e.g. by having instructions in TL on the task sheet; or by modelling the task
- providing their students access to useful formulaic expressions and being continually focused on enabling their students to increase their repertoire of such expressions (such expressions being separate from and /or in addition to the learning intentions)
- reflecting on rather than interfering in what the students are doing, so as to gather real evidence of TL use
- including a logical follow-up to the task, involving productive language and focusing on using the new language that the teacher has highlighted as a result of his/her reflection gathered from observation of the students’ TL use.

CONCLUSION

This paper illustrates effective implementation of the vision and principles of the New Zealand curriculum that students be challenged and engaged to be creative, energetic and enterprise language learners. The evidence presented illustrates that teachers can achieve these aims if they rethink teacher and student roles and language teaching methodologies. If the teacher plans thoroughly he/she can leave the students to engage in tasks which will challenge them to put effort and energy into producing their own language and devising their own ways to report on and present their new language learning. In such lessons the teacher will then be free to investigate the students’ learning and collect evidence of the results of the teaching to inform future planning, based on students’ needs. Such a process fits very well with the Teaching as Inquiry model advocated by the New Zealand Curriculum and with the intent of the NZ Curriculum that the language classroom become learner-rather than teacher-centred.
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APPENDIX 1

DESCRIPTION OF THE TPDL MODEL

The TPDL model encourages and enables teachers to use the target language (TL) in their classrooms (even if they themselves are learners of the language) and to provide ways for their students to use the TL in ever more sophisticated and quantitative ways.

The TPDL model comprises three inter-related foci:

1. Language proficiency improvement: increasing teachers' TL competence and supporting teachers to gain qualifications in that language (ideally, internationally recognised qualifications). Teachers are supported in placement in courses appropriate to their level. In addition, four language group meetings are held per language, to discuss and practise language learning strategies in TL.

2. SLA Pedagogy: deepening teachers' understanding of SLA pedagogy, through requiring all participating teachers to complete a university graduate-level course “Teaching Languages in Schools” (EDPROFST 360, The University of Auckland). This involves 40 hours of face-to-face tuition held in four two-day blocks over the year.

3. In-School Support: supporting teachers to achieve the programme outcomes, with a focus on increased student use of the target language.

Conceptual model of the TPDL

While teachers gain recognised qualifications in the language proficiency and the SLA pedagogy components, it is in the classroom that the teachers demonstrate these gains.

APPENDIX 2

TPDL EVIDENCE OF PRINCIPLES AND STRATEGIES (EPS) FORM
(Headings only – original has spaces under each heading to record evidence from observation visits 2, 3 and 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Principles and Strategies form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher name: __________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence from lesson observations 2, 3 and 4 of teachers demonstrating principles, strategies and resources that are effective in improving student achievement in the target language.

1. **Formal chunks in the TL** that students were heard using:

2. These opportunities and communicative tasks allowed the students to **use the language as a tool for communication**, to initiate interactions (in pairs or groups), find their own words and to **negotiate meaning**:

3. **Target language output.**
   (i) You provided the students with the following opportunities for **sustained** target language output:
   (ii) The **length** of the students’ **utterances** in the TL heard were:
       - single words / short phrases / full clauses / multiple clause sentences / conversations

4. The following Learning Intentions were clear and students were given the opportunity to move on to new learning:
   **Learning Intentions:**
   **New learning involved:**

5. In the following ways you provide **TL input** for your students:
   - Using the TL for classroom management:
     * Entirely TL 5 4 3 2 1 Entirely English*
   - Using the TL for social goals:
     * Entirely TL 5 4 3 2 1 Entirely English*
   - Using TL as the medium of instruction:
     * Entirely TL 5 4 3 2 1 Entirely English*
   - Other sources of TL input during the lesson:
   - Sources of TL input outside of the lesson:

6. In these ways you enabled the students to **focus on form**:

7. In these ways in which you catered for **individual differences**:

8. I noticed these indicators of student intrinsic **motivation**:

9. You were able to **assess student learning (receptive and productive)** in the following ways:

10. In these ways you included an **intercultural dimension** and **fostered an attitude of interest in, understanding**
    of **and respect** for other cultures:

11. In these ways you steered students towards **fluency**, building up their **implicit knowledge** of the language:

12. The following additional factors positively contribute to student learning:

*Statements prepared with reference to Ellis (2005) and Byram (1997).*
APPENDIX 3: SUMMARY OF TEACHER PROGRESS - TEACHER J

Teacher Professional Development in Languages (TPDL) Years 7-10 2009

Visit 1 was fourth lesson; visit 2 16th lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher use of target language</th>
<th>Visit 1</th>
<th>Visit 2</th>
<th>Visit 3</th>
<th>Visit 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher talk entirely in English for social goals &amp; classroom management. For instruction, new language (farewells) &amp; word ‘répétez’ in TL.</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Not expected</td>
<td>Not expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student use of target language</th>
<th>Visit 1</th>
<th>Visit 2</th>
<th>Visit 3</th>
<th>Visit 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single words (greetings and farewells).</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Not expected</td>
<td>Not expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision of opportunities for student interaction in target language</th>
<th>Visit 1</th>
<th>Visit 2</th>
<th>Visit 3</th>
<th>Visit 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students practised greeting and farewell by way of an ‘appointment’ activity.</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Expected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Not expected</td>
<td>Not expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher J learnt French at high school to year 13 and one year through extramural university study. This is her first year teaching French.

Visit 2

Teacher J used French for most of her classroom management, social speak and instructions. Students were heard to utter 16 formulaic expressions in meaningful appropriate contexts in the classroom. The length of the students’ utterances was single words, short phrases and the new simple sentence question and answers (about the weather). A task was designed to promote interactive drilling of the new question and 6 different given answers but because of its design it had limited successful outcomes in terms of student oral output.

Visit 3

Teacher J used French for all social goals and classroom management; most of her instruction was also in French - only using English where there was some doubt as to whether all students had understood. Her French is clear and evidence gathered in the transcript shows that her formulaic language is being copied by students. Teacher J’s talk did not dominate the lesson; the lesson was based around a task which enabled meaningful student to student interaction in French as well as the opportunity to build up implicit knowledge and promote fluency. Students were using more French than in Visit 2; they were initiating conversation as well as reading full paragraphs of French out loud.

Visit 4

Teacher J used French for all social goals and classroom management; most of her instruction was also in French – using English to explain cultural elements. Her talk did not dominate the lesson. After brainstorming and discussion of prior knowledge, students’ attention was drawn to pre-prepared lists of expressions, conjugated new verb forms, phrases, questions and possible responses taped to the whiteboard for their reference during the subsequent task. In groups of three, the students then prepared and presented original role-plays using some of the new language with previously learnt language. During the presentation stage, the teacher took note of points that she would highlight/teach/remind the class of at the start of the next lesson – points of form and of intercultural knowledge.

During the lesson, students were heard to utter 29 formulaic expressions in meaningful contexts as well as several phrases, structures and vocabulary items that were new in this lesson. Students took ownership of their interactions, conversing in French during the rehearsal stage about the task as well as composing the role-play and then in the role-play performance to the rest of the class.
APPENDIX 4: SUMMARY OF TEACHER PROGRESS - TEACHER N

Teacher Professional Development in Languages Years 7-10 2009

Visit 1 was third lesson of year. Some students have prior learning of varying amount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher use of target language</th>
<th>Visit 2</th>
<th>Visit 3</th>
<th>Visit 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher N used some TL</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Not expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student use of target language</th>
<th>Visit 2</th>
<th>Visit 3</th>
<th>Visit 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students use one greeting (at start of lesson). Student TL was determined by teacher.</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Not expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision of opportunities for student interaction in target language</th>
<th>Visit 2</th>
<th>Visit 3</th>
<th>Visit 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students worked in pairs/threes to practice greetings and new language.</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Not expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher N is a native speaker and is teaching German full-time.

Visit 2

The students are using a few formulaic expressions, mainly as single words: Entschuldigung, richtig, falsch, bitte, danke, fertig, bitte schön, nein, ja, mir geht es gut.

The students worked from different worksheets which determined the language to be used. Teacher N used TL for instructions, classroom management and social goals at a level student can understand. Students identified the new vocab and checked it themselves for meaning. Teacher N was available to students by roaming through the classroom and provided support without dominating the lesson. The students worked in groups of three which allows for interaction and repetitions.

Visit 3

10 more formulaic expressions were heard during this lesson. Teacher N encouraged her students towards fluency by placing high expectation of use of extended, yet within reach, German vocabulary. Today’s activities were based on free dialogues using pictures as cues for enriching the sentences and English sentences to transfer into German (but not translate). Formulaic Expressions placemats encouraged interaction in the TL. Teacher N used predominantly German at a comprehension + 1 level. The learning intentions and new learning involved were clear, the focus on form was precise and short (adjectival ending in Dativ). The students were self motivated and accepted the challenge of producing better and longer sentences. At the end of the lesson the students presented their dialogue in front of the class.

Visit 4

Teacher N used German for all her talk with students, with the exception of appropriate use of English for discussion of culturally different attitudes to a common question. Teacher N’s talk did not dominate the lesson; she planned the lesson to incorporate three main activities which offered students opportunities for sustained meaningful interaction in German related to the learning intentions. The students used the new language and their rich repertoire of formulaic expressions was in evidence (56 were heard). Students conversed meaningfully with each other and with the teacher as appropriate. Students rather than the teacher took the lead in many points of the lesson (e.g. marking a quick vocab exercise and calling the roll). Students worked in small groups on tasks which catered for individual differences. Teacher N was free to reflect on student progress and monitor on-task behaviour; she also could assess student learning through their presentation of role-plays, students’ responses to questions and their individual written task at the end of the lesson. Teacher N’s high expectations of on-task behaviour and comprehension and her planning of a lesson which catered for all the principles of effective instructed language learning resulted in high student engagement and meaningful use of German.
**APPENDIX 5:** Example of formulaic expressions heard uttered by students during Teacher N’s lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German Expression</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entschuldigung, ich komme spät</td>
<td>Sorry I’m late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich habe meinen Kuli vergessen</td>
<td>(I forgot my pen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Das ist total super</td>
<td>(That’s really great)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Können Sie mir bitte helfen?</td>
<td>(Could you help me please?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auf Deutsch oder auf Englisch?</td>
<td>(In German or in English?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du blinde Kuh</td>
<td>(You silly moo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du bist gemein</td>
<td>(That’s mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du kannst anfangen</td>
<td>(You can start)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halt die Klappe!</td>
<td>(Shut up!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mist!</td>
<td>(Bother!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich weiss das nicht</td>
<td>(I don’t know)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zehn, neun, acht, sieben…(Counting down while waiting)</td>
<td>(10, 9, 8, 7…).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mein Zahn tut weh (When the student did have a sore tooth)</td>
<td>(My tooth hurts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danke schön</td>
<td>(Thank you)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wie schreibt man das?</td>
<td>(How do you spell/write that?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ich kann es nicht sehen</td>
<td>(I can’t see it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schnell, bitte!</td>
<td>(Fast please)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>