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ABSTRACT

THE TALK'S THE THING: AN ETHNOGRAPHIC STUDY ANALYZING THE CRITICAL REFLECTIVE DIALOGUE OF A COLLABORATIVE CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT TEAM COMPOSED OF A HIGH SCHOOL SPANISH TEACHER, A NATIVE LANGUAGE INFORMANT, AND A RESEARCHER SEPTEMBER 1998

JOYCE L. SZEWCZYN SKI
B.A., WESTFIELD STATE COLLEGE
M.A., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
Ed. D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
Directed by: Professor Jerri Willett

The purpose of this study was to examine the nature of the critical reflective dialogue of a collaborative team composed of a cooperating teacher, a native language informant, and a researcher. The goal of this task-based team was to develop and implement a culture-based thematic unit on Puerto Rico for a second year Spanish class in an American public high school.

The process of group deliberation is described as an interactional experience that involves tension as a normative behavior (McCutcheon 1995, Zacarian, 1996). This study examined the claim that groups comprised of members from diverse cultures and differing professional knowledge systems are more likely to experience tension (Deketelaere & Kelchtermans, 1996; McCutcheon, 1994; Zacarian, 1996). However,
when members are willing to critically and collaboratively examine their tension, it can have positive effects on their communicative process, curricular task, and professional development by allowing members to benefit from the ‘complementary competence’ of the different collaborating professionals (Deketelaere & Kelchtermans, 1996; McCutcheon 1995, Zacarian, 1996). This study also examined the claim that the language used by speakers in groups reflects their ideologies, social relations, and identities that are continually co-constructed during their interactions (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 106).

This study researched these claims by analyzing the critical reflective dialogue that emerged within the planning and implementation phases of a collaborative curriculum development team. The results of this research reveal that the critical reflective dialogue of the collaborative team members influenced a shift in their initial ideologies. The results also reveal that accompanying this shift in ideologies was a realignment of the social relations and identities of the group members. It was found that the NLI contributed to the collaborative curriculum process in significant ways and at multiple levels. Further, the findings suggest that including the NLI in the implementation phase provided communicative opportunities for all parties to engage in a critical reflective dialogue that moved beyond mere technical and practical curricular concerns. In this study it provided collaborative members with increased opportunities to gain a deeper understanding of the complex issues of stereotypes from multiple perspectives. Most significantly, it was seen that engagement in a critical reflective dialogue provided the CT with the opportunity to examine her own assumptions on her own innocence with regard to stereotypes about the culture and people of Puerto Rico.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Background

The teaching of foreign languages\(^1\) (FL) in American public schools has undergone sweeping changes since the 1950s and with these changes have come varying goals for the FL learner. Communicative competence is the goal set forth currently by the National Standards for Foreign Language Learning (1996) and many state curriculum frameworks. These curriculum guides also call for the integration of culture into all aspects of language learning and teaching. Establishing this goal presents many new challenges to FL educators as they participate in the complex task of curriculum reform. Integrating culture into the FL curriculum compels FL teachers to think anew about how they conceptualize culture. Also, it obliges them to reflect critically on the social and political impact of their pedagogical ideologies with regard to their choices on cultural issues in addition to their instructional practices (Kramsch, 1993).

\(^1\)Many terms have been used to describe the teaching of languages other than English in American public schools, e.g., Foreign Languages (FL), Second Languages (SL), Languages Other Than English (LOTEs), and World Languages (WL). For the purposes of this paper, the term Foreign Language (FL) will be used to refer to languages other than English. The selection of the term FL was made in an effort to be consistent with the National Standards. The National Standards uses the term “foreign language” in its title, Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century, since “it is readily understood by all prospective audiences” (p. 19). However, in a continued effort to be in concert with the National Standards, within this paper I also use the terms “second language,” “target language,” and “language” interchangeably to refer to “languages other than English being taught as an academic subject” (p. 19).
Curriculum reform of this magnitude takes time. However, neither time for critical reflection nor participation in research about the process of curriculum deliberation is part of the present institutional ideology for public school teachers (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Zeichner, 1992). Collaborative curriculum deliberation offers intriguing possibilities to this challenge. Its promise lies both in its potential to support teachers as they work through the many complex issues involved in the process of curriculum development and deliberation regarding the integration of culture and to stimulate critical dialogue on these same cultural issues. This study examined the nature of the critical dialogue of a collaborative curriculum development team comprised of a cooperating teacher (CT), a native language informant (NLI), and this researcher as we engaged in the deliberative process of creating a FL curriculum unit on Puerto Rico and in its subsequent classroom implementation.

Statement of Problem

The goal of communicative competence for foreign language education in American public schools inextricably intertwines culture and language (Agar, 1994; Kramsch, 1993; Savignon, 1983). Placing culture at the core of all FL learning poses unique challenges for today's FL teachers in two significant ways. First, it obliges FL educators to expand their conceptualizations of culture. Second, it requires FL teachers to critically examine the broader social and political implications of their pedagogical ideologies regarding cultural issues (Damen, 1987; Kramsch, 1993). As FL teachers are
invited to engage in curricular reforms that reflect the profession’s stated goal, these challenges are necessary and crucial.

Many non-native and native FL teachers claim that opportunities to acquire, sustain or renew cultural contacts are limited (Lorenz & Verdaguer, 1997). This perceived lack of cultural contact opportunities speaks to the frequent insularity of FL teaching even though many schools are located in or near communities where target languages are spoken (Haas & Reardon, 1997; Tedick, & Walker, 1996). In addition, there are few opportunities for FL teachers to engage in thoughtful, critical reflection and examine their daily decisions, collaborate with other professionals, or to engage in a dialogue-over-time with NLIs (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Haas & Reardon, 1997; Tedick & Walker, 1996). I suggest that incorporating a NLI into all phases of FL curriculum development that centers around the integration of culture including the implementation phase can offer intriguing possibilities for FL teachers to cultivate these needed opportunities and help to address the insularity issue of FL teaching.

However, no research on the process of FL collaborative curriculum development and deliberation has been done (Lange & Wieczorek, 1997). Nor has any research been done on a FL collaborative curriculum development team that includes NLIs. Therefore, it seems important to study, by employing the tenets of ethnographic inquiry, how a FL collaborative curriculum development team that includes a NLI encourages thoughtful, critical reflection regarding cultural issues.
Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was multifaceted. First, it is claimed that the goal of communicative competence requires FL teachers to critically examine the broader social and political implications of their pedagogical ideologies regarding cultural issues as they engage in the complex task of curriculum reform (Damen, 1987; Kramsch, 1993). In addition, it is has been argued that there are few opportunities for FL teachers to engage in thoughtful, critical dialogue, examine their daily decisions, collaborate with other professionals, or to engage in a dialogue-over-time with NLIs (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Haas & Reardon, 1997; Tedick & Walker, 1996, Tripp, 1993). A collaborative curriculum development team that includes NLIs offers intriguing possibilities to increase these opportunities. The process of group deliberation is described as an interactional experience that involves tension as a normative behavior (McCutcheon 1995, Zacarian, 1996). Further, it is claimed that groups comprised of culturally diverse members are more likely to experience tension (McCutcheon, 1994; Zacarian, 1996). However, when members are willing to critically and collaboratively examine their tension, it can have positive effects on their communicative process and curricular task (McCutcheon 1995, Zacarian, 1996). Lastly, it is claimed that the language used by speakers in groups reflects their ideologies, identities and social relations that are continually co-constructed during their interactions (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 106). These claims were at the center of this inquiry. First, I explored how ideologies were initially evidenced in the critical dialogue of this speech community. Second, I examined how these initial ideologies were socially re-defined and transformed by this speech
community during the process of collaborative curriculum deliberation. Third, the intent of this study was to inform the FL teaching community about the important connections between the process and product of collaborative curriculum development that includes a NLI.

To these ends, this study involved exploring the collaborative work with a FL educator who is a native speaker of American English, this researcher who is also a native speaker of English, and a native language informant (NLI) who is a native of Puerto Rico and whose native language is Spanish. This collaborative team developed a thematic curriculum unit on Puerto Rico for a second-year high school Spanish class in an American public school.

Significance of the study

Integrating culture into the FL curriculum invites curricular reform which demands that FL educators engage in a critical dialogue about their conceptualizations of culture. In addition, reform of this magnitude also requires practitioners to examine the broader social and political implications of their pedagogical ideologies regarding their choices on cultural issues. As a result, critical dialogue becomes a crucial component in the reform process. An alternative approach to curriculum development and deliberation that includes a NLI seems to be one way to stimulate such a critical dialogue. The optimum environment to study this critical dialogue is one in which a collaborative curriculum development team that includes FL teachers and NLIs is engaged in the deliberation process.
This investigation will add to the knowledge base used to inform the following areas: (a) the FL profession regarding the needed shift in its theoretical conceptualization and practical application of culture in FL teaching, (b) the curriculum development field regarding alternative approaches to curriculum development, (c) university researchers and practitioners regarding the collaboration process in collaborative research designs, and (d) researchers and practitioners interested in exploring the connection between collaborative curriculum development and professional development.

Definition of Terms

Various meanings have been applied to the following terms. To avoid possible confusion, the following definitions are offered to indicate the meanings used in this proposal. The terms and their definitions are listed in alphabetical order.

1. Collaboration

For the purpose of this study, collaboration will be defined as a process of negotiation in which meanings are constructed, contested, and evaluated (Bloome & Willett, 1991).

2. Communicative competence

For the purposes of this dissertation, Savignon's (1983) definition of communicative competence will be used:
Communicative competence may be defined as the ability to function in a truly communicative setting - that is, in a dynamic exchange in which linguistic competence must adapt itself to all informational input, both linguistic and paralinguistic, of one or more interlocutors (p. 8).

3. Critical

For the purpose of this study, the term critical will be used to reflect rethinking and ideological change toward promoting the democratic process in American public schools (Gore, 1993).

4. Culture

Many different meanings have been ascribed to the term culture. For the purpose of this study Geertz’s (1973) definition of culture will be used:

The concept of culture I espouse...is essentially a semiotic one. Believing with Max Weber that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning (p. 5).

5. Curriculum

For the purposes of this study, curriculum will be defined as “what students have opportunities to learn under the auspices of schools: the content that schools offer” (McCutcheon, 1995, p. XV).

6. Deliberation

For the purposes of this research study, McCutcheon’s (1995) definition of deliberation will be used:
[Deliberation] is a decision-making process in which people, individually or in
groups, conceive a problem, create and weigh likely alternative solutions to it,
envision the probable results of each alternative, and select or develop the best
course of action (p. 4).

7. Ideology

The term ideology has historically and situationally varying meanings. For the
purposes of this study, ideology will be defined as "systematically related conceptions
of what is real, what has value, and what is possible, conceptions articulated in
discourses and other forms of practice" (Schecter & Parkhurst, 1993, p. 773).

8. Native language informant (NLI)

For the purpose of this study the term native language informant (NLI) will refer
to a person whose first language is the target language of study and whose ethnic and
cultural background are representative of the target culture of study.

9. Positioning

For the purposes of this study, Davies & Harre’s (1994) definition of positioning
will be used. "Positioning...is the discursive process whereby selves are located in
conversations as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced
story lines" (p. 48).
10. **Stereotype**

For the purpose of this study, the term stereotype will be defined as “a standardized mental picture held in common by members of a group and representing an over-simplified opinion, affective attitude, or uncritical judgement of a person, a race, an issue, or an event” (Merriam-Webster, 1972).

11. **Tension**

For the purpose of this dissertation, the term tension is defined as an individual’s “struggle with what they have to sacrifice of themselves in order to belong to the group” (McCutcheon, 1995, p. 150).
CHAPTER 2
RESEARCH CONTEXT

Introduction

Critically examining the process and outcomes of collaborative curriculum development on integrating culture into the FL curriculum involves research in three literature fields. First, the research context demands an examination of the conceptualization of culture and its role in FL learning. I begin by discussing the need for an expanded conceptualization of culture that moves beyond the functionalist and behaviorist notions and includes an interpretivist view of culture (Geertz, 1973). I also include a discussion about the challenges of integrating culture into the FL curriculum.

In the second section, I call attention to the role critical reflection can play in FL curriculum development and deliberation. This literature forms the framework for the purpose of the proposed study.

The third literature context reviews alternative theories of curriculum development and their potential benefits to FL educators. I outline a curricular development design that incorporates a NLI in the collaborative team. This literature informs the design of the collaborative curriculum development project to be researched in this proposed study. Also included in this section is a discussion of the ideologies that are co-constructed in the interactional discourse of collaborative deliberation and revealed through the language of the participants (Carbaugh, 1996; McCutcheon, 1995; Schiffrin, 1994, 1996).
The Role of Culture in FL Learning

Culture erases the circle around language that people usually draw. You can master grammar and the dictionary, but without culture you won't communicate (Agar, 1994, p. 29).

Current Trends

Interest in the relationship between language and culture in the FL classroom is evidenced in professional literature, conference sessions, professional development workshops, state curriculum frameworks and the National Standards for Foreign Language Learning (1996). This includes two interrelated trends, the reaffirmation of the goal of communicative competence and the need to integrate culture into all aspects of language learning and teaching. A closer look at these two issues helps us to understand the current challenges facing the FL educator.

Communicative Competence

Many language researchers have contributed to the discussion on communicative competence launched by Hymes in the 1970s (Campbell and Wales, 1970; Savignon, 1983; Canale and Swain, 1980; Johnson, 1982; Omaggio Hadley, 1993). Many have centered their discussion on how to define the term. The role of grammatical competence and the negotiative nature of communication have been two principal issues at the heart of these discussions (Omaggio Hadley, 1993).

A model of communicative competence that helps to clarify this concept was formulated by Canale and Swain (1980). They include four components under the overarching category of communicative competence: sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, strategic competence, and grammatical competence. The
sociolinguistic component, in particular, strongly links language and culture by requiring a focus on the communicative nature of language. The steady push for communicative competence as a goal has also shaped a new and expanded definition of language.

Notion of Language: New Perspective

From a sociolinguistic perspective, language is viewed as a process of meaning-making (Loveday, 1982). It is the communicative nature of language that defines it as a dynamic, meaning-making process. Communication has traditionally been defined as a “series of ways of expressing the activities of individual’s internal world vis-a-vis the external world” (Fu, 1996, p. 46). What is being communicated, then, is an individual’s beliefs, attitudes, feelings, and descriptions of events and objects.

More recent notions regard communication as “a recurring, reflexive process in the creation and maintenance of social realities” (Pearce, 1989, p. 18). Thus, language as part of this process is viewed as a means by which individuals construct reality. The communicative revolution and the proficiency movement that has followed in its wake have compelled FL educators to include this perspective and expand their notion of language beyond regarding it merely as a form of communication (Kramsch, 1993; Omaggio Hadley, 1993).

[Both movements] have made clear that languages are learned in a cultural context, that is both the internal and the external context of communication. This context is the matrix in which forms get attached to meanings which are expressed, interpreted and negotiated in communication (Kramsch, 1988b, p. 63).
The following definition captures this extended notion of language:

Language is the symbolic representation of a social reality that enables its users to distance themselves from it and thus to create, shape and change it. This constructed reality is given social truth and validity through the interactional efforts of speakers and hearers, readers and writers who negotiate their own and other's meanings. (Kramsch, 1988a, p. 4).

Looking at language as a social semiotic establishes the link between language and culture and makes language inseparable from culture (Weatherford, 1986). Further, this perception of language defines learning a language as being more like developing communicative competence (Schiffrin, 1996, p. 323). Thus, this link requires FL educators to expand our notion of culture beyond the behaviorist and functionalist perspectives which are the two perspectives most often adopted by FL educators (Robinson, 1985).

**Limitations of behaviorist and functionalist perspectives of culture**

The behaviorist and functionalist approaches have been valuable to the language learner. To their credit, these approaches provide a description of culture and an awareness of why people act the way they do. In the FL classroom, we can 'see' these conceptualizations in action through the use of culture capsules, cultural clusters, culture notes, songs, and slides, to mention a few. All of these strategies help to provide learners with cultural information. Despite this important aspect, however, researchers

---

2A behaviorist approach to culture stresses observable actions and events in a society. The behaviorist's descriptions of society are mainly concerned with observations of behavior or sets of behaviors as opposed to the rules that govern them (Steele & Suozzo, 1994). A functionalist perspective, however, stresses the underlying rules or structures which govern and explain these observable behaviors (Robinson, 1985).
in the fields of linguistic anthropology, FL, and anthropology claim that there are significant limitations in these two notions of culture (Agar, 1994; Allen, 1985; Geertz, 1972; Kramsch, 1988b, 1993; Steele & Suozzo, 1994). An information-centered culture-teaching strategy implies not only that the target culture of study is closed and complete but also that culture itself is a static, containable phenomenon. As a result, these perspectives of culture and their accompanying teaching strategies do not "prepare students to recognize and understand cultural change over time" (Crawford-Lange & Lange, 1984, p. 142).

In addition, recent studies have also pointed to the restrictive nature of these two perspectives (Lan, 1990; Moore, 1991; Sawicki, 1994). When functionalist and behaviorist concepts of culture are at work in the classroom, students are taught about culture and not how to interact with it (Crawford-Lange & Lange, 1984, p. 145). As a result, what is overlooked in these approaches are the aspects of culture that involve interpreting and creating meaning. This has lead some anthropologists to posit that limiting culture to empirical phenomena alone may hamper cultural understanding (Berreman, 1972). Further, an information-only culture-learning strategy may establish and/or reinforce stereotypes, which most FL educators work to diminish (Crawford-Lange & Lange, 1984, p. 145). Thus, defining culture in such a way may be counterproductive and impede rather than aid in working toward the goal of communicative competence.

Although FL classroom practices tend to reflect behaviorist and functionalist notions of culture (Robinson, 1985), I have argued that they are not all that is needed in order to achieve the goal of communicative competence (Berreman, 1972; Crawford-
Lange & Lange, 1984). Educators need to add a conceptualization of culture that looks at the process of the creation of meaning and complements the sociolinguistic notion of language that views language as a meaning making process. An interpretivist definition of culture as posited by Geertz (1973) offers such a perspective.

**Interpretivist perspective of culture**

An interpretivist theory of culture focuses on the shared interpretation of behaviors, events and institutions (Geertz, 1973). According to Geertz, culture is neither behavior nor patterns of behavior per se. He views culture as shared interpretations and the importance ascribed to a particular behavior.

The concept of culture I espouse...is essentially a semiotic one. Believing with Max Weber that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning (p. 5).

For Geertz, culture consists of the webs people create as they interact with one other and co-construct shared meanings. From this interpretivist perspective, cultural inquiry involves the study of particular shared meanings and how those meanings are co-constructed. An observer or learner interprets a target culture based on preconceived notions and perceptions. As such, the target culture is understood through the interpretations that the learner brings to bear on a situation or experience (Geertz, 1973). Therefore, as a result of the interaction, the preconceived notions of all parties are changed to some degree and even the target culture itself is modified:
The observer is transformed in his/her cumulative perceptions of the target culture, which in turn further modify the target culture. Furthermore, informants within the target culture who interact with the observer are also transformed by this interaction as they report about explicit elements of their subjective culture (Moore, 1991, p. 12).

Moreover, in a group situation, interpretation is a collaborative act, where multiple views are held in dynamic tension as participants seek to make sense of meanings (Goodwin & Duranti, 1992). This is a very radical departure from the behaviorist and functionalist approaches to culture.

Implications for FL classroom

If we adopt the perspective that culture is continuously being co-constructed and interpreted by all individuals, I believe that we accept a construct that allows individuals to recognize the importance of their role in the creation of culture and the formation of multiple perspectives and interpretations. Specifically, it allows individuals to reflect on their personal experiences and perspectives with those from the target culture and to synthesize these varying perspectives in order to derive meaning from them. Further, this conceptualization affords FL educators an opportunity to think in new ways not only about culture itself but also about what it means to teach it.

The potential of linking this perspective of culture with communicative approaches to language teaching “may lie in their ability to engage the [teacher and] the learner in the dialectic of meaning production” (Kramsch, 1993, p. 239). In this manner, the learner has a role, an integral role, in making sense of new perspectives and knowledge. The language learner is no longer a passive recipient of static cultural knowledge. Rather, the learner is an active co-participant in the creation of culture.
This creation of culture constitutes an on-going synthesis between the learner’s previous and new perspectives and experiences. This dynamic synthesis removes the monolithic view of culture and brings it to a personal, attainable level. “It is through the opportunities for dialogue and reflection upon dialogic experiences that cross-cultural exchanges have their value” (Kramsch, 1993, p. 26). Further, it connects teacher and student together as cultural explorers on a mutual journey of discovery and reflection and provides the space where more experienced learners (the teachers) and less experienced learners (the students) “can [use] the foreign language not merely as imperfect native speakers, but as speakers in their own right. It is in this development of the foreign language learner as both a social and an individual speaker that we have to see the emergence of culture in the language classroom” (Kramsch, 1993, p. 28).

In summary, I have argued that a dialectic notion of culture together with a sociolinguistic view of language can offer an invaluable contribution to FL educators as they participate in the complex task of curriculum reform. Moreover, this task challenges FL professionals to examine what is meant by the integration of culture into FL learning.

Integration of culture: new challenges

Agar (1994) coined the word "languaculture" to accentuate the point that culture and language are inextricably intertwined. In addition, the National Standards

---

3 The theoretical underpinnings for Agar’s languaculture lie in the famous Sapir-Whorf hypothesis. Briefly, this hypothesis argues that language shapes the world rather than simply reflecting it (Agar, 1994).
for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century (1996)\(^4\) and many state language curriculum guidelines emphasize the integration of culture with the teaching of language skills:

Because language is the primary vehicle for expressing cultural perspectives and for participating in social practices, the study of a language provides opportunities for students to develop insights in a culture that are available in no other way. In reality, then, the true content of the foreign language course is not the grammar and the vocabulary of the language, but the cultures expressed through that language (National Standards, pp. 39-40).

This framework emphasizes the integration of culture with the teaching of language skills (Massachusetts World Languages Framework, p. 24).

The key word is integration. It appears to have been carefully chosen to emphasize the interconnectedness between language and culture. Our use of these two separate words, language and culture, may reflect how the profession has historically separated the two. The term languaculture challenges us to think about the inextricable links between the two:

What I want you to remember...is that whenever you hear the word language or the word culture, you might wonder about the missing half. That's the reason for the clunky term. 'Languaculture' is a reminder...of the necessary connection between its two parts...(Agar, 1994, p. 60).

To integrate culture and thereby teach languaculture, requires that FL educators engage in critical reflection\(^5\) not only on individual experiences, feelings, and

\(^4\)The National Standards were developed by a federally funded task force with the charge of designing content standards for foreign language education, K-12 in American public schools. Their purpose is “to serve as a gauge for excellence as states and local districts carry out their responsibilities for curriculum in schools “ (p.9).

\(^5\)Interest in reflective thinking stretches back to Dewey (1933) and has been revitalized with the more recent publication of Schon’s book The Reflective Practitioner (1983). Studies on reflective thinking range from those that focus on micro aspects of teaching (Cruickshank, 1985) to those that deal with macro interests in the sociopolitical or moral principles of teaching (Liston & Zeichner, 1987; Tom, 1985). The interest in
perceptions but also on pedagogical and instructional choices to include whose culture is taught and legitimized (Crawford-Lange and Lange, 1984; Kramsch, 1993; Lloyd, 1989). The integration of culture is a complex issue. It does not merely mean the presence of cultural information in the curriculum or in daily lesson plans. I suggest that it implies critical reflection on not only the choices FL teachers make but also on the implications of those same choices. The decisions that teachers make help to shape the social realities for their students (Kramsch, 1993). Therefore the importance of the social implications of these decisions speaks to the issue of the need to develop a critical pedagogy (Freire, 1985; Kramsch, 1993; Shor & Freire, 1987). Its purpose goes beyond supplying a ‘one-size-fits-all’ blueprint for classroom practices. It is a revolutionary step that reaches to the essence of what it means to be a language teacher. It asks us to engage in critical reflection and question the conventional underpinnings of the profession and our own pedagogical ideologies. I believe it begs us to examine what we are doing, not just how we are doing it, and encircles the what and how with the question for what purpose?

Critical Reflection in Education

It has been argued that critical reflection is a crucial component in teacher development (Gore & Zeichner, 1991; Hunsaker & Johnston, 1992; Kramsch, 1993; Liston & Zeichner, 1987; O’Loughlin, 1991) and curriculum development (Sears &
Marshall, 1990). Further, findings from studies on teacher reflection suggest that teachers become better at reflection when they are allowed time and encouragement to engage in reflective practice and, as a result, transform their beliefs and/or teaching practices (Beyer, 1984; Bullough, 1989; Hunsaker & Johnston, 1992; Tabachnick & Zeichner, 1984). However, teachers have little preparation in critically reflecting on their assumptions and beliefs and “in listening to themselves” (Kramsch, 1993, p. 245). Moreover, the practice of critical reflection is commonly not part of the present institutional ideology for public school teachers (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Zeichner, 1992). As a result, it is often put aside when attempting to ‘get the job done’.

This poses an interesting dilemma for FL educators who are being asked to participate in the transformational shift of integrating culture into all aspects of FL teaching and learning. I have argued that such a shift demands a critical perspective in order to gain deeper insights into the implications of the pedagogical ideologies regarding cultural issues and requires FL teachers to examine what it means to be a language educator. Further, I propose that the notion of critical reflection in curriculum deliberation be extended to include critical dialogue interaction among collaborators. A critical reflective dialogue performed within the context of collaborative curriculum deliberation has the potential to provide opportunities for involved parties to “challenge and transform existing social and political forms” (Giroux, 1991, p. 47) as well as to question their own routinized ideological practices (Tripp, 1993).
Teaching culture as ideologic practice: critical reflection in FL education

The critical view poses a serious challenge to conventional educational discourse that often centers around technical and practical classroom issues (Burbules & Rice, 1991; Gore & Zeichner, 1991). As it pushes the discourse beyond technical and practical concerns, critical reflection becomes an integral component to personal and professional development. It is particularly significant with FL educators who constantly make choices regarding complex cultural issues. “Introspection and critical self-assessment are essential for the further development of any language teacher” (Kramsch, 1993, p. 245).

Moving the frontiers of educational discourse speaks to the essence of what it means to be a language teacher. This critical discourse invites FL educators to question the broader social and political implications of their choices and the ideological underpinnings that help to frame these same choices (Kramsch, 1993). This is not to say, however, that the critical perspective is separate from the technical or practical classroom-based reality of the FL teacher. Rather “the critical [aspect] is embedded in the very essence of the teacher’s classroom reality (Gore & Zeichner, 1991, p. 125). Since “political issues are not separate from classrooms” (p. 132), the challenge is to explore avenues that help FL teachers forge and develop opportunities “to see the connections between the[ir] classroom and the social and political contexts in which it is embedded”(p. 125). Moreover, defining ideology to include its practice implies that there is no ideology without practice and that “there is no practice without an attendant and informing ideology” (Schecter & Parkhurst, 1993, p. 773).
For example, in their attempts to teach toward an understanding of various perspectives of reality, FL educators frequently find themselves at odds with their own textbooks that often use the target language to promote American values and perspectives (Kramsch, 1988a; Kramsch, 1993). In seeking to respond to ongoing ideological debates in American society, publishers frequently distort the target culture they are attempting to represent. As a result, FL textbooks often fail to help students understand multiple perspectives of reality (Kramsch, 1993). In turn, this failure presents a risk of perpetuating the precise notion that FL educators are attempting to dispel, “that beyond communication what really counts is only one’s own way of life and system of thought” (p. 228). Of equal concern is the fact that this educational cultural ideology “undermines the search for and the negotiation of meaning that form the core of a communicative approach” (p. 228). As a result, critical reflection by FL educators needs to include thinking about the tensions that exist between the American educational ideology and the stated competency goals of the FL profession.

**Conclusion**

As FL teachers are asked “to take up the invitation to address the [S]tandards in their classrooms and in curriculum design, the need for experimentation, reflection, and reform will be great” (Phillips, 1997, p. xiii). Critical reflection and dialogue are crucial to this process. These critical components are the media through which we can examine new, alternative theoretical approaches to curriculum development, and question and restructure our pedagogical ideologies as we work on curricular reform. Further, these
alternative approaches hold special appeal in their potential to help the profession ground new theoretical constructs with the realities of classroom practices.

An examination of alternative curriculum development theories including collaborative curriculum development and deliberation will help us to see their potential benefits for the FL field. However, in order to better understand their unique contributions, we first must take a brief look at the characteristics of the traditional approach to curricular development.

Curriculum Development Theories

Traditional approach to curriculum development

Sears & Marshall (1990) concisely outline features of the “traditional” theoretical approach to curriculum development. They describe this approach as a linear process that reflects a scientific, reductionist, and rational approach (p. 7). Further, they note that with this approach, specialists determine the curricular goals and objectives prior to classroom engagements. The primary responsibility of these curricular specialists is to carefully and efficiently organize material that is to be taught and learned. This work is done prior to classroom implementation and the curricular goals, objectives, and content are precisely determined and organized. Moreover, the content of the curriculum is often in the form of a textbook (p. 7). The teachers are trained in order to effectively and efficiently implement the curriculum. The effectiveness of curricula developed by using this approach is determined by measuring student learning objectively.
What is interesting about this approach is the relegation of the teacher to the role of “conveyor of the curriculum” (p. 8). A “‘conduit’ metaphor” (Deketelaere & Kelchtermans, 1996, p. 71) is also used to describe this relationship between teachers and curriculum development and reform. “Teachers are seen as the ones who ‘pass on’, ‘deliver’ the curriculum, developed by others, to the coming generations” (p. 71). In addition, the students are positioned as passive recipients of the curriculum and as such are expected to learn its contents with little variation. In sharp contrast to this approach, alternative curriculum theorizers offer very different views of curriculum development, the role of the curriculum in educational practices, and the roles of the teacher and the student in this endeavor (Sears & Marshall, 1990).

Alternative theoretical approaches to curriculum development

Three alternative approaches to curriculum development are discussed by Sears & Marshall (1990). One approach personalizes and highlights the student’s reflection on the meaning of the content and learning experience (Sears & Marshall, 1990, p. 10). Theorists who subscribe to this approach have a strong commitment to helping learners become “self-actualizing persons” (p. 10).

A second approach highlights the role of the teacher in the development and implementation phases of the curriculum. Proponents of this approach expect curricula to be tailored to reflect the uniqueness of every group of teachers and students. To that end, they advocate helping teachers to become more skillful curriculum developers.

A third approach focuses on the importance of “the interaction of societal norms, values, and expectations in curriculum and schooling” (p. 11). Grounded in
critical theory, these curricularists are concerned with improving society and human relationships. The goal of the curriculum developed from this perspective is to help foster these transformations. The content for the curriculum is derived from societal issues and problems and the physical world of the students and includes material about what must be done to improve them (p. 11).

As in the second approach, this perspective advocates for a participatory curriculum which includes input from teachers and students who together are deeply involved in experiencing the democratic process in their classrooms (p. 1). "These scholars raise our consciousness about the assumptions we make and the values we hold about curriculum, and the relationship of these to the broader society as it exists now and as it might exist in a more ideal form" (p. 12).

**Benefits of alternative approaches to FL curriculum reform**

Alternative theoretical perspectives on curriculum development contribute significantly to the field of curriculum theory, research, and practice (Sears & Marshall, 1990). They extend our thinking about the deliberative process involved in curriculum development, including FL curriculum. They propose intriguing ways to grapple with the complexities of reform by viewing curriculum as a resource rather than a prescription (Donmoyer, 1990). This distinctive perspective has profound implications for FL educators embarking on the task of dramatic and challenging curricular reforms regarding the integration of culture. I believe that viewing curriculum as an evolving, organic resource has great potential to help us in our quest for unique solutions to the
complex issues that we are facing. One alternative approach that holds particular appeal is collaborative curriculum development and deliberation.

Curriculum development and deliberation as a collaborative endeavor

A major tenet of collaborative or group deliberation is that collaborative deliberators develop a social construction of their reality "through a quest for intersubjective agreement" (McCutcheon, 1995, p. 147). Although the processes in collaborative deliberation are similar to those in solo deliberation, collaborative deliberators socially construct their knowledge "through group processes while developing a curriculum" (p. 149). An important factor in the social construction of knowledge is the on-going negotiation of meaning by all participants.

Further, in collaborative group settings, the process in completing a task becomes an integral component in the final product, with the interaction between product and process being dynamic, and ongoing (Cohen, 1994; McCutcheon, 1995; Zacarian, 1996).

When groups deliberate to develop a curriculum, they actually create both a text and a subtext. The text is the curriculum they are developing, and the subtext is the set of agreed-upon norms and social rules for proceeding. The text and subtext are highly interrelated, as they influence each other greatly (McCutcheon, 1995, p. 48).

A significant benefit gleaned from this dialogic process between text and subtext is the generation of more alternatives and the development of more creative solutions to curricular problems (Thorndike, 1938). However, I suggest that this approach has more to offer. First, in addition to tendering technical solutions to curricular problems, I believe that a collaborative approach can help forge opportunities for educators to
engage in a critical reflective dialogue about the broader social and political implications of their pedagogical ideologies. For FL educators, the dialogic process between text and subtext offers multiple opportunities to critically examine how they are defining culture and what the broader implications are about their decisions regarding culture. Second, the critical dialogue within the context of a collaborative approach to curriculum development may offer support for FL teachers as they engage in the complex task of integrating culture into their curriculum. In addition, for FL educators, I propose expanding the collaborative group to include a NLI into this critical discourse. In the following section, I discuss a collaborative curriculum development design that includes a NLI. In this discussion, I offer that a collaborative curriculum development group that includes a NLI can provide FL teachers with rich opportunities to develop not only a curriculum that integrates culture but also to engage in an intercultural co-construction of knowledge that may render cultural insights to all participants that are uniquely available through the critical discourse in the deliberative process.

A new design in FL curriculum development and deliberation

I propose a FL curricular development design that includes a NLI directly into all phases of the curriculum development process, including the implementation phase. This prolonged involvement might provide communicative opportunities for all parties to engage in a critical reflective dialogue that moves beyond mere technical and practical curricular concerns.
Employing critical reflection as the medium through which all phases of collaborative curriculum development are cultivated would give to the process an added depth. This dimension coupled with prolonged engagement may afford opportunities for members to engage in a critical "dialogue across differences" (Burbules & Rice, 1991). As the critical dialogue participants co-explore cultural differences and similarities, their dialogue can serve as "a means of entering another person's frame of reference and developing cultural and social awareness" (Kramsch, 1993, p. 244). Further, their dialogue "can proceed in a manner that aims toward careful, respectful, non-dominating agreement" (Burbules & Rice, 1991, p. 40). Moreover, when consensus may not be achievable, the critical dialogue can serve as means "...toward understanding, tolerance, and respect across difference" (p. 408).

This design is a dialogic one, in which the process of the development of the curriculum plays an integral role in its own product (McCutcheon, 1995). The process and product interact with each other as the NLI and teacher (as well as other participants) co-construct new knowledge not only about the teaching of culture but also about their personal selves and each other. As critical or "reflective moments" arise (Feinberg, 1989), they become opportunities for deeper self-understanding and a release from the common sense assumptions that typically frame our daily existence. This does not require embracing the other standpoint or letting it supersede our own, but it does stress the value of incorporating that perspective into a more complex and multifaceted framework of understanding (Burbules & Rice, 1991).

This is a multidimensional approach that holds intriguing possibilities for FL educators. What it offers is more than learning about culture and how to teach it per se. This approach to curriculum development and deliberation transforms the process from
being one that concerns itself primarily with technical aspects of curricular issues to becoming one that also includes learning how to engage in an intercultural construction of reality - how to become sensitive to other ways of looking at the world. While engaging in this approach, the teacher is modeling and apprenticing (Freire, 1985) the intercultural communicative competence that she is attempting to achieve with her students. This collaborative approach positions the teacher as a cultural learner within the process of curriculum development. As a result, the task and the process intimately influence each other. In this manner, culture is not conceptualized as static pieces of information. Through the process of collaborative deliberation with NLIs, culture becomes what is created among the participants (Geertz, 1973) as they negotiate meanings while working to complete the curricular task.

The co-construction of meaning in FL collaborative curriculum deliberation

As NLIs and FL teachers involved in curriculum deliberations interpret cultural issues, they are also involved in the co-construction and interpretation of new meanings and knowledge (McCutcheon, 1995). These new meanings are more likely to be realized, extended or contested when they are co-constructed within the medium of critical reflection. As this process unfolds, all participants are transformed in some way.

To be a recipient of a communication is to have an enlarged and changed experience. Nor is the one who communicates left unaffected. Try the experiment of communicating, with fullness and accuracy, some experience to another, especially if it be somewhat complicated, and you will find your own attitude toward your experience changing.... The experience has to be formulated in order to be communicated. To formulate requires getting outside of it, seeing it as another would see it.... One has to assimilate, imaginatively, something of another's experience in order to tell him intelligently of one's own experience (Dewey, 1916, p. 5).
Participants involved in collaborative deliberations bring to the group process their own identity and cultural belief system. Embedded in these individual identities and belief systems are their individual views, assumptions and experiences of the world around them (Jeannot, 1994; Zacarian, 1996). Despite each person’s unique identity and belief system, group members are gathered to work collaboratively toward completing a common task.

Moreover, groups comprised of culturally diverse members are more likely to hold differing views and perceptions and therefore are more likely to experience conflict and tension (McCutcheon, 1994; Zacarian, 1996). This implies that conflict and tension are more likely to occur in a FL collaborative deliberation group that includes a NLI. For example, tensions may emerge between the NLI’s taken-for-granted view of his/her own culture and the non-natives’, static, stereotypic view. These multiple views are held in dynamic tension which arises out of the interactions as participants recontextualize their taken-for-granted or static views (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992). Therefore, these dynamic tensions hold a strong potential to stimulate a critical reflective “dialogue across difference[s]” (Burbules & Rice, 1991) in order to assist group members in increasing their understanding and respect for differences while being involved in their quest for innovative solutions to complex curricular issues.

Further, as participants engage in this interactive process of making meaning, their preconceived notions are recontextualized and placed in a new set of relationships and expectations (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992). Part of this process is the building and re-building of participants’ ideologies, social relations, and identities.
Ideologies, social relations and identities revealed through language

All speakers are members of social and cultural groups (Carbaugh, 1996; Schiffrin, 1994; Schiffrin, 1996). Moreover, the language used by speakers in groups reflects the ideologies, social relations, and identities that are continually co-constructed during their interactions (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 106). Language, therefore, is a resource that provides a contextual frame with which to examine the development and transformation of these ideologies as they occur throughout the interactive process. Therefore, built into the fabric of social interaction is the continual redefining or maintaining of ourselves and others. "...what we are (or believe ourselves to be) is a product not only of social processes that operate at the level of social institutions...but of social processes that are embedded in the situations, occasions, encounters, and rituals of everyday life" (Schiffrin, 1996, p. 308). Moreover, all language use is ideological in nature and thereby serves as "both an assessment and expression of [one’s] ideology" (Gee, 1990, p. 131).

Positioning is a conversational phenomenon which influences the social meaning of what is being said by participants in a speech community (Davies & Harre, 1994). Its focus is on the way in which discursive practices constitute members of a speech community in certain ways and at the same time is a source through which members can negotiate new positions (Davies & Harre, 1994). Positioning can be either interactive, "in which what one person says positions another" or reflexive, "in which one positions oneself" (p. 48). Examining the interactive and reflexive positioning moves that occur within the process of social interaction of a speech community can serve as a window through which we may view the ways interlocutors progressively and
dynamically reassess and transform their ideologies, social relations, and identities over time (Carbaugh, 1996; Davies & Harre, 1994).

Critical dialogue plays a pivotal role in the continual realignment of ideologies of participants that is likely to occur in collaborative curriculum development teams that includes NLIs. Carefully analyzing this dialogue would provide a rich opportunity to gain insights into (a) how ideologies, social relations, and identities are evidenced by participants engaged in the deliberation process; (b) how the initial ideologies, social relations, and identities are redefined by this speech community during the process of curriculum development and deliberation, and (c) how these transformations are related to the process and product of this speech community.

The role of the NLI in FL curriculum development and deliberation

Including NLIs in all phases of curricular development and its implementation affords FL teachers with opportunities not only for obtaining an insider’s perspective on cultural issues but also for negotiating their meanings. This is significant because while many teachers spend time abroad, their cross-cultural contacts provide no guarantee that they produce much cultural learning (Damen, 1987). Further, many non-native and native FL teachers claim that when travel to a country is not possible, opportunities to acquire, sustain or renew cultural contacts are limited (Lorenz & Verdaguer, 1997). This perceived lack of cultural contact opportunities speaks to the frequent insularity of FL teaching even though many schools are located near or in

---

6A 1995 report from the Center For Applied Linguistics states that 80% of Spanish teachers, more than 50% of French and Japanese teachers, and 76% of German teachers have spent time abroad (Dutcher, 1995).
communities where target languages are spoken (Haas & Reardon, 1997; Tedick, & Walker, 1996). Even when community resources are available, there is often no connection with these language-culture representatives. “...Until recently, local resources have been neglected, over-looked, and under-utilized in the teaching of foreign languages and cultures” (Lotito & Perez-Erdelyi, 1988, p. 144). The lack of connection between the Spanish FL classroom and Latino communities is an important example.

That today's students of Spanish, many living in proximity to vital Spanish-speaking neighborhoods and communities, can study the language with virtually no attention to the richness and variety of Latino life in the United States underscores the insularity of language teaching and the deep chasm that exists between language and culture in second language classrooms” (Tedick, et al., 1995, p. 502).

This insularity becomes a greater concern in settings where community resources do not exist. Including NLIs on curricular issues involving culture can be particularly helpful for teachers who are not sure of how to interpret various aspects of the target culture (Sadow, 1987; Wilson Keenan, Willett, & Solsken, 1993).

Research studies on projects in FL classrooms that include NLIs

A recent study involving NLIs was conducted with university FL students. Robinson & Nocon (1996) conducted a study with third semester university FL students that employed ethnographic interview techniques similar to those espoused by Damen (1987). The purpose of the study was to employ these techniques as a pedagogical tool to promote positive attitudes in students toward native speakers of Spanish. This tool was built into a cross-cultural project that was integrated into the course curriculum. Results from this study indicated that the students involved in this project had enhanced their understanding of the culture of local Spanish speakers, the students’ own culture,
and their overall attitudes toward the study of the language itself (p. 1). The NLIs were an integral part of the design and implementation of this unit. However, it did not appear that NLIs were involved in the curriculum development process.

Two studies conducted in FL classrooms in American public schools that included NLIs were described in the recent 1997 Northeast Conference Reports (Haas & Reardon, 1997; Schwartz & Kavanaugh, 1997). These reports were dedicated entirely to examining six innovative collaborative research projects conducted in various FL classroom settings. The purpose of these collaborations, including the two that incorporated NLIs, was to explore, review, and observe the changes envisioned by the National Standards (1996) within the context of the classroom (p. xiii). The aim of each of these projects was to research one particular goal area set forth by the standards and to develop a curriculum that reflects a particular area. In addition to adding to the database on curriculum units that integrate culture, the claimed success of these collaborations contribute significant information to the fields of FL education and university-school collaborative ventures. Since the curriculum development design for this proposed study includes a collaborative relationship between a researcher and a practitioner, a brief look at the particular feature of the collaborative process that was credited with the success of these projects will be provided. This section will be followed by a discussion of the two studies that included NLIs in their curriculum designs.
University-school research collaboration on FL curriculum development

The six the projects described in the 1997 Northeast Conference Reports were all collaborative in nature in the sense that university professors were part of the collaborative teams with FL practitioners in five of the six studies (Adair-Hauck & Cumo-Johanssen, 1997; Haas & Reardon, 1997; Lorenz & Verdaguer, 1997; Moore & English, 1997; Schwartz & Kavanaugh, 1997). These collaborations were significant endeavors since “the lack of collaboration between school systems and universities is notorious” (Lorenz & Verdaguer, 1997, p. 160). Discussions on the evaluations of these projects indicated that the successes of these studies were due in large part to the collaborative process and the “negotiation and understandings [that] took place about each other’s assumptions” (Lange, & Wieczorek, 1997, p. 249). It was also noted that the negotiation and co-construction of meanings is a vital component to collaboration and as such there is a “need to research the collaboration [process]” (p. 248) in university-school research collaboration on FL curriculum development.

The role of NLIs in two FL curriculum unit designs implemented in American public schools

The study by Haas & Reardon (1997) showed the largest number of NLIs. These NLIs were integrated into the implementation phase of the curriculum unit and became the focus of planned classroom activities. Reardon’s 7th grade Spanish students “exchanged e-mail letters with Chilean students, interviewed a first-grade teacher in their own school who is originally from Chile and the author of a reading passage about Chile, and visited a Chilean bakery in the village nearby” (p. 215). An effort was put
forth to address the issue of limited contact opportunities available for Spanish FL learners with Latino communities (Haas & Reardon, 1997; Lotito & Perez-Erdelyi, 1988; Tedick, & Walker, 1996). This was accomplished by expanding the notion of community to include the electronic community. Throughout the implementation of this unit, the FL students were exposed to a wide variety of NLIs and it was reported that the learners enjoyed and benefited from these contacts. However, as in the study by Robinson-Stuart & Nocon (1996), it did not seem that these cultural contacts were involved in the curriculum development and deliberation processes. These processes were described as collaborative efforts reserved for the teacher and the university researcher.

Immigration was the theme of the second curriculum unit project that incorporated a NLI. The collaborative team of Schwartz & Kavanaugh (1997) developed a cultural unit on Guatemala that used “video, feature length film, library research, and many other resources” (Phillips, 1997, p. xvi). One of these resources was an immigrant from Guatemala who visited the class and whom the students interviewed. As in the cultural units created by Haas & Reardon (1997) and Robinson-Stuart & Nocon (1996), the design of this curriculum unit incorporated a NLI whose role was to serve as a cultural contact for the students. The NLI in this curricular design did not appear to serve in the capacity of a curriculum development collaborator. It is interesting to note that Schwartz, the university researcher in this project, is a native speaker of Spanish. However, the discussions of the curriculum unit design and its implementation did not indicate her country of origin nor what influence her being a native speaker of Spanish had on the development or deliberation processes.
Future role of NLI in FL education

Thinking of innovative ways to integrate NLIs into the design of these cultural units was one of the primary objectives of these two curricular projects. It was reported that in both of these studies, exposure to NLIs proved to be rich and exciting experiences for the students as it provided them with opportunities to interact with NLIs and to observe and interpret cultural issues as they arose (Haas & Reardon, 1997; Schwartz & Kavanaugh, 1997). Incorporating NLIs into FL classroom activities is an important step in working to dissolve the insularity of FL classroom teaching and in helping learners find ways to communicate with various languaculture representatives. However, the role of NLIs need not be limited to being the main feature of a classroom activity nor the destination of a field trip. I suggest expanding the role of the NLIs to include them as significant members in the processes of FL curriculum development and deliberation in collaboration with FL teachers. This collaborative endeavor would provide a pivotal dimension to intercultural communication efforts in FL teaching and learning. Further, I suggest that the results of these intercultural communicative efforts between NLIs and the FL teacher would ultimately benefit the learners, since the process and product of collaborative curriculum deliberations are dialogically interactive (Cohen, 1994; McCutcheon, 1995; Zacarian, 1996).
Conclusions

This section examined the role of culture in FL education. I argued that, in light of the communicative competence goal of FL education in American public schools, FL educators need to expand their conceptualizations of culture beyond the behaviorist and functionalist views. I also claimed that a dialectic notion of culture (Geertz, 1973) together with a sociolinguistic view of language (Loveday, 1982; Schiffrin, 1996) can offer an invaluable contribution to FL educators as they participate in the complex task of curriculum reform that reflects the communicative competence goal and the integration of culture in the curriculum mandated by this goal.

Moreover, this section demonstrated that the integration of culture into the FL curriculum is a complex issue. I posited that curriculum reform of this magnitude requires that FL educators engage in critical reflection on their individual experiences, feelings, and perceptions and on their pedagogical and instructional choices, including which version of culture is taught and legitimized (Crawford-Lange and Lange, 1984; Kramsch, 1993; Lloyd, 1989). Moreover, I posed that critical reflection is essential for the professional development of FL educators (Kramsch, 1993).

Also, this section reviewed alternative approaches to curriculum development (Sears & Marshall, 1990) and discussed their potential benefits to FL curriculum reform. I held that viewing curriculum as a resource rather than a prescription (Donmoyer, 1990) holds particular promise in helping FL curriculum developers in their search for unique solutions to the complex issues they are facing.
Further, I offered that a collaborative curriculum development design that consists of NLIs and FL educators can provide FL teachers with rich opportunities not only to develop a curriculum that integrates culture, but also to engage in an intercultural co-construction of knowledge that may render cultural insights to all participants. Also, I claimed that in collaborative group settings, the process in completing a task becomes an integral component in the final product, with the interaction between product and process being dynamic, and on-going (Cohen, 1994, McCutcheon, 1995; Zacarian, 1996). In addition, it was seen that prolonged involvement between the NLIs and other collaborators might provide communicative opportunities for all parties to engage in a critical dialogue that moves beyond mere technical and practical curricular concerns. Moreover, it was claimed that while engaging in this approach, the FL teacher is modeling and apprenticing (Freire, 1985) the intercultural communicative competence that she is attempting to achieve with her students.

It was also seen that critical collaborative dialogue plays a pivotal role in the transformation process of ideologies, social relations, and identities that is likely to occur in a collaborative curriculum development team that includes NLIs. In addition, it was claimed that tension is a normative behavior in group deliberations and that groups comprised of culturally diverse members are more likely to experience conflict and tension (McCutcheon, 1994; Zacarian, 1996). Further, it was claimed that language is inherently ideological and thereby reflects the ideologies, social relations, and identities that are continually co-constructed by speakers in groups during their interactions (Gee, 1990; Schiffrin, 1994, p. 106). It was also stated that the conversational phenomenon
of positioning can serve as a window into how members of a speech community progressively and dynamically reassess and transform their ideologies, social relations, and identities over time (Carbaugh, 1996; Davies & Harre, 1994).

Lastly, it was claimed that analyzing the dialogue of a collaborative curriculum deliberation team that includes a NLI seems to be an optimum environment to gain insights into (a) how ideologies, social relations, and identities are evidenced by participants engaged in the deliberation process, (b) how the initial ideologies, social relations, and identities are redefined by this speech community during the process of curriculum development and deliberation, and (c) how these transformations are related to the process and product of this speech community.

Suggestions to consider

It is encouraging to see that there are attempts to dissolve the insularity of FL teaching in American public schools through increased uses of NLIs in FL classroom practices (Haas & Reardon, 1997; Schwartz & Kavanaugh, 1997). It is also encouraging to see a variety of innovative and successful university researcher-FL practitioner collaborative curriculum endeavors (Adair-Hauck & Cumo-Johanssen, 1997; Haas & Reardon, 1997; Lorenz & Verdaguer, 1997; Moore & English, 1997; Schwartz & Kavanaugh, 1997). These are not small achievements, given the history of insularity of FL teaching and since very little research of any kind has been performed in the FL classroom (Bernhardt & Tedick, 1991; Haas & Reardon, 1997; Lotito & Perez-Erdelyi, 1988; Milleret, 1992; Phillips, 1997; Tedick, & Walker, 1996). In addition,
the history of the lack of collaboration between higher education and school systems is well documented (Lorenz & Verdaguer, 1997).

While a survey of the body of research on university-researcher collaboration on FL curriculum development yielded only two studies that included NLIs, their reported successes will hopefully inspire future collaborative endeavors as well as experimentation with expanded roles for NLIs in FL education. If new collaborative efforts on FL curriculum development and deliberation are to continue to succeed, there is a need to research the collaborative process (Lange & Wieczorek, 1997, p. 248). An implication of this notion is that there might be a great deal learned by analyzing the critical collaborative dialogue of participants who are engaged in FL curriculum development and deliberations. It also suggests that analyzing the critical dialogue of a FL collaborative team that consists of NLIs and FL educators will yield a deeper understanding of the process of intercultural negotiation of meaning that occurs when participants work to complete their task. In short, this milieu can provide a rich opportunity to examine the dialogic nature of *languaculture* (Agar, 1994) in action. This study attempted to address this very issue.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

Introduction

A collaborative curriculum development team that is working to integrate culture into a FL curriculum and includes a NLI offers its participants rich opportunities to become cultural co-learners within the process of completing their task. In addition, working on such a team offers a rare chance for FL educators to (a) apprentice and model intercultural communicative practices, (b) reflect upon recent reforms in the FL profession with regard to the teaching and learning of culture and the stated communicative goals, and (c) address the issue of the perceived lack of cultural contact opportunities and the frequent insularity of FL teaching (Haas & Reardon, 1997; Tedick, & Walker, 1996). Also, the unique composition of the curriculum team suggests an opportunity for FL educators to explore this paradigm shift in a supportive setting that is conducive to encouraging professional and personal growth. Further, analyzing the critical collaborative dialogue of such a team and how its members co-construct meanings can provide a window for examining the dialogic nature of culture in action.

This study investigated the processes and outcomes of the critical dialogue of a speech community comprised of a FL educator, a NLI, and this researcher who engaged in the collaborative process of developing a curriculum unit that integrated culture for a second-year high school Spanish class in an American public school. This research
project was primarily focused on an interest in studying how ideologies, social relations, and identities were evidenced and transformed during the collaborative deliberatory process.

McCutcheon (1995) claims that a major tenet of collaborative deliberation is that the participants develop a social construction of their reality by seeking intersubjective agreement (p. 147). Further, it is claimed that participants involved in the interactive process of socially constructing meaning use language as a symbolic resource to continually reassess and transform ideologies (Carbaugh, 1996; Gee, 1990; Schiffrin, 1994). In addition, it is claimed that in collaborative group settings, the process of working on a task becomes an integral component in the final product, with the interaction between product and process being dynamic, and on-going (Cohen, 1994; McCutcheon, 1995; Zacarian, 1996). These claims were important aspects of this investigation.

The design of this project called for me to perform in the dual roles of researcher and collaborative partner. As the primary researcher, I designed and initiated the project, selected the participants, gathered data in various formats, and engaged in a number of other activities employing the methodology of ethnographic research (Carspecken, 1996; Ely, 1991; Erickson, 1996; Geertz, 1973; Gumperz & Hymes, 1972; Hymes, 1980; Saville-Troike, 1996; Spradley, 1980). In the role of co-collaborator, I was a curriculum resource and materials gatherer, professional colleague, idea generator, encourager, and listener. These responsibilities seem to fall within the domains of either the researcher or the co-collaborator role. However, it is important to note that these two roles did not function independently of each other. Rather, they
were interdependent and interactive, with scholarly research informing and influencing the collaborative dialogue and the dialogue influencing my on-going research. Thus, it was as a researcher/collaborator that I inquired into the interactive process of collaborative curriculum development and deliberation in a team comprised of a FL educator and a NLI. I used this dual role as a perspective through which to answer the following set of primary research questions:

- How are ideologies as they relate to social relations and identities initially evidenced in the critical dialogue of this speech community?
- How are the initial ideologies, social relations, and identities socially re-defined and transformed by this speech community during the process of curriculum development and deliberation?
- How are these transformations related to the process and product of this speech community?

**Project Design**

This project was based on the ethnographic tenets of Carspecken (1996), Ely et al. (1991), Erickson (1996), Geertz (1973), Gumperz & Hymes (1972), Hymes (1980), Moerman (1988), Saville-Troike (1996), and Spradley (1980). Ethnographic investigation uses qualitative research methodology and focuses on "understanding and explicating how people make sense of their lives" (Moerman, 1988, p. x). Its hallmark is a "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) achieved by keeping detailed records through observations, interviews, audio and/or video recordings and "anything else that documents the social situation under study" (Spradley, 1980, p. 57). Its purpose is to seek understanding of a speech community by relying on people's own words as the
primary source of data (Ely, et al., 1991; Erickson, 1996; Spradley, 1980) and regarding inquiry as an interactive process between the researcher and the participants (Carspecken, 1996; Marshall & Rossman, 1989).

Ethnographers of communication propose that conversational interaction is the essence of all linguistic strategies and that the ethnographic approach to the study of communicative activity provides a critical framework to collect and analyze data about the construction, negotiation and conveyance of social meanings (Gumperz & Hymes, 1972; Saville-Troike, 1996). Further, they claim that there is no shared meaning without interaction and that understanding is gained through careful analysis of a speech community's "scene and setting, participants, forms of speech, message content, norms of interaction, purpose of an event from a community standpoint, tone in which an act was done, [and] where the event took place" (Gumperz & Hymes, 1972, p. 76). Hymes (1980) defines a speech community as "a community sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech, and rules for the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety" (p. 54).

Language is viewed as a "socially and culturally constructed symbol system that both reflects and creates macro-level social meaning and micro-level interpersonal meanings" (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 133). Every utterance serves the function of signaling each individual's "identity, socialization, and ideology with the general framework or context in which the utterance [is] interactively and socially embedded" (p. 134). Hence, the function of language is more than just to communicate; "language is ... also a device to think and feel with, as well as a device with which to signal and negotiate social identity" (Gee, 1990, p. 78). Moreover, language is one of the "symbolic
resources” that provides a contextual frame used to “define” the concept of self and the relationships that exist among participants of a speech community (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 106).

Discourse is a “multi-faceted process through which meanings are progressively and dynamically achieved” (Davies & Harre, 1994, p. 46). The co-construction of meaning through interactive discourse includes the ability of interlocutors to “exclude, include, and guess” relevance within a given context or social situation (Gee, 1990). Moreover, discourses shift in meaning according to the context and the positioning of subjects in them (Davies & Harre, 1994).

The study of the discourse in a speech community involves “... (a) a detailed thick description of how people act and react to each other, and the ways they use language (including written language) to act and react [with each other], and (b) an emic interpretation of what is happening in the event, moment by moment as the event evolves, and as what is happening when the event changes and is contested” (Bloome, 1996, p. 8). Ethnographic researchers use the data culled from moment-to-moment interactions to formulate interpretations.

Positioning is a conversational phenomenon which influences the social meanings of what is being said by participants in a speech community (Davies & Harre, 1994). As a conversational phenomenon, its focus is on the way in which discursive practices constitute participants in a speech community in certain ways while simultaneously serving as a source through which participants can negotiate new positions (Davies & Harre, 1994). Positioning can also be used as an analytical tool with which to examine the dynamically evolving reassessment and transformation of
ideologies, social relations, and identities of a speech community’s participants (Carbaugh, 1996; Davies & Harre, 1994). Using positioning as a concept for analyzing the social interaction of a collaborative curriculum development team that includes a NLI provides an analytic framework for understanding the social life of this community.

This study has been designed to offer a rich description of a collaborative team comprised of a FL educator, NLI, and this researcher, that is involved in the process of developing and implementing a culture-based thematic unit on Puerto Rico for a second-year Spanish class in an American public high school. Further, the nature of the collaborative dialogue as it emerges throughout this study was explored. Ethnographic investigation is suggested “for research that is exploratory or descriptive and that stresses the importance of context, setting, and subjects' frame of reference” (Marshall & Rossman, 1989, p. 46). This type of investigation is consistent with my intentions for this study.

Setting, Participants, and Procedures

Setting

The unit was developed for students enrolled in a second year Spanish class in a small, suburban American public Junior/Senior High School. Longview Junior/Senior High School was located in a community where 98.4% of its members were white and

7Pseudonyms have been used for people, places, and institutions in an attempt to provide anonymity.
claimed that American English was their native language\[8\]. The FL faculty and students reflected the racial and linguistic makeup of the community. At the time of this study, two neighboring cities had large Puerto Rican populations.

**Participants**

The three participants involved in the curriculum development process were the CT, the NLI, and this researcher. None of these participants had ever worked on a collaborative curriculum development research project that included a NLI. Consent letters were given to the CT and NLI during the first three-way meeting. These letters informed the CT and NHI of the nature of the proposed research (see Appendices B and C).

The CT was an experienced FL language teacher who had been actively involved in various professional development workshops, study circles, and projects aimed at developing and promoting a culturally diverse school-wide curriculum. At the initiation of this study, the CT had never visited Puerto Rico nor had attended any conferences or workshops on Puerto Rico. The CT claimed that the cultural talk on Puerto Rico in her language classes was limited to the information gleaned from the culture sections included in the textbook.

The NLI was a graduate of the University of Puerto Rico at Rio Piedras and had been teaching English as a Second Language at a junior and senior high school in a nearby community for three years. At the time of this study, she was enrolled in a

\[8\]This information was taken from the 1996 School and Community Profile that was compiled for the New England Association of Schools and Colleges accreditation process.
Master’s degree program at the state university in order to receive state certification in ESL.

As a doctoral candidate, I served in the dual roles of principal researcher and co-collaborator for this study. I was also an assistant professor of Spanish and teaching full time at a nearby private four year college at the time of this study. My experience also included teaching French and Spanish for five years at the secondary level. I had taught Latin American culture courses at the college level that included various aspects of Puerto Rican language and culture. I visited Puerto Rico once, twenty-five years ago.

The students for whom the curriculum unit was designed were second year Spanish students. The class composition was a mixture of sophomore, junior, and senior high school students. None of the twenty-three students (ten female and thirteen male) had the CT the previous year for Spanish I. In addition, all of the students claimed to have never visited Puerto Rico, known anyone from Puerto Rico or from Puerto Rican heritage, or been involved in a research project. Parental consent letters were given to the whole class during the first day of the implementation of the curriculum unit. These letters informed the students and their parents of the nature and anticipated duration of the project and were signed by the school principal and this researcher (see Appendix D).

Procedures

During the eight and a half months of this study, the three-member collaborative curriculum development team held nine meetings, each lasting between 1.5 and 3 hours. The purpose of these meetings was to deliberate on and (re)design the curriculum unit
and to discuss issues which were raised in our shared scholarly readings on FL teaching. Also, during the fourteen-week implementation phase of the unit, the team members engaged in numerous phone calls (15) and dialogue exchanges (36). The purposes of these calls and journal exchanges were varied and included discussions on issues of classroom management, materials development, lesson planning, as well as on broader matters on FL teaching. Additionally, during the teaching of the unit, I made daily classroom observations at Longview Junior/Senior High School and held eight pre-class meetings with the CT.

Data Collection

To generate data rich in detail and embedded in context, data was collected in a number of ways over an extended period of time. These included direct classroom observation of the Spanish II class daily for forty-seven minutes during the fourteen-week implementation of the unit, audio taping and transcribing all meetings, phone conversations, pre-class discussions (CT and researcher), collecting thirty-six dialogue journal exchanges, and keeping field notes and log notes. The amount of total contact for this project was eight and a half months. See Appendix A for a summary of data collection.

Audio taping

As previously stated, audio taping was the principle source of data collection for this project. Audio taping and transcribing the tapes of the dialogues I had with the CT
and the NLI in the planning and implementation stages of the unit and the subsequent reflection on the project with the participants allowed me to gather a significant body of data relating to the nature of our dialogue. Selected transcripts were shown to the NLI and the CT in order to facilitate further discussion and/or ask for clarification.

Analysis

Three types of analysis were performed from the collected data. First, a broad analysis was conducted and consisted of a detailed description of the situated context of the speech community. This included descriptions of the context of the school setting, the targeted FL learners, the purpose and design of the curriculum unit, the three member curriculum team participants, and the meetings of the team members. The purpose of this analysis was to provide a broad context in order to begin to develop a descriptive construct of the nature of the critical reflective dialogue of this speech community.

A second analysis focused on the team meetings, pre-class meetings, phone conversations and dialogue journals (speech encounters) in order to gain a deeper understanding of the “communicative practices” or normative patterns that occurred over time (Carbaugh, 1996). The purpose of this analysis was to categorize patterns into themes in order to further develop a theoretical construct of the speech community’s interactional meanings concerning their ideologies identities, and social relations.

The third stage of analysis was a microanalysis of selected episodes of analyzed communicative practices regarding the ideologies, identities, and social relations of the
collaborative team members. Using the analytical tool of positioning (Davies & Harre, 1994; Carbaugh, 1996), critical moments were micro analyzed in order to gain a deeper understanding of the ways in which the participants of this speech community co-constructed meanings of their ideologies, identities, and social relations.

Field notes, log notes, dialogue journals entries, and transcripts were sorted and collated into several categories relating to the communicative practices of the speech community. These were grouped into common themes and will be the primary sources for these three types of analyses.

Initial analysis identified the following categories:

- communicative practice of rejecting being positioned as sole authority on culture (NLI)
- communicative practice of positioning self as distinct from majority of FL teachers (CT)
- communicative practice of positioning self as collaborator (researcher)

Trustworthiness

A variety of techniques were used in order to ensure the probability of credible findings in this project. These techniques included: (a) prolonged engagement, (b) persistent observation, (c) triangulation, (d) negative case analysis, (e) member-checking, and (f) peer debriefing (Carspecken, 1996; Ely, 1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The time devoted to this study included scheduled time dedicated to the initial and ongoing development of the unit with the CT and the NLI as well as the observation of all of the forty-seven minute classes involved in the implementation of the unit.
(fourteen weeks, five days a week). Intense classroom observations provided this researcher with an important tool for discovering meaning hidden in the social context of the FL classroom. Assurance of the credibility of this project was assisted through this prolonged engagement and persistent observation (Carspecken, 1996; Ely, 1991; Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The procedure of triangulation, the “heart of ethnographic validity” (Fetterman, 1989, p. 89) was used to further strengthen the validity and reliability of the data and their subsequent interpretations. This technique requires the use of various sources of data collection in order to weaken the possibility of bias from a single source of data and (Carspecken, 1996; Ely, 1991 p. 98; Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 305). For this project the diverse sources of data included (a) audio taping and transcribing all team meetings (9), phone conversations (15) and pre-class conferences (8), (b) collecting dialogue journals exchanges (36), (c) taking copious field and log notes, and (d) observing the Spanish II class, daily for fourteen weeks, forty-seven minutes each day.

Negative case analysis can lead to a re-examination of the findings by allowing the researcher to search for evidence that does not fit the emergent patterns (Ely, 1991, p. 98). Further, this type of analysis can “... make data more credible by reducing the number of exceptional cases....” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 312).

This study, collaborative by design, employed member-checking throughout its duration. This technique involves testing the interpretations and conclusions of the data analysis with the participants in order to assist in ensuring the credibility of the study (Ely, 1991, p. 165; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In this project, interpretations were
checked with the CT and the NLI. This was done through phone conversations and interviews.

The use of peer debriefers is also suggested as a technique for maintaining credibility (Carspecken, 1996; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Their purpose is to ask questions, test interpretations, check for possible biases, and provide support and guidance in the research project (Carspecken, 1996, p. 89; Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 308-309). Two debriefers were involved in this study. They read transcripts and checked their interpretations.

**Limitations of the Study**

It should be noted that this study has limitations in important domains. First, as Peshkin (1988) states, subjectivity is inherent in every research process. Also, the CT and this researcher held the point of view that collaborative curriculum development and deliberation that includes a NLI can offer unique opportunities for professional development by offering support for teachers as they introduce and experiment with curriculum changes. These perspectives might contribute to the subjectivity in this area.

Despite these limitations, it is believed that this project will add an important contribution to the on-going discussion of collaborative curriculum development and deliberation, the collaborative process, issues concerning professional development, as well as the teaching and learning of culture in the FL classroom.
CHAPTER 4
THE BROAD CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

Introduction

I have conducted research in a collaborative curriculum development team comprised of a FL educator, a NLI, and myself that worked to create and implement a culture-based thematic unit on Puerto Rico for a second-year Spanish class at Longview Junior/Senior High School. The purpose of this study was multi-fold. First, it is claimed that the goal of communicative competence requires FL teachers to critically examine the broader social and political implications of their pedagogical ideologies regarding cultural issues as they engage in the complex task of curriculum reform (Damen, 1987; Kramsch, 1993). In addition, it is has been argued that there are few opportunities for FL teachers to engage in thoughtful, critical dialogue, examine their daily decisions, collaborate with other professionals, or to engage in a dialogue-over-time with NLIs (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Haas & Reardon, 1997; Tedick & Walker, 1996, Tripp, 1993). A collaborative curriculum development team that includes NLIs offers intriguing possibilities to increase these opportunities. The process of group deliberation is described as an interactional experience that involves tension as a normative behavior (McCutcheon 1995, Zacarian, 1996). Further, it is claimed that groups comprised of culturally diverse members are more likely to experience tension (McCutcheon, 1994; Zacarian, 1996). However, when members are willing to critically and collaboratively examine their tension, it can have positive effects on their communicative process and
curricular task (McCutcheon 1995, Zacarian, 1996). Lastly, it is claimed that the language used by speakers in groups reflects their ideologies that are continually co-constructed during their interactions (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 106).

These claims were at the center of this inquiry and were guided by the following set of primary questions:

• How are ideologies initially evidenced in the critical dialogue of this speech community?

• How are the initial ideologies socially re-defined and transformed by this speech community during the process of curriculum development and deliberation?

• How are these transformations related to the process and product of this speech community?

This chapter provides a detailed description of the collaborative curriculum development team members who functioned as a speech community over the eight and a half months of this study. Included in this description is a detailed account of the sequencing of the meetings, dialogue journal exchanges and phone conversations. It also includes a detailed depiction of Longview Junior/Senior High School, the FL Program, and the students.

The Collaborative Curriculum Development Team

I selected the participants which formed the collaborative curriculum development team. This team was comprised of a FL educator who was a native speaker of American English and the CT, a NLI who was a native of Puerto Rico and
whose first language was Spanish, and myself as principal researcher who was also a native speaker of American English. The following is a description of these participants and is followed by a detailed description of the setting of this speech community.

Team members

Nora, a Caucasian native speaker of American English in her mid-forties with an undergraduate degree in French and Spanish was twenty-two years experience as a FL teacher at Longview Junior/Senior High School, was the CT in this research project. At the time of this study she was the only full time Spanish teacher in the school and was chair of the Foreign Language Department. During the academic year in which this study occurred, Nora taught all sections of Spanish II through V.

As Nora’s career shifted toward teaching more Spanish, she participated in several programs to improve her proficiency. These included total immersion programs at a local college, formal college courses, and summer programs in Mexico. Nora’s cultural focus in her Spanish curriculum up to the time of this study had been primarily on that country. She had visited Mexico several times in the past fifteen years and had organized six student trips to that country.

Nora was a volunteer member of a regional task force that periodically reviewed the Massachusetts World Languages Curriculum Framework during its development. In addition, she was a key member of a study circle team at Longview which initiated a school-wide curriculum reform project aimed at creating a multicultural curriculum. As a result of her work, she had received two awards, the Global Educator of the Year Award and the Multicultural Recognition award. Her experiences with these endeavors
stimulated her interest in the cultural aspects of her individual teaching practices and were instrumental in her decision to work on this research project.

Nora had never visited Puerto Rico and her experience with the Puerto Rican culture was limited to the information found in the texts that she used. Nora had had no prior experience collaborating with a NLI or with a researcher on curriculum development.

Carmen, a native speaker of Spanish in her thirties was born and raised in Puerto Rico. She was completing her third year as a teach of English as a Second Language at the junior and senior high schools in a neighboring community for three years at the time of this study. In concert with her teaching responsibilities, she was involved in a group designed to provide support among the Latino parents of children in the elementary schools. Carmen was a graduate of the University of Puerto Rico at Rio Piedras, graduating with concentrations in Biology and Education. She moved to the US mainland in 1985 with her certification as an educator. Carmen was enrolled in a Masters Program at the state university for ESL certification. Her involvement in this research project was incorporated into her degree program by serving as a three-credit independent study. The content of this independent study required Carmen to participate as a collaborative team member, keep a journal, and write a reflective paper on her role as a NLI. Carmen had never previously worked on a research project as a NLI.

Joyce. I am a female, Caucasian native speaker of American English. At the time of this study, I was in my late forties and an assistant professor of Spanish at a nearby private four-year college. My undergraduate degree is in French and I have a
Masters degree in Hispanic Literature and Linguistics. At the time of this study, I had worked in the FL field for twenty five years. My experience included teaching French and Spanish at the secondary level for five years.

I was a volunteer member of the same regional task force as Nora, that periodically reviewed the Massachusetts World Languages Curriculum Framework during its development. I visited Puerto Rico once, twenty-five years ago. I have never worked with a NLI in a collaborative curriculum development team.

The Task

This team was responsible for the collaborative co-construction and subsequent implementation of a culture-based thematic unit on Puerto Rico for Nora’s level II Spanish class at Longview Junior/Senior High School. Deliberations began four months prior to Nora’s teaching of the unit and continued throughout the fourteen weeks of its implementation. The purposes of our deliberations were to (a) gather information and materials, (b) discuss various approaches to deliver the content of the unit, (c) discuss shared scholarly readings, (d) assess the progress of the implementation of the unit, (e) discuss any proposed changes to the initial unit design and delivery strategies and methodologies.

The Goals

The co-constructed goals of the collaborative team were multifold and were in the form of three questions that served as a guide for our initial deliberative sessions.
• How can students and teachers access an insider’s perspective of the target culture in a community where there is no easy access to native speakers who could serve as resources?

• How does culture get integrated into the curriculum and move beyond the celebratory concept of culture?

• How can the issue of stereotypes be addressed?

Scholarly Readings

The team shared seven common scholarly readings as part of their core of resources. These were selected by Nora and me.

Table 1. List of Scholarly Readings


Settings

The collaborative development team met in a variety of locations. The settings can be divided into four genres, full and partial team meetings, pre-class meetings at Longview, phone conversations, dialogue journal exchanges. There were no team meetings conducted in a classroom environment.

Team Meetings

The collaborative team held eight meetings during the eight and a half months of this study. Each of these meetings lasted between 1.5 and 3 hours. Meetings two and seven were 3-way meetings between Carmen, Nora, and myself. The remaining six meetings were 2-way meetings between Nora and myself. All meetings were audio taped and subsequently transcribed. The overall purpose of all eight meetings was to deliberate on, (re)design the curriculum unit, and to discuss issues which were raised in our shared scholarly readings on FL teaching.

Each of the eight meetings was convened at various locations that included restaurants, libraries, and the homes of each of the members of the collaborative team. There were no formal, written agendas for these meetings, rather the collaborative team members proposed ‘topics of discussion’ in phone conversations or journal exchanges. These ideas served as ‘entrees’ for our dialogue.

The ninth meeting was a taped interview that I conducted with Nora. This interview was held one year after the completion of the implementation phase of the
unit. The questions asked in this interview can be found in Appendix F. Table 2 represents a profile of these nine meetings.

Table 2. Profile of Team Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>In Attendance</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>4/18</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
<td>Nora's house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>6/7</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>Nora, Carmen, Joyce</td>
<td>Public library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>6/21</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
<td>Nora's house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>7/31</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
<td>Nora's house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>8/7</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
<td>Nora's house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>10/4</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
<td>Nora's house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>10/18</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Nora, Carmen, Joyce</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>11/9</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2/18</td>
<td>2 hrs.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
<td>Joyce's house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-class Meetings

There were eight opportunities for Nora and me to hold short (5-15 minutes each) pre-class meetings at the Junior/Senior High School during the implementation phase of the unit. The constraints of time, logistics, and the daily schedules of Nora’s classes dictated both the duration of these meetings and their physical locations. On some occasions, Nora and I engaged in our brief dialogues during the five minutes of ‘student passing time’ between classes. On other occasions, our collaborative dialogue took place during the last ten minutes of Nora’s lunch period in an empty classroom which was adjacent to her own. Each of these meetings were audio taped and transcribed.

Due to time constraints on Nora’s and my part, there were no after-class meetings. Any post-class debriefing or continued deliberations occurred through
subsequent phone conversations, pre-class meetings, or dialogue journal exchanges.

Table 3 provides a summary of the pre-class meetings.

Table 3. Summary of Pre-class Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>10/23</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>11/13</td>
<td>10 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>11/15</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>11/19</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>12/16</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>12/19</td>
<td>10 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>12/20</td>
<td>5 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phone Conversations**

Much of the data analyzed for this study was generated from the sixteen\(^9\) audio taped phone conversations that occurred between Carmen, Nora, and me. The purposes of these calls were varied and included discussions on issues of classroom management, materials development, lesson planning, as well as on broader matters on FL teaching. Reflections on the unit and the collaborative process continued for three months after the fourteen-week implementation phase.

These phone conversations ranged in length from a minimum of ten minutes to a maximum of ninety minutes. The purpose of these calls was precipitated by specific issues or concerns regarding the implementation phase of the unit. These included

---

\(^9\)The sixteenth phone call was an exit interview with Carmen.
continued deliberations focusing on student progress, concerns about the design of the unit, and the role of the NLI. Table 4 provides a summary of the phone conversations.

Table 4. Summary of Phone Conversations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>10/6</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>10/7</td>
<td>30 min.</td>
<td>Carmen, Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>10/7</td>
<td>45 min.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>10/17</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>11/17</td>
<td>1.5 hrs.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>11/18</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>11/20</td>
<td>20 min.</td>
<td>Carmen, Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>11/20</td>
<td>10 min.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>12/3</td>
<td>10 min.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>12/5</td>
<td>10 min.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>12/8</td>
<td>25 min.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>12/14</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>1/26</td>
<td>20 min.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>10 min.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>5/20</td>
<td>1 hr.</td>
<td>Nora, Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>6/20</td>
<td>30 min.</td>
<td>Carmen, Joyce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dialogue Journals

There was a total of thirty-six dialogue journal exchanges that occurred between Nora, Carmen and myself over the course of the fourteen week implementation phase of the unit. Each exchange was shared with all of the three participants. This was accomplished by our using e-mail as the format for the journals and forwarding copies of all exchanges to each other.

The highest number of exchanges (14) occurred during the first three weeks of the implementation phase. Of these fourteen exchanges, Carmen sent seven, four to
Nora and three to me. Nora initiated the next highest number of exchanges for a total of five, three to Carmen and two to me. During this time frame, I sent two messages, one each to Carmen and Nora.

The second highest number of exchanges (11) took place during weeks seven through nine. I sent a total of six exchanges, five to Carmen and one to Nora. Carmen sent the next highest number of exchanges (4) with three to me and one to Nora. Nora sent one message to Carmen during week seven. Table 5 shows the profile of the journal exchanges.

Table 5. Profile of Journal Entries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joyce*, Nora (4)</td>
<td>Carmen, Nora (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora, Joyce (1)</td>
<td>Carmen, Joyce (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Total: 5</td>
<td>Nora, Carmen (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nora, Joyce (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joyce, Carmen (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joyce, Nora (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joyce, Carmen (5)</td>
<td>Joyce, Carmen (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen, Joyce (3)</td>
<td>Joyce, Nora (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen, Nora (1)</td>
<td>Nora, Carmen (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce, Nora (1)</td>
<td>Carmen, Joyce (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora, Carmen (1)</td>
<td>Monthly Total: 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Total: 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* First person listed is sender of entry
Classroom Observations

I observed Nora’s Spanish II class everyday, for forty-seven minutes during the fourteen-week implementation phase of the curriculum unit. This prolonged observation afforded me the opportunity to acquaint myself with the overall environment of Nora’s teaching world. This included my becoming familiar with her students and colleagues and her teaching.

Longview Junior/Senior High School

Longview Junior/Senior High School was located in the town of Longview, a suburban community, nestled in the hills of southern Massachusetts. At the time of this study the population of the town was 7,651. Taken from the 1990 US Census, the following chart depicts the racial and ethnic composition of the community.
Table 6. Racial and Ethnic Composition of Longview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial and Ethnic Composition of Longview</th>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7,651</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian, Eskimo or Aleut</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Origin</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The school system in Longview consisted of three public schools, one pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten school, one elementary school which was the feeder school to the junior/senior high school, and Longview Junior/Senior High School which housed grades seven through twelve. Grades nine through twelve were divided into traditional curricular-based departments. At the time of this study, there were forty full time faculty working at Longview Junior/Senior High School.

The Junior/Senior High School was a two-story brick building located in a quiet, residential area surrounded by homes as well as open and wooded land. This building housed four science labs, one computer lab and twenty-five classrooms. In addition, there was one gym, an auditorium, a student cafeteria and a library which was centrally located on the first floor. All language classes were taught in the same wing.

At the time of this study there were 605 students attending Longview Junior/Senior High School. The racial and ethnic composition of the student body
reflected that of the town of Longview. The following chart presents the ethnic, racial, and cultural groups that comprised the student population\textsuperscript{10}.

Table 7. Racial and Ethnic Composition of Student Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The school day at Longview Junior/Senior High School starts at 7:43 AM and ends at 2:05 PM. The daily schedule consists of seven, forty-seven minute classes. Full time faculty members were assigned to teach five classes. In addition, each teacher’s daily schedule included one preparation period and one duty period.

**The FL Program**

At the time of this study, there were three full time teachers and one part time language teacher in the FL department. The FL program at Longview began in the seventh grade with a course entitled World Languages and Cultures. This course was a relatively new addition to the FL program at Longview. It was added to the program

\textsuperscript{10}This information was drawn from the document prepared by the administration and faculty at Longview Junior/Senior High as part of their preparation for the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) accreditation process.
one year prior to the time of this study and was in its second year of implementation. This course was mandatory for all students in the seventh and eighth grades. The curriculum for this course was divided into two sections, with the first half taught in the seventh grade and the second half taught the subsequent year in grade eight.

This course was described as exploratory in design and its purpose was to provide students with an introduction and familiarity to the nature of language and language learning. Students were exposed to the two modern languages (Spanish and French) which they may choose for sequential study in their high school program. This course was not part of an articulated language program and proficiency in either Spanish or French was not stated as a student outcome for this program. One full time teacher was responsible for the seventh and eighth grade program.

The articulated FL program at Longview offered four levels of instruction in both Spanish and French and students were able to matriculate for the first time in grade nine. Although some students waited until grade ten to start their language studies, the majority elected to begin the program in their freshman year. The study of FLs was not a requirement for graduation at Longview. Nevertheless, the majority of students studied their selected language for a maximum two years as exemplified in Table 3.

At the time of this study, a combined total of fifty-nine Spanish and French students were enrolled in the advanced levels of language instruction (third and fourth years). In addition, one student was enrolled in an independent study course as a level five Spanish student. Matriculation in the first year Spanish language program was more than three times the enrollment in the first year French program. This disparity in enrollment between the two languages was consistent throughout the four levels of
language study at Longview. The following chart shows the breakdown of the student enrollment in the Spanish and French programs at the time of this study.

Table 8. Student Enrollment in Language Programs

### Spanish Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish I</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish II</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish III</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish IV</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish V</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One student enrolled in Spanish V as an independent study with the CT.

### French Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French I</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French II</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French III</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French IV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The philosophy of the FL program, as described in their written curriculum guide, stated that every student should have the opportunity to study a foreign language. Further, this philosophy was written in terms of four values or benefits which students would derive from learning a second language. These values are listed below.
1. It helps the student become more articulate in his/her own language.

2. It offers the pleasure of accomplishments.

3. It permits the student to gain an insight into and an understanding of another people’s language, literature, and culture in general and to see the values of one’s own culture in the light of another culture.

4. It allows the student the opportunity to begin to prepare him/herself to fulfill a primary social and intellectual need, be it for future study, business, travel, military service, Peace Corps, foreign Service, Central Intelligence Agency, or for student or teaching exchange programs (Longview Junior/Senior High School Foreign Language Curriculum Guide, 1989, p. 1).

In addition, the curriculum guide named five “cultural goals” for Longview’s FL program.

1. To demonstrate awareness of the difference between the foreign culture and one’s own, especially as reflected in daily life.

2. To demonstrate an awareness of similarities between the foreign culture and one’s own and of universal human values embodied in both.

3. To accept different foreign expressions, actions, and reactions as appropriate and natural to members of another culture.

4. To believe that the knowledge of a foreign language and culture contribute to the enrichment of one’s life.

5. To believe that the foreign culture has made valuable contributions to world civilization (p. 2).

At the time of this study, the FL curriculum was in the process of being re-written based on three school-wide initiatives. Longview was in its second year of a school-wide curriculum development project whose purpose was to explore ways to include diverse cultural perspectives of historical and contemporary issues into all disciplines. Nora, the CT for this study and chairperson of the FL department, was instrumental in this initiative.
A second school-wide initiative was aimed at transforming all departmental curricula into a student exit-outcomes format. This undertaking involved re-writing the curricula to by carefully detailing the objectives of each course to reflect what student should be able to do at various stages of their development. Further, the faculty and administration at Longview were preparing for their accreditation by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC). A major part of this preparation process was revising the curricula of each discipline, including FL, in order to comply with the 1994 Massachusetts Educational Reform Act and with NEASC standards.

For the FL program this meant that the curriculum was being transformed in order to align itself not only with the NEASC standards but also with the mandates of the State World Languages Curriculum Framework. As a result, the FL curriculum at Longview was undergoing revisions in order to conform with curricular state mandates, NEASC accreditation standards, and its own school-wide initiatives.

---

11Outcomes assessment is a process of describing the effects of curriculum and instruction in order to improve performance of students, faculty, programs, and institutions. This form of assessment requires that curricular goals and objectives specify what students should be able to do at various stages of their development.

12A significant part of the this reform act included the formation of the Common Core of Learning. This Core consisted of seven disciplines, The Arts, Mathematics, Science and Technology, English Language Arts, Health, World Languages, and Social Studies. The state developed a curriculum framework for each of the disciplines within this Core. The aim of these frameworks was to guide school districts in their development of purposeful curricula for all students and to structure schools and professional development that reflect Education Reform.
The Spanish Language Program

The written general and cultural aims of the Spanish language program were identical with those of the foreign language program listed above. The written linguistic objectives were separated into the four skills of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

1. To understand the language as it is spoken by the native speaker.
2. To speak the language in a manner acceptable to natives.
3. To read literary texts, magazines, and newspapers in the foreign language.

As mentioned earlier, curriculum revision for the entire FL program was still a work in progress during the eight and a half months of this study. As a result, the general cultural and linguistic aims of the pre-reform curriculum continued to be implemented in the four levels of Spanish language instruction. The specific curriculum for each level of Spanish was derived from the main grammar points, language structure, vocabulary, and themes listed in the table of contents of the textbook for that particular level.

At the time of this study, Longview was using the 1985 McGraw-Hill series in its Spanish language program. This series consisted of four different books, one for each level of instruction, Saludos I, Amistades II, Perspectivas III, and Galeria de Arte y Vida IV (McGraw-Hill, 1985). All four texts in this series claimed to be
communicative in nature and aimed at helping students develop their language skills through activities that "focus on meaningful, personal communication" (Woodford, Schmitt, & Marshall, 1985, p. vi). The content of the texts in this series was divided into thematic chapters, such as family, sports, and food. Each chapter contained three basic parts, a specific language structure, a conversation, and a cultural reading related to the specific theme of the chapter.

Technology was not integrated into the curriculum in the form of computer assisted language learning. Also, there was no language resource center where the students could individually practice their speaking and listening comprehension skills. Listening comprehension activities were presented in a direct teacher-led format or were orchestrated by the teacher in the form of playing a cassette or compact disk for the class at large.

At the time of this study, there were three teachers who taught Spanish. The complete level I Spanish program was taught by two teachers, both of whom had teaching responsibilities in other areas (math and French). Levels II through IV were taught exclusively by Nora, the CT who participated in this study. In addition, Nora was responsible for the one student enrolled in level V as independent study. All classes taught by the Nora met in the same room.

The Spanish II Language Program

As noted above, at the time of this study, the revisions in the second year Spanish curriculum had not been completed and the 'old' curriculum was still in operation. This written curriculum provided a sequential outline of the verb tenses,
grammatical structures, and basic reading selections which were expected to be covered in level II. The section on culture was under the heading of “Civilization” and included two main categories, Spain and the Spanish-Speaking Countries and The People of the Spanish-Speaking World. Under these categories was a list of topics or themes to be addressed. These themes included locations and capitals, geographical features, history, food, holidays, music, and work to name a few. (See Appendix E) In classroom practice, Nora directly connected the grammatical structures, verbs, and vocabulary to ‘real life’ situations for the level III and IV students who participate in a school-sanctioned trip to Mexico.

Classroom discussions on cultural issues other than Mexico were limited to the information found in the Lectura Cultural or cultural reading sections which were included in each chapter of the Spanish II text, Amistades (Woodford, P. Schmitt, C. & Marshall, R., 1985). Further, the only mention of Puerto Rico in the text was in the Lectura Cultural section found in chapter twelve. Culture, then, was not only limited in scope but also isolated from the listening, speaking, reading and writing components of the level II Spanish language instruction.

Nora claimed that while she was aware that the material in the culture sections of all the texts were limited and dated, she often “didn’t take the time” to go beyond what was in the book. She claimed that this was particularly true with regard to Puerto Rico since she had never visited the island and did not know very much about its people and culture. Nora also stated that the ethnic and cultural composition of the student body at Longview Junior/Senior High School and of the town itself made it difficult for
her to form cultural contacts with native speakers from the Spanish speaking world, including Puerto Rico. In addition, she claimed that she did not actively seek out ancillary curricular materials on Puerto Rican culture to use in the classroom. Moreover, she stated that there existed a tendency to separate language and culture in the level II Spanish program.

The classroom

Nora, taught all of her Spanish classes in the same room and organized it to be in accord with her style of instruction. The design most frequently used was a group seating arrangement where students’ desks faced each other and were arranged in seven pods of four desks and one pod of two desks. These pods were evenly spread throughout the room with large spaces between each pod. This design was reconfigured during the implementation phase of the unit in order to accommodate various whole class and group activities. Only before taking a conventional written test were the students instructed to place the desks into rows.

The walls of the classroom were covered with student and teacher-generated work as well as with commercial posters and official school notices. The back of the room functioned as a small reference library for students of all levels as well as for the teacher. Stored in marked boxes was a plethora of materials in Spanish. These materials included journals, newspapers, comic books, short stories, children’s stories, books on legends, anthologies, and projects of former students. Other boxes contained a myriad of art supplies and assorted games in Spanish.
The class

I observed one Spanish II class daily, Monday through Friday, for forty-seven minutes, from 11:35 AM to 12:22 PM, for fourteen weeks during the implementation phase of the curriculum unit on Puerto Rico. There were twenty-three students, a mixture of sophomores, juniors, and seniors enrolled in this class. This was the first time any of the students had Nora as their language teacher. None of the students had previously participated in a research project.

All of the ten females and twelve of the thirteen males were Caucasian and claimed American English as their native language. There was one African-American male student who also claimed American English as his native language. These students reflected the racial and linguistic makeup of the student population at Longview Junior/Senior High School as well as the community at-large. In addition, when asked to complete a questionnaire that included questions concerning the students’ familiarity with Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans, none of the students claimed to have ever visited Puerto Rico, known anyone who had visited the island, nor claimed to have known anyone from Puerto Rico. Further, all of the students stated that they knew no one for whom English was his/her second language. Table 9 depicts the profile of the FL learners.
Table 9. Profile of Spanish II Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sophomores</th>
<th>Juniors</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The implementation of the unit on Puerto Rico began the third week of the 1996-1997 academic year. The first three weeks were devoted to reviewing selected vocabulary and grammar structures from the Spanish I curriculum. This review session ended with an exam on a Friday and Nora began teaching the new unit on the following Monday.

The class had been issued the level II Spanish book at the start of the school year. However, during the entire implementation phase of the unit on Puerto Rico, the book was not used during class time nor for homework assignments. All in-class and homework activities and assignments were either generated by the teacher or came from a variety of sources other than the student text.

**Conclusions**

The purpose of this chapter has been to provide a broad context for the study which included a detailed description of the situated context of this speech community. Included in this description was an account of the meetings, dialogue journal exchanges, and phone conversations of the participants. It was claimed that the goal of communicative competence requires FL teachers to critically examine the broader social
and political implications of their pedagogical ideologies regarding cultural issues as they engage in the complex task of curriculum reform (Damen, 1987; Kramsch, 1993). In addition, it was stated that there are few opportunities for FL teachers to engage in thoughtful, critical dialogue, examine their daily decisions, collaborate with other professionals, or to engage in a dialogue-over-time with NLIs (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Haas & Reardon, 1997; Tedick & Walker, 1996, Tripp, 1993). Further, I proposed that a collaborative curriculum development team that includes NLIs offers intriguing possibilities to increase these opportunities. The process of group deliberation was described as an interactional experience that involves tension as a normative behavior (McCutcheon 1995, Zacarian, 1996). Further, it was claimed that groups comprised of culturally diverse members are more likely to experience tension (McCutcheon, 1994; Zacarian, 1996). However, it was also stated that when members are willing to critically and collaboratively examine their tension, it can have positive effects on their communicative process and curricular task (McCutcheon 1995, Zacarian, 1996). Lastly, it was claimed that the language used by speakers in groups reflects their ideologies, identities, and social relations that are continually co-constructed during their interactions (Schiffrin, 1994, p. 106).

Also, this chapter provided a detailed portrayal of Longview Junior/Senior High School and included a description of its FL Program, students, and the particular Spanish II class for whom the curricular unit was developed and implemented. It was seen that the racial and ethnic composition of the student body at Longview Junior/Senior High School and the community of Longview provided limited opportunities for cultural contacts. As a result of these limited opportunities, the CT
needed to search beyond the immediate locale for native language informants. Finally, the collaborative curriculum development team composed of the CT, a NLI, and this researcher offered unique opportunities for the CT to participate in a critical dialogue with professional colleagues and to engage in a dialogue-over-time with a NLI. All these factors were taken into account as the collaborative curriculum development team engaged in its deliberations. An examination of the process of relationship building that occurred between the team members will now be provided.
CHAPTER 5
THE BUILDING OF RELATIONSHIPS

The good thing about [our] collaboration is the journey. It’s that these three people are processing ideas together; how one person’s point of view might [allow her to] see something in a different way. Whatever is being developed is a bridge. (Carmen, phone conversation 10/7)

Introduction

This chapter will present the findings seen in this ethnographic study of the participants in a collaborative curriculum development team who were members of a speech community for eight and a half months. The critical reflective dialogue of the participants in this study evolved out of their collaborative interactions during the planning and implementation of a culture-based thematic unit on Puerto Rico for a second year Spanish class in an American public school. In order to better understand the nature of the dialogue which emerged during these interactions, it is important to examine the relationships between the members and the context in which these interactions transpired. Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is to examine both the process and the context of the relationship building that occurred between the team members.

A collaborative approach to curriculum development with participants whose views come from differing professional knowledge systems and varying personal experiences offers a rich context for the growth of a critical reflective dialogue. The change that this dialogue engenders involves participants in a process of simultaneously...
looking backward to the familiar and known and forward to the new and unknown, often inviting change without guarantee of ‘success.’ Leaving the ‘comfort zone’ of routine and venturing into uncharted territory is often accompanied with feelings of self-doubt and tension.

Tension is described as a normative behavior of collaborative group work (McCutcheon, 1994). Moreover, groups comprised of culturally diverse members with varying professional knowledge systems and personal experiences are more likely to hold differing views and perceptions and therefore are more likely to experience tension (Deketelaere & Kelchtermans, 1996; McCutcheon, 1994; Zacarian, 1996). This implies that tension is more likely to occur in a FL collaborative deliberation group that includes a CT, NLI, and researcher. For example, the CT, NLI, and researcher are likely to bring to the deliberative process differing views of both curriculum development and academic research as well as varying beliefs of their roles and positions within these two processes. Also tensions may emerge between the NLI’s taken-for-granted view of his/her own culture and the non-natives’, static, stereotypical view. All of these multiple views are held in a dynamic tension which arises out of the interactions as participants recontextualize their taken-for-granted or static views (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992). Moreover, these dynamic tensions hold a strong potential to stimulate a critical reflective dialogue as participants work to define and re-define their ideologies, social relations, and identities within their task-based collaborative process.

Nora, Carmen, and I brought to the group process our own identities and belief systems. Embedded in our individual identities and belief systems were our individual views, assumptions, and experiences of the world around us (Jeannot, 1994; Zacarian,
Further, as professional colleagues with varying experiences, we also brought to the group process our differing professional knowledge systems (Deketelaere & Kelchtermans, 1996). During the group process, the tension between our differing knowledge systems and personal experiences of Nora as a teacher, Carmen as a NLI, and myself as a researcher allowed us to engage in a critical dialogue and benefit from our "complementary competence" (Deketelaere & Kelchtermans, 1996) as we re-examined our professional values and judgements from new perspectives. The themes of these dialogues included critical reflection on professional values, routinized teaching practices, curriculum development, and university research. As such, the critical reflective dialogue became an integral component of all the phases of our collaborative group work as we engaged in our task of developing and implementing a culture-based thematic unit on Puerto Rico for a level II Spanish class.

Our team met eight times during the eight and a half months of this study. For the purpose of this discussion, the eight team meetings have been divided into two phases, the Planning Phase and the Implementation Phase.

The Phases in the Team's Meetings

The two phases used to describe the team’s meetings, Planning Phase and Implementation Phase, are based on a modified version of Walker’s (1971) “naturalistic

---

13Deketelaere & Kelchtermans use the term ‘complementary competence’ to define the differing yet equally important and relevant experiences and expertise of educationalists and experienced teachers from varying disciplines who are working collaboratively in curriculum development.
model”. Walker defines three phases in the process of curriculum development, Platform, Deliberation, and Design. He uses the term Platform to describe how participants present their individual platforms or belief and value systems in the initial process of curriculum deliberations. Included in this phase are individual beliefs about and visions of teaching. The terms Deliberation Phase and Design Phase are self-explanatory, with Deliberation referring to the phase of reaching agreement about policies and materials and Design referring to the phase in which connections are drawn among all of the agreed upon policies and material to form one design.

The approach to curriculum development of the team in this study mirrored Walker’s deliberative approach: a set of different, thoughtfully taken phases which result in a creative design of curriculum materials (Marsh, 1992, p. 112-115). As such, Walker’s model does provide a language to describe the team’s process over the eight and a half month duration of the study. However, it is important to note two limitations of his model as they apply to this study.

First, his “naturalistic model” presents a uni-directional approach to curriculum development that does not take into account the dialogic nature and co-occurrence of the three phases that often arise in group deliberations (Zacarian, 1996). The curriculum development process for this team was a collaborative endeavor in which we co-constructed knowledge and shared ways of thinking based on the continuous and “random” presence of our individual Platforms, Deliberations, and Design (Zacarian, 1996, p. 100). There were random and co-occurrences of one or more of Walker’s three phases in all of our eight team meetings. However, there was a concentration of their co-occurrences in meetings one through five which took place prior to the teaching of
the unit. Therefore, Planning Phase will be the term to describe the group’s first five meetings.

Second, Walker did not include implementation as a component of the curricular process. In this study, incorporating the implementation of the curriculum unit as part of the curricular process proved to be crucial. This culmination phase was pulled back and integrated into a cyclic process with the preceding three phases and had a powerful impact on the continued deliberations and the evaluation and restructuring of the initial curricular design. Further, this phase was instrumental in fostering a critical reflective dialogue since it tied the critical dialogue directly to the practice of teaching. Figure 1 shows the phases of the team’s curriculum development process. Specifically it shows (a) the relation of the implementation phase with Walker’s (1971) Platform, Deliberation, and Design phases, (b) the recursive nature of Walker’s phases, and (c) the relation of all phases to the critical reflective dialogue.

![Figure 1. Relationship of Phases in Curriculum Development](image-url)
The term Implementation Phase will be used to describe all of the group’s interactions during the delivery of the unit; meetings six through eight, pre-class meetings, phone conversations, and dialogue journal entries. The critical reflective dialogue evolved out of the team’s collaborative interactions during the Planning and Implementation Phases. In order to better understand the nature of the dialogue which emerged from these interactions, it is important to examine the building of the relationships between the members and the context in which these interactions dialogue occurred.

Forming the Curriculum Development Team: Building Relationships

Initial considerations

My interests to investigate the integration of culture into the FL curriculum evolved from my own extensive teaching practice as a FL educator whereas my desire to research the critical reflective dialogue of FL teachers emerged from course work and scholarly readings that were part of my doctoral studies program. In addition, as I became more familiar with the “power/knowledge differential” that often occurs between researcher and teacher (Ulichny & Schoener, 1996, p. 503), I decided that I wanted to engage in a research project that worked to diminish the dichotomy between the researcher and the researched. Ulichny & Schoener (1996) use the term “power/knowledge differential” to describe this unequal status and the resulting tension that this hierarchical positioning presents.
The power of the researcher derives from the differential status that the wider academic community gives to the researcher's work - producing knowledge about teaching - versus the status accorded to the teacher. While the power and the knowledge appear to reside with researcher in the eyes of the broader education community, it is the teacher who has the most knowledge of the setting under investigation. The tension that results from intimately knowing one's own classroom, yet feeling that one's knowledge can legitimately be by the researchers, creates a vulnerability that may shake a teacher's confidence in both teaching and knowing how to teach. This is the wedge that inserts itself in the practitioner's concept of self as a professional. It separates professional activity. (p. 503)

The research model that I chose to adopt for this project followed the major principles of a collaborative research model as outlined by Clemson (1990): common purpose, incentives, trust, shared vision, and representative diversity among the collaborators. Therefore, my first responsibility as a researcher was to design a study that would facilitate a more collaborative partnership between all participants.

As a FL professional for the past twenty-five years, I had experienced the shift in the profession's focus from grammar-translation goals to the present emphasis on communicative competence (National Standards for Foreign Language Learning: Preparing for the 21st Century, 1996). Concurrent with the development of the National Standards for Foreign Language Learning, Massachusetts in 1993 implemented significant educational reforms for its public schools. Two major components of this reform were the institution of a system of Professional Development Points (PDPs) for educators and the development of curriculum frameworks for various core courses which included FLs. I volunteered to be a member of a regional task force that reviewed the World Languages Framework periodically during its development. It was

---

14 This research project cannot be defined as 'collaborative research' since the participants did not engage in the interpretation or analysis of the data.
through that involvement that I became interested in the connection between alternative models for professional development that would tie into the state’s professional development requirements and the implementation of the World Languages Framework. I was particularly interested in how FL practitioners might address both curricular reform and practical classroom issues concerning the integration of culture into all aspects of the teaching and learning of languages. As I participated in this task force, I began to ask myself questions:

- What approaches to curriculum development might facilitate the integration of culture into the FL curriculum?
- How can native cultural perspectives be obtained?
- How can accessing these perspectives be tied to professional development?

The above questions led me to reflect on an approach to FL curriculum development that would have the potential to (a) permit access to an -emic, or insider’s, cultural perspective, (b) integrate this perspective into classroom activities and materials, (c) connect curricular reform with professional and personal development, and (d) create an environment for participants in the curriculum development process to engage in a dialogue that moves beyond a discussion of mere technical and practical FL curricular concerns to a critical reflective dialogue which challenges routinized practices and professional values (Tripp, 1993).

In an attempt to address these issues and my concern with the teacher/researcher dichotomy, I designed a collaborative curricular development approach with four main objectives:
1. Include a NLI as an integral member of the curriculum development team

2. Involve all members of the curriculum development team in the implementation phase of the curriculum unit

3. Incorporate a critical reflective dialogue into the planning and implementation phases of the curriculum.

4. Facilitate a collaborative partnership between members.

The selection of the participants

The selection of the CT and the NLI for this research project occurred over a period of time. Associations with colleagues, within professional and formal academic environments, was central to the selection process. Expressing my interests in cultural issues to FL colleagues in various professional settings, to classmates in my graduate courses, and to colleagues in other disciplines resulted in direct dialogue with those who held mutual interests or in referrals to other professionals who might be interested in similar cultural issues.

Mutual interests: a win-win situation

Nora was a volunteer member of the same regional task force as I that reviewed the World Languages Framework. Nora and I were acquainted with each other from previous, brief encounters at meetings of our local professional collaborative and state conferences and workshops. The most recent and consistent of these were the regional task force meetings. As we spoke to each other, we began to see that our questions, concerns, interests about the teaching and learning of culture, as well as our backgrounds, dovetailed.
The topic of integrating culture into the classroom was the theme of many of our discussions. I learned that Nora’s interest in culture went beyond just her language classes. She was a participant in a study circle in her school which was examining cultural diversity issues in the curriculum at Longview. I also learned that the student population at Longview Junior/Senior High School represented the ethnic, racial, and cultural composition of the community of Longview, where 98.4% of the population was white, middle class, and native speakers of American English. She stated that the lack of diversity both in the student body and community made it difficult for her to find “people” resources that she could call to help her answer questions on linguistic and cultural matters. She told me that her participation in the regional task force made her think that foreign language educators who teach in more diversified school districts had an “easier” time finding “real” people to use as resources since there would be faculty, staff, students, and community members whom the teacher could call.

In addition, in one of our conversations, Nora expressed concern over her own lack of ‘diversity’ and the impact that might be having on her teaching of culture. She explained that Mexico had been her main area of cultural expertise and interest. She claimed that her work with the task force and her involvement with curricular reforms at Longview made her question the effect her exclusive familiarity with Mexico might be having on her ability to interpret other cultures of the Spanish speaking world and to present various cultural perspectives to her students.

Nora also stated that she was seeking alternative models for professional development. She claimed that she was interested in a form of professional development that would go beyond the one-day workshop model and offer “a continual
support and feedback system” to her as she experimented with new materials, activities, and methodological practices, particularly in areas concerning culture. Further, she stated that she wanted to become involved in a venture that would challenge her on both professional and personal levels. From her perspective there did not seem to be “much out there” in terms of professional development that was geared for “experienced” FL teachers. She stated that as an experienced teacher who had attended “hundreds” of conferences, workshops, and presentations, she was not finding anything new or exciting in these forms of professional development. What she was looking for was something innovative to help her “keep up a strong momentum and excitement” in her teaching and to provide her with some insights into her teaching practices.

During one of our conversations, I explained my research interests and my need to find a site for my study. As we spoke, Nora stated that she had heard about research in the classroom and had found the idea “intriguing” and that she would enjoy working with me on my project and considered our relationship a “win-win situation” for both of us. In one of her journal entries she summed up her rationale for her decision to participate in this project.

I had heard about research in the classroom...and the idea seemed intriguing. This would be an opportunity for me to become involved in this type of project. I felt comfortable with Joyce. I thought it was a win-win situation. I realized that it would be some work on my part but I figured that I probably would end up with some materials which would be developed not only with my input but with someone else’s. In addition, I thought that perhaps it would provide me with some insight on improving my own teaching techniques and classroom strategies.

Thus, the seeds for the collaboration between Nora and myself were sown before our commitment to this project was confirmed. Our professional contacts prior to this study allowed us to share our platforms and provided us with opportunities to get to
know each other and to enter into this project with some degree of familiarity and comfort. Further, it was out of our early discussions that I was able to gain important information on the context of Nora’s learning community, her critical questioning on her practices of teaching culture, and her expressed interest for an innovative form of professional development. All of these matched the parameters for the context of my research.

**An authentic resource: making a difference**

As with Nora, associations with colleagues played an important role in fostering connections that led to the selection of the key NLI for this project. After Nora had decided to participate in this project, we discussed Puerto Rico as the cultural focus for our curriculum unit. With that focus in mind, I began my search for a NLI. I spoke to a friend who was the director of the ESL program where Carmen worked about my need to find someone to serve as a NLI in my research. She quickly recommended Carmen to me as someone whom she considered “bright, full of energy, and a great person to work with.” I immediately remembered Carmen.

Carmen and I met two years prior to this project in a graduate course at the university. As classmates, we often found ourselves as members of the same small discussion groups. Although our relationship was cordial and friendly, we did not stay in contact with each other after the course was finished. The next time we spoke was when I followed my colleague’s recommendation and called Carmen to tell her about my research and to ask her to be part of the curriculum development team.
Carmen remembered me and agreed to meet with me and Nora but did not immediately agree to become involved in the project. At the beginning of our first three-way meeting, there was an air of uneasiness in her speech as she struggled with the newness of her dual roles as NLI and a collaborative curriculum developer. Her concerns over the vagueness of her roles are apparent in the following excerpt.

**Excerpt 1**

Carmen: OK, I have a question. Question number 1: What is my piece in this research of you two working together? I want to know what is my piece. What is it exactly that I have to do as a NLI? Number 2: What is, contribution, my commitment, to your work? How much time will it take?...."

At this point in the meeting Carmen did not appear to include herself as a member of the collaborative partnership. She seemed to interpret my research and the future collaborative curriculum task as a single unit that belonged exclusively to Nora and myself. Note her reference to “you two working together.” As such, Carmen clearly positioned herself as separate and independent from the ‘Nora and Joyce’ team.

However, as the meeting progressed Carmen’s concern over having a precise definition of her role seemed to ease as she moved from a more distant attitude to an effective commitment to the project. During the last half of the meeting there were two significant changes that occurred. First, the focal topic of Carmen’s talk expanded beyond her personal concerns of her role in the project to one that included broader questions around the curriculum unit the team would create. Embedded in Carmen’s talk about the unit, there was also a noticeable shift in her pattern of speech. Carmen shifted from the use of the first person singular, I, as seen in Excerpt 1, to the use of the first person plural, we. Both the shift in her topic and the shift in her speech pattern are
evidenced in the following string of talk that occurred during the last ten minutes of this meeting.

Excerpt 2

781 **Carmen:** If we have a goal, what do we really want to get out of these ten weeks? What do we want the kids to get out of after we finish this ten weeks of work? What do we want them to accomplish? What do we want them to have and take with them after these ten weeks?

Carmen’s shift in her choice of pronouns was significant because it changed the dynamics of the interaction by realigning the social relations of the members of this speech community. Up to this point, the formation of a collaborative team that included Carmen was still a work in progress. Carmen’s shift to “we” signaled a re-thinking on her part. Posing questions that sought a collaborative dialogue, Carmen identified herself as a member in the collaborative team. Once this shift occurred, it remained constant until the end of the meeting.

At the end of this first three-way meeting Carmen agreed to join the collaborative curriculum development team and to serve as the NLI. She said that she viewed her role in this project as an important one and stated, not once but twice, her desire to come to Nora’s class.

Excerpt 3

872 **Carmen:** I would love to come to your class and talk to your kids and have them ask me all the possible questions and their ideas. I would love to come.

She hoped that her contribution as an authentic resource for the unit on Puerto Rico would serve as a way to help Nora’s students develop an understanding of and appreciation for cultural diversity. Carmen’s thoughts are reflected in her following journal entry.
I felt flattered to be chosen for this partnership because talking about my country and culture makes me proud. Moreover, having an American person genuinely interested in knowing about my background is quite impressive. 10/12

The nature of the meetings

All of our meetings during the planning and implementation phases were informal in nature. Their informality was evidenced by the free-flowing, spontaneous interactions between Nora, Carmen, and myself and the absence of any formalized, set agendas. Further, convening the meetings in comfortable surroundings, which included restaurants, libraries, and the homes of each of the team members, provided a relaxed physical environment which also helped to promote the informal character of our deliberative encounters. As such, we made our meetings partly a social event in which we could get to know each other better. In addition, these encounters could be described as ‘stolen moments’ of time, with each meeting time and place carefully negotiated to carve out time for our deliberations and to simultaneously incorporate ‘something else’ that at least one of the collaborators had to do.

Also, holding our meetings away from any of the individual schools where we taught also may have helped us to develop a more de-contextualized way of thinking about the curriculum unit both as a process and a product (Deketelaere & Kelchtermans, 1996). This is an important point to consider since it has been claimed that the professional knowledge of teachers is closely linked to the school context in which they are working (Deketelaere & Kelchtermans, 1996).

Moreover, convening meetings on neutral grounds and informal settings may have helped us to do more than de-contextualize our thinking with regard to curriculum
development. The neutral environment may also have helped us to critically reflect on, challenge, and recontextualize our preconceived notions on individual teaching practices, professional judgements, and cultural issues (Deketelaere & Kelchtermans, 1996; Tripp, 1993).

Therefore, it seems that the physical settings of our meetings helped to form their informal nature and provide a rich context for the evolution of our critical reflective dialogue. In addition, as the critical reflective dialogue emerged from this context, it became an integral part of the context. As such, the critical reflective dialogue became a strong, influential contributor to both the process and product of our collaborative deliberations. There were also two factors that contributed in significant ways to the process and product of our deliberations: the tension produced by a clash between Nora’s ‘traditional’ position and her ‘new’ position in the curriculum development process and the struggle that this tension produced as she worked to redefine her identity.

Conveyor of the Curriculum: Whose Unit Is this?

Nora struggled with two opposing ideological frameworks concerning curriculum development and her role within that process. On one hand, Nora first approached the curriculum development process and this research project with the idea that her role was limited to that of a “neutral presenter” of the “wisdom coming from the university.” Her conceptualization points to an ideological framework of curriculum development which casts teachers in the role of ‘conductors’ or ‘implementors’ of a
prescribed and predetermined curriculum. This framework is referred to as a traditional approach to curriculum development (Sears & Marshall, 1990). This approach is described as a linear process which positions teachers as passive conveyors of a curriculum, conduits through which curricular content is passed to the students (Deketelaere, & Kelchtermans, 1996 Sears & Marshall, 1990). As such, with this approach, teachers are in a marginalized position where they do not have control over curricular content. Rather, the curriculum is determined by 'others' who are usually considered specialists in the area of curriculum development.

On the other hand, Nora appeared to reject the passive role of merely being a conveyor of the curriculum and thereby seemed to reject the traditional approach to curriculum development. She positioned herself as one who wanted to collaborate on curricular change based on our common belief that Longview's Spanish II curriculum (a) separated language and culture, (b) did not include Puerto Rico as a target culture of study, and (c) did not address the stereotypes which many students held with regard to Puerto Rico. Her resistance to being positioned as a mere conveyor of curricular information was evidenced in her attempts to position herself as a co-collaborator in the curriculum development process. As she engaged in the dynamic process of collaboration, there was often a clash between the boundaries of her position in her 'passive' role as a teacher as defined within the traditional ideology of the curriculum development process and the parameters of her new position as a teacher with autonomy and control over curricular content. Her new position aligned itself with alternative approaches to curriculum development, of which collaborative curriculum development is a part. These differing positions were tension producing for Nora.
This tension can be seen in Nora’s struggle to define her identity as a curriculum developer within the team. This struggle evidenced during our fifth deliberative meeting. Nora and I co-constructed a web which had el Vejigante\textsuperscript{15} at its center (see Appendix H). During the process of developing the web, Nora wrote a ‘what I need to be doing list,’ based on her existing Spanish II written curriculum (see Appendices I and E respectively). When placed side by side, we noticed an exclusive attention to grammar on her list and to culture on the web. This dichotomy between the two curricula troubled Nora and she questioned whether the unit would “work”.

Excerpt 4

179  Nora: Do you think this is going to work? If I just go from that [pointing to the web]?  
181  Joyce: Why not?  
182  Nora: Ok. Sounds good to me.

Her question in line 179 suggests some skepticism on Nora’s part. It suggests that she was not completely convinced that developing a unit based on “just go[ing]” from the cultural information on the web would “work.” My “why not” question to her in line 181 did not prompt her to offer any rationale for her skepticism. Rather she replied with a superficial agreement in line 182. By agreeing with me and not offering a counter statement as to why the unit might not “work,” Nora positioned me as the expert with regard to being able to evaluate the instructional value of the unit. Also, by

\textsuperscript{15}The Vejigante is a character introduced into carnival celebrations hundreds of years ago. He is an example of the blending of African, Spanish, and Caribbean influences in Puerto Rican culture. During the carnival celebrations in Loiza Aldea and Ponce, the Vejigantes roam the streets in groups and chase children. The Vejigante’s costume is brightly colored and resembles a clown suit. He wears a full head mask which is also brightly painted and decorated with several horns (Fontanez, 1996).
positioning me as the expert, she simultaneously positioned herself as a ‘non-expert’ with regard to understanding how the new unit would ‘play itself out’ during its implementation.

At this point, what Nora was agreeing to, even if superficially, was to implement ‘my’ unit. Thus, she relegated herself to the position of a conduit, through which the curricular content would be transmitted to the students. Nora’s identifying herself as a curriculum presenter and not as a curriculum developer had set up a social relation between us that was hierarchical in nature.

However, Nora did not stay in her passive position as conveyor of the curriculum for long. Immediately after her ‘agreement’ she emphatically stated how she was going to approach solving the dichotomy of the two curricula.

**Excerpt 5**

187 **Nora**: I’m not just going do this [teach the unit on Puerto Rico] in isolation. I’m going to try and look at history and maybe in that I will, um, work in some vocabulary and certain structure. OK? That [way] they’re getting some grammatical practice ....

Her statement that she is not going to “just” implement the new curriculum in isolation is an explicit declaration of her proposed implementation strategy. By declaring to me her strong stand against the isolation of the two curricula, Nora also made explicit her desire for autonomy over the curricular content and not merely its implementation. In declaring her wish for autonomy, Nora takes the risk of defining her role within the curricular process to be more in line with one found in an alternative approach to curriculum development. This positional move afforded her more control and simultaneously positioned me in a role with less control by challenging my status as
the sole author of the new curriculum. The re-shaping of Nora’s identity as a collaborative partner and her emphatic statement of not teaching the new unit in isolation seemed to carry a warning or challenge to me: ‘I’m not going to do this in isolation, no matter what.’ Also, her new identity realigned the social relation to be more of an equal partnership and less hierarchical.

Nevertheless, despite claims of wanting status as a co-developer of the curriculum, there were signals that Nora was also struggling with how I would accept her ‘new’ status. Her struggle and certain uneasiness with her newly proclaimed role is seen by her attempt to ‘soften’ her challenge to me, in line 189. Nora’s “OK?” seems to be asking for my permission to take up her new position as co-curriculum developer.

Nora described her initial interpretation of her role in the curriculum development process during her exit interview. Her description seems to validate the interpretation that her initial conceptualization of her role was consistent with the traditional approach to curriculum development and that her position in that approach was a marginalized one. She stated that she had pictured each of us three collaborators as having very specific, compartmentalized “little job descriptions” and her job description did not include her as having “a lot of control” or being much of a “force” in the actual development of the unit. She had ascribed the authoring of the unit exclusively to myself and Carmen, in that order. As such, she positioned herself as a vessel of the curricular content and not an owner. Her “job” was not to question or contribute to the development of the unit, but to implement the product which Carmen and I created.
Excerpt 6

845 Nora: (laughing) I was going to be (laughing) the GREAT disseminator of
846 WISDOM coming from the UNIVERSITY (laughing). I don’t know why. But I
847 was going to be the magic disseminator into the classroom of all the wisdom
848 that you were bringing me from the university because you were going to help
849 me to integrate this cultural thing. .... I was just going to PRESENT them, [and
850 be] kind of a neutral presenter.

The “Experiment” and The “Guinea Pig”

Nora’s initial assumptions about academic research seemed to reflect both an
experimental research model and the ‘traditional’ educational research model. The
traditional educational research model has been described as a hierarchical, one-way
process in which the teacher is relegated to the passive position of ‘being’ researched
(Coles & Knowles, 1993). In this passive, marginal position, the teacher’s voice is
often silenced in the name of research (Gitlin, 1990).

During the planning phase and the beginning weeks of the implementation phase
Nora’s view of research as an experiment was evident in the way she often described
herself herself as the “guinea pig” or “work horse.” This initial conception of research
was also evidenced in the following excerpt taken from our fourth phone conversation
which occurred during the third week of the implementation phase. In this excerpt,
Nora described how she might have preferred to “play” with the unit first, before
becoming involved with Carmen and myself. In her description, she used several terms
which one usually associates with the process of conducting a scientific experiment:
“do[ing] a trial run, find[ing] out all the problems, get[ting] all the answers, mak[ing] a
listing, and run[ing] it a second time.”
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Excerpt 7

Nora: ...perhaps let me independently play with it [the unit]. Let me go out and get the answers to the problems that I encountered in the rehearsal. In other words, do my trial run and find out all the problems I had, all the questions that were asked, all the things that I did not have the background to do. Go do that rehearsal with my kids all independently and probably talking with you too about what is going on during that time. Then we make a listing. Then we work with our informant. Get all these things worked out things that didn’t work well and then run it again.

During her exit interview, Nora claimed that she initially saw herself has carrying the full responsibility for the ‘success’ or ‘failure’ of the our project.

Excerpt 8

Nora: I think maybe my perception of university research was that you people were, the people who were doing this research were the gods and they set up, they set up. It was like a laboratory experiment that you had to set up precisely. And I was just, I was just a facilitator of that thing. And that if one element of that thing, that laboratory experiment, didn’t go right because I screwed up, that your whole, your whole building blew up maybe? And that’s how I looked at university research.

Nora appears to remember a sense of a lack of autonomy and control in this early stage of the curriculum development process. Nora used the phrase “just a facilitator” to describe her initial perception of her position in this ‘experiment’. Her use of the word ‘just’ seems to suggest that she had narrowly defined her role as facilitator as one who would merely carry out the “experiment”, i.e., implement the curriculum, without much, if any, input into the design of the plan itself. In that role, Nora understood herself to be in a marginalized position with little or no control over what or how she ‘facilitated’ the “laboratory experiment” that the “gods” from the university had orchestrated. In this marginalized position, Nora was the ‘outsider’ in relationship to me, the researcher and representative of the university and the ‘new’ curriculum. Here, she identified me with “the people doing this research” and with that identity I
represented concept she had of “university research.” However, she also identified herself as an outsider who was willing to let me conduct my “experiment” in the “laboratory” of her classroom.

Nora’s description of “university research” as a “laboratory experiment,” which had the potential to not “go right,” suggests a thinking about research from a success/failure oppositional framework. As such, this framework reflects an all-or-nothing concept of the possible outcomes of the research and our collaborative efforts. This concept points to an understanding of research that is rooted in a scientific, experimental research paradigm. From this perspective, the results of an ‘experiment’ are polarized into two camps, success or failure and are evaluated at a specific point in time. This evokes an image of Tripp’s (1993) analogy of evaluating the Wright brother’s first flight.

To illustrate the point, Flynn took the problem of knowing when would have been the right time and what would have been the right method to evaluate the idea that aircraft should replace rail and ship for safe, cheap, fast, long-distance passenger travel. Suppose the idea had been subjected to evaluation on the basis of the Wrights’ flight, which was, after all, though to be the first true travel in a heavier-than-air machine. On the basis of their success, no responsible evaluator could have recommended further funding for the idea, even to the Pentagon .... Yet flying developed because it was not a single endeavour which could be submitted to a single evaluation. .... Each attempt was used for learning so that the next project began from an improved position. (p. xi)

Conclusions

It was seen that the building of relationships between the team members was an important component in the design success of this study. Further, it was seen that the
physical settings of our meetings helped to form their informal nature and provide a rich context for the evolution of our critical reflective dialogue.

It was found that Nora held the concept of curriculum development that followed the definition of the 'traditional' approach to curriculum development. It was also found that Nora's initial assumptions about academic research seemed to reflect both an experimental research model and the 'traditional' educational research model. Nora's initial conceptualizations of her roles in the curriculum development process and in the research process placed her in passive, marginal positions.

Chapter 6 and Chapter 7 will provide an in-depth analysis of the critical reflective dialogue that emerged from the communicative interactions of the collaborative team during the Planning Phase and the Implementation Phase.
CHAPTER 6

THE CRITICAL REFLECTIVE DIALOGUE: THE PLANNING PHASE

It would have been much different if I was working with another teacher on this unit and she went off to develop ‘X’ and I developed ‘Y’ and then we just exchanged activities. It could have been just adding new vocabulary on Puerto Rico to some old activities and never really taking the time to talk about why we do this or that. It’s the talk we had that did it. That’s what made the difference. The talk’s the thing. (Nora, phone conversation, 5/20)

Introduction

The critical reflective dialogue that emerged during this phase will be described using three distinct categories: (a) collaborative discussions on the shared scholarly readings, (b) Nora’s description of her learning community, and (c) collaborative discussions on the design of the curriculum unit on Puerto Rico. The theme of the critical dialogue during this phase centered on Nora’s critical examination of various aspects of her teaching practices. We will see that from the first planning meeting to the fifth, as Nora increased her focus on creating the day-to-day operational components of the unit, the less she examined her teaching practices. Further, the closer we moved toward the implementation phase, the more pronounced my role as ‘critical colleague’ became.

Researchers in education have argued that critical reflection is a crucial element in curriculum development and in the development of professional judgement for teachers (Gore & Zeichner, 1991; Hunsaker & Johnston, 1992; Kramsch, 1993; Liston
& Zeichner, 1987; O’Loughlin, 1991; Sears & Marshall, 1990; Tripp, 1993). In addition, it has also been claimed that teachers become better at reflection when they are allowed time and encouragement to engage in reflective practice (Beyer, 1984; Bullough, 1989; Hunsaker & Johnston, 1992; Tabachnick & Zeichner; 1984; Tripp, 1993). However, reflection, which does not include some form challenge to or critique of existing teaching practices, works to reinforce existing views and thereby limits the possibility for change (Tripp, 1993).

..Reflection does not take place in a social and psychological vacuum; so-called ‘objectivity’ is always partial because perception and thought are always contextualised and therefore limited. Reflection is always informed by a view of the world which is created by our culture, values and experiences. This forms a circularity that reinforces our existing view of the world; we construct our world through reflection, but how and on what we reflect is largely determined by our existing world view. It is this tendency which means that we have to do something other than merely reflect upon our practice to change it or view it differently. We first must change our awareness through deliberately setting out to view the world of our practice in new ways. In other words, to develop our professional judgement, we have to move beyond our everyday ‘working’ way of looking at things... (Tripp, 1993, p. 12).

Despite the valuable contribution to change that critical reflection may offer, teachers have little preparation in critically reflecting on their assumptions and beliefs. Further, practitioners are not encouraged to critically examine their teaching since the practice of critical reflection is commonly not part of the present institutional ideology for public school teachers (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Kramsch, 1993; Zeichner, 1992). As a result, critical reflection is often put aside when attempting to focus on the day-to-day operational components of teaching.
Integrating the Critical Reflective Dialogue: Where to Begin?

I have argued that the transformational shift in FL education to integrate culture into all aspects of FL teaching and learning demands a critical perspective in order to gain deeper insights into the implications of the pedagogical ideologies regarding cultural issues. In addition, I have posited that the notion of critical reflection in curriculum deliberation be extended to include critical dialogue interaction among collaborators. I proposed that a critical reflective dialogue performed within the context of collaborative curriculum deliberation has the potential to provide opportunities for involved parties to "challenge and transform existing social and political forms" (Giroux, 1991, p. 47) as well as to question their own routinized ideological practices (Tripp, 1993).

Therefore, my first challenge in this project was to address the practical application of this theoretical concept. One of the first issues I considered was, how can I integrate a critical reflective dialogue on culture into the process of collaborative curriculum development? That question precipitated an equally important second concern, how do I as a researcher facilitate this critical reflective dialogue so that it fosters a collaborative exchange of ideas between professional colleagues without devolving into an examination by a researcher? In my role as researcher, I wanted to establish a research stance which would not be distant from and seemingly analytical of Nora’s teaching practice. Further, since one of my goals was to foster a collaborative partnership between all team members, I felt it was important to attempt to build a relationship between myself as the researcher and the other two principal participants.
that was non-hierarchial in nature (Gitlin, 1990; Wasser Davidson & Bresler, 1996). I reasoned that one way to encourage such a partnership was to share material on FL theory and practice that would familiarize the CT and the NLI with my platform with regard to my professional ideologies and values. Yet I questioned how much written material to share. An entry in my log notes reveals an interesting tension that arose between my ideology of the role of critical reflection in FL education from my position as a researcher and my ideology of the same issue from my position as a collaborative peer and teacher.

I'm wondering how much material to give Nora. I don't want to overwhelm her, yet this is a collaboration and I want and value her comments on my thoughts and observations, etc. There's also the time factor to consider. This project creeps into the weekends, vacation times. Just how much time is one expected to donate? Once school starts, I know that a majority of a classroom teacher's time is taken up with classroom management duties (correcting quizzes, lesson plans, making up quizzes, meetings, committee work, etc.). That doesn't leave much if any time left over for the reflective aspect of this project. That part takes time, not only to write journal entries to me but to THINK. (4/3)

From this entry we can see that I was very concerned about 'overwhelming' Nora. Further, it seems that I was narrowly defining 'overwhelmed' in terms of the "time factor." Noticeably absent in this entry is any mention of a concern I might have about how to introduce or address sensitive, critical issues with Nora. My concerns as expressed here seemed to be rooted exclusively in technical and logistical matters, particularly around time. This is not to say that these concerns were not real, or unimportant, or unjustified. As a former FL educator in a US public high school, I was very much aware of the myriad of day-to-day operational demands that teachers have, both inside and outside of the environs of the classroom. Further, in nearly all of the meetings between Nora and me, the "time factor" was mentioned. For example, in one
of our meetings Nora stated that she was spending so much time on this project, that if she had children, she would “probably get accused of child neglect.” In addition, from my perspective as a researcher, I was concerned that if, in my zeal to build an equal status collaborative partnership, I overwhelmed Nora with ‘my’ theoretical material, she might decide to withdraw from the project because it interfered with her ability to attend to her day-to-day ‘job.’

Thus, despite my serious interest in and strong commitment to the belief that the integration of a critical reflective dialogue into the curriculum development process is necessary for FL curricular reform, my instinct was to place myself in the position of a teacher. In that position, I pushed to the background ‘critical think’ time by positioning it outside of the curriculum development process and making it secondary to the business of teaching; the “reflective aspect of this project” was something that would be done if there was “any time left over.” As such, I was placing a higher value on the technical and logistical aspects of “classroom management duties” and a lesser value on critical reflection. With this positioning, I was perpetuating the status quo that the practice of critical reflection is commonly not part of the present institutional ideology for public school teachers and is often put aside when attempting to ‘get the job done’ (Cochran-Smith, 1991; Zeichner, 1992). The fact that I found myself ‘caught up’ in the perpetuation of the status quo in my position as a teacher, despite my commitment to reform in my position as a researcher, supports Pajares’ (1992) claim of the “hardiness of beliefs and the difficulty of belief change” for teachers (p. 339).

The tensions that arose between the differing ideological stances reflected by each of these positions posed quite a challenge to me. Trying to keep a delicate balance
between my roles and identities as a researcher, collaborative peer and teacher was a challenge that surfaced in the early stages of this project and continued throughout. I often found that the complexity of the dual roles made me question how to represent and identify myself. When was I a researcher? When was I a collaborator? How do I, or should I, merge the two roles? Further, as previously stated, in my identity as an FL educator, I also found myself willingly, albeit unconsciously, drawn to the position of professional colleague with Nora. My struggle in dealing with finding the balance of my multi-faceted identities is again reflected in an entry from my log notes.

My role: I don’t know if I’m really being a researcher here. I feel more like a mentor, facilitator, coach, colleague. Is that what a researcher is? Nora runs her activity ideas by me and asks if they’re OK, as if for my approval. I offer suggestions. She doesn’t always follow them, and gives a reason why she thinks “X” wouldn’t work with this class. Usually we brainstorm a compromise. But I wonder if she thinks I actually KNOW more/better that she does, whether “X” is good or not? (Log Notes 10/8)

With regard to the critical aspect, I felt reasonably confident from my scholarly readings that critical moments would arise during the collaborative curriculum development process, particularly given the composition of the collaborative team, its task, and the context of the learning community for whom the unit was being developed. However, I did not enter this study with any preconceived ideas of how, when, or in what form critical moments would arise. In addition, as a researcher, I questioned whether I would be able to recognize a critical moment when it did present itself. My struggle with this challenge is revealed in the second paragraph of the same October 8 log note entry.
With Carmen, I’m lost. I would like to look at the input of the native language informant from a critical perspective. But to date, Carmen’s role seems to have been limited to ‘materials person.’ What’s critical in that? She had not contributed to the actual development or revision of the unit. Nora has met with her (without me) and has used her materials. I guess I was looking for a MORE critical component, whatever that is. Nora says she is becoming more culturally aware since she knew very little about Puerto Rico before this and would never have explored Puerto Rico if she weren’t involved in the project. What does that tell me? I guess the next step is, WHAT IS THE NEXT STEP? (Log Notes 10/8)

During the initial stages of the Planning Phase, I attempted to meet the challenge of how to integrate a critical reflective dialogue into the process of collaborative curriculum development with my decision to share material on FL theory and practice. I selected material that would familiarize the CT and the NLI with my professional beliefs and values in hope that such material would spark a critical dialogue between Nora and me. I addressed my concerns with regard to the quantity of material by selecting documents to share with my co-collaborators that (a) represented my views on the teaching of culture; (b) could serve as a stimulus for critical dialogue with regard to cultural issues, (c ) would help us all to reflect on our individual cultural awareness and sensitivity, and (d) would generate a discussion around our expectations of students with regard to the sociocultural component of FL teaching and learning. With these features in mind, I selected the following two items:


The primary resource was an extensive paper I had written as part of the requirements for my doctoral studies (Szewczynski, 1996). This paper was a comprehensive review of literature that explored the challenges of integrating “languaculture” (Agar, 1994) into the FL classroom in American Public Schools. Included in this paper were examinations of three theoretical constructs which I considered to be directly related to both the process and task of our collaborative team: Kramsch’s (1993) theory of critical language pedagogy, Bennett’s (1993) developmental model of intercultural sensitivity, and Damen’s (1987) pragmatic ethnographic approach to cultural inquiry.

I had given Nora a copy of my paper three weeks prior to our first planning meeting in order for her to better understand what influenced my thoughts on the topic and the design for this study. Further, I considered it an excellent forum for eliciting Nora’s platforms on the teaching and learning of culture in FL education for initiating a critical reflective dialogue on these same issues.

The sharing of academic literature on culture during this phase was not unidirectional. In addition to reading and taking notes about the material I had given to her, Nora had photocopied for me Hanvey’s (1975) article, *An Attainable Global Perspective*. She was familiar with this article from the curriculum work she had been involved with at Longview. She stated that she saw several parallels between the information I had discussed in my paper and Hanvey’s views on global education and cultural awareness.
By incorporating selected scholarly material into our collaborative process, I identified myself as a researcher in FL education who wanted to share my professional knowledge system and my ideological stance with Nora and Carmen. As such, I had hoped the open willingness on my part to share the knowledge from my academic world would facilitate a non-hierarchical social relationship among the three of us. Similarly, Nora’s reciprocal initiative of providing me with scholarly material identified her with me as a reader of scholarly literature. Further, this identity positioned her as a collaborator who was willing to share her own beliefs and knowledge. It appeared that Nora was defining her role as collaborative partner, from the perspective of ‘peer’ collaboration. For Nora, at this point in the project, identifying herself as my peer appeared to mean positioning herself with me as a reader of scholarly material. Further, this identity positioned her as a collaborator who was willing to share her own beliefs and knowledge. As a result, her action also worked to create a social relation between us that was less hierarchical in nature. In addition, this cross-sharing of material allowed both of us to make important connections between our differing professional experiences and knowledge systems.

The first meeting

This meeting took place at Nora’s home, with the first hour devoted exclusively to a page-by-page discussion of the contents of my paper. In preparation for our first meeting, Nora had read my paper thoroughly and had written notes on points she agreed with. As a result, our meeting was an intense two hours of sharing and exchanging of information about our professional values and beliefs and the changing role of culture in
FL education. In other words, it was a systematic exploration and presentation of our individual platforms. Nora’s views on curriculum reform in FL education were revealed in her affirming comments about my proposals and various theoretical sections of my paper. These comments came in the form of strong, intellectual agreements, “I love this; This is great; Good information here” and were often followed by a personal opinion.

Excerpt 9

Nora: [reading from my paper] “The learner is no longer a passive recipient of static cultural knowledge.” I like that statement. That’s great. I really like it because I think that this is traditionally how kids are [passive recipients] in school. ...I think that is were we need to be going in restructuring.

Nora’s agreement signaled her theoretical approval of my proposal and as such aligned her with my ideology on the teaching and learning of culture. Further, the contents of the paper seemed to allow Nora to directly connect her own practical experiences as an FL educator to the theoretical academic research in the FL profession. This connection positioned Nora in the role of a professional with practical experience who was able to offer an informed opinion about the direction of restructuring in the field.

Out of our discussion of these shared readings, Nora examined various aspects of her teaching practices. Her critical examination came in the form of questions. For example, in our discussion on the integration of culture, we talked about the challenges that the concept of integration posed for assessing students’ cultural proficiency. This topic seemed to serve as a trigger for Nora to critically question her prior student assessment practices.
Nora: This makes me think about assessment and how much of an influence over the years I have had. How well have I prepared my students?

Nora’s reflection was framed in a question (line 47). Framing her critical reflections about her teaching practices was present during this meeting and was a communicative pattern for Nora during our discussions of my paper. We can see evidence of this pattern in our discussion on the integration of culture of FL teaching. Nora voiced her agreement with a statement I had made in my paper: “The integration of culture into FL teaching means more than the presence of cultural information in the curriculum or daily lesson plans” (Szewczynski, 1996 p. 30). She claimed that this statement made her think about how she taught culture. However, she also stated that thinking about how she taught culture made her feel tense.

Nora: It’s making me tense. I keep thinking, how do I do culture? Do I do enough of it?

Nora’s honest and critical reflection on her teaching practices was also framed in the form of embedded statements which can also been seen in the following excerpt. In talking about the role of NLIs, Nora told of her familiarity with Mexico. She stated how important it had been for her as a cultural learner to have had friends in Mexico with whom she could interact, observe, and thereby ‘learn’. However, at the end of her story, Nora also expressed worry that her strong familiarity with Mexico might impede her ability to offer her students other perspectives about the cultures from other Spanish speaking countries.
Nora: [reading from my paper] “Native informants can be particularly helpful for teachers who are not sure how to interpret various aspects of the target culture.” I sometimes worry that I’m just interpreting them from what I know of my friends in Mexico. [I worry that] I’m just giving them [the students] a slanted view.

Nora’s “worry” about interpreting various aspects of target cultures seemed to have been prompted by her reading about the value of NLIs for FL teachers and she appeared to be identifying her friends in Mexico as NLIs. She also seemed to be questioning the validity of having cultural resources from only one Spanish-speaking culture. There is an embedded statement in line 144, that she is worried about giving her students a “slanted view” of culture based on her experiences with her “friends in Mexico.”

Nora’s understanding of herself as a teacher of culture became more evident when we filled out a questionnaire that was developed by the American Association of Teachers of French (AATF) as part of a report of the committee on cultural competence (see Appendix G). I selected this questionnaire because of its focus, “to define the consensus of foreign language educators on the nature and importance of the sociocultural component in foreign language learning” (p.12). As such, it required FL educators to reflect on what they consider important with regard to the cultural components of FL learning and teaching. In addition, I considered this questionnaire as a way to connect the discussion in my paper of Bennett’s (1993) theoretical model of intercultural sensitivity to practical classroom applications.

What was significant was not the individual numbers that Nora and I assigned to the various statements in the questionnaire, but the insight Nora seemed to gain about
her beliefs as a result of this process. The questionnaire seemed to serve as a catalyst for a dialogue which allowed Nora to identify and voice what she understood about her own beliefs and values regarding her teaching of culture. Further, the process allowed her to “see” the influence that her prior curriculum work at Longview was having on her reconceptualization of what was important for her to emphasize in the teaching of culture.

Excerpt 13

202 Nora: I think that having taken this, you know what I think I’m seeing in my own beliefs? I think that I’m seeing a lot of the influence of Global Horizons. And ... one of the first things you need to do is ... to get an understanding .... that it’s OK for everyone not to have the same perspective. [I’m also seeing that ] discrete facts are not that important to me.

I then asked Nora how she described herself as a cultural learner. In her response she called herself a “mimicker” and stated that it was important for her as a cultural learner to “observe and imitate people’s actions.” Further, she stated that she was a “mimicker” of what she had observed and heard over the years on her trips to Mexico.

Excerpt 14

214 Nora: I’m mimicker. I mimic in the sense that I use things that I’ve heard my friends in Mexico say. If I’ve seen it done. I observed it. Well, that must be what they do, and I’m going to do it and show the [students]. [For example],

217 when I was there and Mat was two years old, whenever Mom would want him, [she would say] “Correle, Correle.” So, I do that with the kids [students],

219 Correle. The last time I was in Mexico, the kids taught me the names of the fingers. They sat with me at the beach on day. I sit with the kids a lot because I can learn from them things I can usually use. So, I taught [what I learned] to the kids [students].

In defining herself as a “mimicker,” Nora presented her beliefs of what it means to be a cultural learner. Also, she was identifying herself as an American who understood Mexican culture because of what she had “observed.” As a result, she also
identified her students as understanding Mexican culture through her “mimicking.”

Further, it appears that for Nora, as a learner of culture, she needed to have contact with NLIs whom she could observe and “mimic.” Also, it seemed that Nora was defining her teaching of culture as an implicit act which presented itself in the form of her actions and speech in the classroom. It appeared that, for Nora, it was very important for students to see her, the teacher, ‘doing and saying’ what she had observed and heard from native speakers. As such, Nora seemed to place a high value on NLIs as an integral part of her own cultural learning process.

Further, Nora’s defining herself as a “mimicker” pointed to a conceptualization of culture that followed a behaviorist approach. This approach emphasizes the observable actions and events in a society (Steele & Suozzo, 1994) and it was her observations that Nora “mimic[ked]” for her students. That Nora defined culture from a behaviorist perspective and that her instructional behavior reflected this perspective seem to support two significant claims about the teaching of culture in FL classrooms:

1. that there is a relationship between a teacher’s conceptualization of culture and her understanding of how culture is acquired and her instructional practices on the teaching of culture (Robinson, 1985; Ryan, 1994);

2. that the behaviorist perspective to culture is one of the perspectives most often adopted by FL educators (Robinson, 1985).

The first three-way meeting: Nora’s description of her learning community

Nora provided Carmen and me with a rich description of her learning community during our first three-way meeting. First, she explained that prior to her involvement in this study, her primary cultural interest had been Mexico. She had
formally studied in Mexico, had friends who lived there, had visited Mexico several
times in the past fifteen years, and had organized six students trips to that country.

Excerpt 15

Carmen: Where did you learn Spanish?
Nora: Where? I learned some of it as an undergraduate in my minor, and once I
started teaching more and more Spanish, I picked up courses around the area and
then I started traveling. I picked up some of it in schooling in Mexico. Primarily
my interest has been in Mexico. We have friends there. We travel a lot there.
We’ve been going there for about 15 years now and that’s my main focus.

Nora went on to express her desire to learn more about another area of the Spanish¬
speaking population.

Excerpt 16

So this is going to be interesting because we are going go to be able go to get
some perspective on a different area of the Spanish-speaking world, I think.
That’s what I want to do.

She told us that her classroom discussions on cultural issues other than Mexico
were limited to the information found in the Lectura Cultural or cultural reading
sections which were included in each chapter of the Spanish II text. Further, Nora
claimed that while she was aware that the material in the culture sections of all the texts
was limited and dated, she often “didn’t take the time” to go beyond what was in the
book. She claimed that this was particularly true with regard to Puerto Rico since she
had never visited the island and did not know very much about its people and culture.

Nora also stated that the ethnic and cultural composition of the student body at
Longview Junior/Senior High School and of the town itself made it difficult for her to
form cultural contacts with native speakers from the Spanish speaking world, including
Puerto Rico. Thus, the study of Puerto Rico was not part of the Spanish II curriculum of
study at Longview and by its exclusion, it was not placed in a position of value.
Nora’s talk about her not taking the time to seek cultural information beyond what was in the texts prompted an open expression of her concerns about this particular aspect of her teaching. She was thumbing through the pages of the Spanish II text and stopped at a Lectura Cultural section which described what she called the “great culture of talking on the telephone.” What is interesting about her description was that the collaborative process seemed to provide a rich context which afforded Nora the opportunity to critically question her instructional practices with regard to teaching culture to include evaluating the authenticity of cultural information.

Excerpt 17

402 Nora: How do I do this? I just get so frustrated. The only way I can do culture is like this book, these little goodies at the end of every chapter. I read it and I think, well, is it true? Is it not true? I don’t know. I can relate to what I’ve experienced speaking on the telephone in Mexico, [but] I can’t tell them [students] what it would be like if I were in Puerto Rico.

In this excerpt, Nora identified herself as a cultural learner within the collaboration process. Her position as a learner is first evidenced in her question in line 402 “how do I do this?” With this question she defined herself as a full collaborator who was willing to openly state that she did not have all the answers. Puerto Rican culture had not been part of either her formal academic or personal experiences. Her critical questions in lines 404 further show her positioning herself as a non-expert with regard to her ability to evaluate whether the “little [cultural] goodies” in the book were accurate or not. Her identity as a learner was also seen by her statements that she “can’t tell [the students]” about Puerto Rico in lines 405 and 406 and her definitive claim of “I don’t know” in line 404.
In her role as a collaborator, identifying herself as a learner of Puerto Rican culture identified Nora as a non-agent in the curriculum development process. As a non-agent, she relegated herself to the position of a curriculum conveyor rather than a curriculum developer. This position within the curriculum development process reflects a traditional approach to curriculum development in which teachers are cast in the role of conductors or implementors of a curriculum developed by others (Deketelaere & Kelchtermans, 1996; Sears & Marshall, 1990). Further, Nora’s identity as a non-agent within the curriculum development process created a distanced and hierarchical social relation between the collaborators by placing Carmen and me in the socially distanced position of ‘other’, i.e., with ‘those’ who develop curriculum. In addition, Nora’s position as a learner and non-expert also worked to increase the social distance between Nora and Carmen by elevating Carmen to a high status position of a “true” Puerto Rican cultural authority.

Concerns over students’ stereotypes

During her description of the context of her learning community, Nora also expressed her concerns regarding the stereotypes of Spanish-speaking countries, including Puerto Rico, its culture, and people she claimed were held by some of her students at Longview. In addition, Nora questioned her success in her prior attempts at addressing the issue of stereotypes in her Spanish II classes. For example, she described feeling “very comfortable” teaching about Mexico. However, despite her efforts not to unconsciously reinforce stereotypes when she taught about Mexico, Nora claimed that many of her students often described Mexico as a “dirty, disgusting, place.” If she could
not eradicate stereotypical views of a culture she was familiar with, how would she fare teaching Puerto Rican culture, about which she admittedly knew very little?

She offered two reasons which might have influenced her students' perceptions of the Spanish-speaking world. First, she explained that there were very few minority students of any kind at Longview High School.

Excerpt 18

230  **Nora:** We have very few minority students.
232  **Carmen:** Oh?
232  **Nora:** I would say we had, have two or three boys whose either mother or father is Puerto Rican. .... But that's basically our connection with Spanish-speaking people or any other people. We have no Asian. We have no Cambodians.
235  We have no French, no Russian, nothing!
236  **Carmen:** Basically, a white school?
237  **Nora:** (Laughing) You really have to see it. This is a white suburban, I would say middle-class, lower middle to middle class school, with very little contact with people from other [worlds].

Nora also noted that the town of Longview was in close proximity to two cities with very large Puerto Rican populations. Yet despite this geographic proximity, she claimed that there had been no attempt either by her or the other Spanish teachers to forge connections with the Spanish-speaking communities living in these two cities. The lack of connection between the Spanish FL students and the nearby Puerto Rican communities seems to support the claim that there is frequently an insularity of FL language teaching (Haas & Reardon, 1997; Lotito & Perez-Erdelyi, 1988; Tedick, & Walker, 1996; Tedick, et al., 1995). Nora also claimed that in her opinion it was more difficult for FL teachers to initiate intercultural connections in a small, suburban school district whose student, faculty, and staff populations, as well as the community at-large, are neither racially nor culturally diverse.
Further, Nora stated that from her perspective the ethic and linguistic homogeneity of the community of Longview and the student body of the Junior/Senior High School afforded very few opportunities for her students to connect personally, either in a formal academic setting or in a broader, social setting, with any one who was Spanish-speaking. This lack of contact, she reasoned, might lead some students to have misconceptions about Puerto Ricans and their culture. She offered an example of the kinds of stereotypes she believed were held by her students and her reactions to these stereotypes.

Excerpt 19

480 Nora: As a matter of fact, just to tell you some of the stereotypes. If I brought the lady to school [who is Puerto Rican] from town who is just finishing up her last year of her medical residency at [X], she couldn’t be Puerto Rican. She works and she has a degree. I mean, their impressions are no one works and no one, no one would be smart enough to go to school. This is the idea [they have] and I hate it. I get angry.

Nora’s comments in line 485 seemed to indicate that she was thinking about her professional beliefs as she told us her feelings about the stereotypes held her students. Further, by stating that she was “angry” and hated the stereotypes held by her students, Nora was also supplying Carmen and me with very important information on her professional values. First, Nora’s emotional response strongly suggested that she considered the issue of stereotypes to be a serious dynamic in her Spanish II classes. Further, her comments indicated that she not only was aware of the existence of the stereotypes but also that she was against their presence. Second, her comments implied that she did not have a clearly defined idea of how she could get beyond her anger to address its cause. Carmen immediately responded.
Excerpt 20

486 Carmen: It’s very true because of the minority [issue]. What you want to do in the Spanish class is to make the kids aware of the contribution[s] of all the Spanish people to the American society because... it is the contributions of all these different cultures [that makes up] what it is to be an American.

In her response, Carmen appeared to interpret Nora’s expressed anger over her students’ stereotypes about Puerto Ricans in two ways. First, Carmen’s response suggested that she understood Nora to be looking for a reason or explanation for her (Nora’s) students’ stereotypes. Second, she seemed to understand Nora’s strong, emotional statements as an indirect solicitation for advice, what can I (Nora) do about this? Carmen acted on both of her interpretations by presenting Nora with a clear directive or ‘solution’ as to what Nora needed to do in her classes in order to address the issue of stereotypes.

The strings of talk in excerpts 19 and 20 reveal interesting dynamics in the social relations between Nora and Carmen. In excerpt 19, Nora presented herself in the vulnerable position of a teacher who did not know how to tend to what she herself identified as an important issue. Carmen sensed this and offered her a ‘solution’ in the form of a clear directive, “what you want to do is...”(excerpt 20, line 486). This directive elevated Carmen to a place of authority. Thus, there was a hierarchical positioning between the two women, with Carmen’s voice of authority arising from her dual role as an experienced professional colleague and as a NLI. Further, Carmen identified herself as a group member who (a) was willing to collaborate in addressing Nora’s dilemma, (b) felt confident that her contribution to the group was important, and (c) strongly believed that Nora could benefit from her (Carmen’s) experience as a teacher and a NLI.
Interestingly, Carmen’s authoritative role as a NLI contained an undertone of compassion for Nora as a teacher as well as for Nora’s students and seems to be consistent with the position of “compassionate authority” (Jeannot, 1997; Jones, 1993). Compassionate authority is characterized by “taking up the position of the other [and] having access to...knowledge of the agents involved in ...situations, of their particular histories, attitudes, characters, and desires” (Jones, 1993, p. 147). Carmen did not present herself as an ‘authority figure’ who analyzed and evaluated Nora’s accountability for the stereotypes of her students. There was a noticeable lack of surprise, blame, or outrage in Carmen’s comments. Rather, her response seemed to indicate that she understood the concept of students’ holding stereotypes as a ‘natural’ or matter-of-fact phenomenon. Nevertheless, her compassion did not relieve Nora of the responsibility Carmen felt Nora had as a teacher to address this serious issue. Carmen’s prescriptive ‘how to’ directive pointed to her belief that Nora needed to take charge and help her students examine their perceptions not just of Puerto Ricans, but of the much broader issue of “what it means to be an American” (line 489).

Collaborating on the design of the unit on Puerto Rico: a critical colleague

Nora and I began to shift our ideas about the unit into concrete plans during the next three meetings. We decided to develop a thematic-based cultural unit on Puerto Rico with the Vejigante celebration as a central core. There were two themes which emerged in our communicative exchanges during our process of designing the curriculum. First, during the concrete task of developing the activities, Nora appeared to have difficulty aligning herself (a) to my ideology of the need to include a critical
perspective in the curriculum development process and its resulting product and (b) to my understanding of what was critical. As a result, I assumed the role of a ‘critical colleague.’ In this role I brought my understanding of broader and more abstract issues to the forefront of our discussions. The following two scenarios, taken from our third and fifth meetings respectively, will serve as representative examples of these themes.

The third meeting

Nora and I were working on a whole class activity that would address the issue of stereotypes. Our intention was to begin the unit on Puerto Rico with such an activity in order to help students understand the concept of stereotypes. Within this context, Nora was also planning a related activity which aimed at flushing out her students’ prior knowledge and beliefs about Puerto Rico and its culture. She was intensely focused on making sure that both activities were structured so that they would supply her with facts, such as what foods her students associated with Puerto Rico and what they knew about the history of the island.

Excerpt 21

372 Nora: [I’ll] have the students brainstorm their ideas on what the island’s like, what the culture’s like, what do [they] think the foods are?
374 Joyce: What you’re saying is, find out what the students know.
375 Nora: OK, find out what they know.
376 Joyce: Right.
377 Nora: In other words, prior knowledge.
378 Joyce: That’s right.
379 Nora: OK. All right.

Nora and I appeared to be in agreement about the importance of the need to understand her students’ prior knowledge about Puerto Rico and its people. However, at this point, the prior knowledge Nora was asking for rested at the level of factual
information derived from the ‘little-c’ concept of culture. Further, at this point in the curriculum development process, this conceptualization of culture seemed to inhibit Nora from including a critical perspective in the activity planning process and in the activity itself. Our discussion continued.

Excerpt 22

380 Joyce: And then even find out, how do they know what they think they know?
381 Get them to think about where they got that information.
382 Nora: OK.
383 Joyce: Because I think that’s important, too. So maybe find out what they know and how they know it.
385 Nora: Where they got it.
386 Joyce: Where they got that information.
387 Nora: Which should be an interesting thing.

In my response, I introduced my belief in the importance of finding out not just what the students knew but also of having them think about their sources of information (lines 380 and 381). Nora’s comment in line 387 indicated that she considered my suggestion “interesting” but did not indicate whether she considered it “important.” I did not dismiss or devalue what Nora had proposed about having “the students brainstorm their ideas.” However, I did state that I believed the brainstorming session could and should be expanded to include finding out “how” the students received their information about Puerto Rico and “get[ting] them to think” (lines 380 and 381).

As we continued to plan the activity, our talk moved to a discussion about our expectations of level II Spanish students, most of whom would be sophomores. We were looking at a particular section of notes that I had taken at a conference on the

17 The ‘little-c’ concept of culture is defined as “those aspects of daily living studied by the sociologist and the anthropologist: housing, clothing, food, tools, transportation, and all the patterns of behavior that members of the culture regard as necessary and appropriate” (National Standards, 199, p. 22).
teaching of culture. In this section, there was a reference to the teaching of freedom in FL classes. Nora stated that she thought “these types of issues” could only be handled in a more “mature” class and presented her view of the limitations of Longview’s sophomores.

**Excerpt 23**

571 Nora: .... From my years of experience, I don’t think that you’re going to talk
572 about issues of freedom with sophomores, at least not with the average
573 sophomore.
574 Joyce: Immm.
575 Nora: You’re going to have a difficult time. They are still very concrete
576 at this level. I mean, at least our kids are. They can’t talk rationally about things
577 with you. So I think at level II you are going to have a real hard time doing
578 those kinds of things.

Nora’s reaction to this proposal was representative of her responses to my reoccurring suggestions of expanding the lessons beyond the presentation and solicitation of factual information. She presented a resistant stance to the suggestion of “talk[ing] about issues of freedom with sophomores” in her statements about having a “difficult” and “real hard” time “doing those kinds of things” (lines 575, 577, and 578).

Nora appealed to her experience to place herself in a position of authority (line 571). Although she did not state an explicit refusal to my suggestion, her message was not one of encouragement and she spoke from her position of authority in an effort to ground me in the realities of her learning environment. Further, Nora used her position of authority to express her resistance which came in the form of a directive, almost a warning to me. With that directive, she placed herself as an insider with valuable information that I needed in order to design a curriculum unit that would work in her particular learning community. As an insider, Nora positioned, me the researcher, as an outsider with limited knowledge of the context of her learning community. Note her use
of the pronoun “you,” meaning me, in all three of her references to who would have a
difficult time with the students (lines 571, 575, and 577). The implication was that I
alone would have a difficult time if I proceeded with the idea of going beyond “very
concrete” concepts, an idea which contradicted what her experience had led her to
believe about her students. From her experience, she believed that “most sophomores”
could not “talk rationally about things.” It is interesting to note that, in this exchange,
Nora focused on broader, more general cognitive limitations of her level II students at
Longview and not on their possible linguistic limitations in Spanish. Her comment in
lines 576 and 577 that “they can’t speak rationally with you” pointed directly to her
perceived understanding of the limited critical thinking capabilities of her students.
Nora then asked me a direct question.

Excerpt 24

579  Nora: Do you agree? Maybe it is too young?
580  Joyce: Imm. I’ve taught that age. Somehow I think we would need to get at
581       some of the higher cognitive skills.
582  Nora: Imm.
583  Joyce: I think they are capable of doing that. Also if we reduce it [culture] to
584       food and recipes, what we are doing is defining culture to those kinds of
585       artifacts.
586  Nora: Those kinds of artifacts, right.
587  Joyce: Imm.
588  Nora: But I go into leisure time activities and values.

I did not offer an explicit agreement or denial to Nora’s question (line 579).
Rather, I challenged Nora’s position as sole authority with regard to understanding the
capabilities of sophomores. Further, with that challenge, I resisted being placed in the
position of a researcher with limited experiential knowledge about the cognitive
capabilities of high school sophomores. In lines 580 and 581, I claimed my own
position of authority by stating that I had “taught that age” and that I thought that
students were “capable of doing that.” I, like Nora, appealed to my teaching experience as a justification for my position of authority. I phrased my desire to “get at some of the higher cognitive skills” by stating that that was something “we” would need to do. Including Nora into what “need[ed]” to be done sent an important message: it placed in the foreground my belief that our enterprise was still a collaborative one, despite our differing ideological positions.

In lines 583 through 585, I offered a second reason why I believed that “we” needed to incorporate more than “what” questions into our activity. I stated that we would be “reducing” how we “defin[ed] culture,” with the implication that what we should be doing was expanding the students’ thinking (and our own) about culture beyond “food and recipes.” With this discourse move, I functioned as a critical colleague and presented us, as co-collaborators, with a complex, multilayered challenge:

- a challenge to think about how “we” were defining culture,
- a challenge to think about how our conceptualizations of culture affected how we were conceptualizing our learners,
- and a challenge to think about how (a) and (b) affected our teaching practices.

In my position as a researcher, this challenge carried a certain legitimacy. Nora seemed to interpret this ‘collaborative’ challenge as a personal accusation by me about her teaching of culture and defended her teaching practices with an explanation of where she “go[es]” in her cultural teachings. By stating that she “go[es] into leisure time activities and values,” (line 588) Nora resisted being positioned as an FL educator who defined culture “to those kinds of artifacts” and sent the message that she did more than “reduce” culture to “food and recipes.”
In my role as critical colleague, I continued the push to expand the lessons beyond the presentation and solicitation of factual information. Also, in her response, Nora continued to show resistance to my suggestions.

Excerpt 25

589 Joyce: We need to start asking some of the why questions to get the students to think. Like, why do you think this way? And why do you think X. Why? Why? Why?
590 Nora: .... You’re going to have a difficult time. You are dealing with kids who don’t have the background.
591 Joyce: Imm.
592 Nora: I try to do deeper things with my 3’s and I get so frustrated that they cannot use any prior knowledge with [what we are] current[ly] doing.
593 Joyce: They can’t make that connection.
594 Nora: No.
595 Joyce: That’s something we can work on.

Nora appeared to interpret my statement as an accusation. Her resistance in lines 592 and 593 came in the form a directive that mirrored the directive she presented in Excerpt 23. Further, we again see Nora identifying herself as an insider in a position of authority and defensively positioning me as the distanced an outsider. However, despite her hold on insider knowledge, Nora seemed to feel a need to justify her directive (lines 592 and 593) to me and thereby provided me with further information as to why I would have a “difficult time” with her level II students. Her comment “I do try” was a move for her to save face\(^\text{18}\) in front of the ‘researcher’ by telling me that she did “try” to address the “deeper things.” As such, her comment seemed to mirror her own unease in “dealing” with the problem of ‘kids who don’t have the background.” My response (line 412) was neither a total acceptance nor denial of her evaluation of her students or

\(^{18}\) Goffman (1967) defines the term face as “the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact (p. 5).
her claims of having tried to incorporate higher cognitive skills in her practice. It also
did not propose a quick fix solution to the situation. Rather, it demonstrated that I
recognized her perceived concern as existing but not insurmountable. Further, my use
of the word “we” expressed my willingness to collaborate with her in working toward
addressing the challenge and thereby also my willingness to share in the responsibility
and accountability of the project. In doing so, I did not relieve Nora of her own
responsibility and accountability but invited her to join me in developing a solution.
That Nora and I continued the collaborative process, despite our differing ideological
stances and the tensions they invoked, spoke, I think, to the commitment that we both
had to work toward making the process, the product, and the project a success.

The fifth meeting

The fifth planning meeting was devoted to designing a complete outline for the
unit. A major part of our work was creating an initial curricular web (Appendix I).
Similar to our third planning meeting, Nora focused on topics which centered on either
the transmission or solicitation of concrete, factual information. These topics included
geography, products, cities, dances, and food. Also similar to our third meeting, I
assumed the role of critical colleague and tried to coach her to think beyond the level of
merely seeking information from or supplying information to her students. My role was
quite visible in the following exchange.
Joyce: What about looking at, I mean, one of our original concepts of looking at this is to look at some aspects of stereotyping.

Nora: Imm. Imm. [signaling her agreement]

Joyce: I mean, I'm wondering whether we might look at this (the web) from that perspective because perhaps unintentionally we [could be] present[ing] a stereotype that the kids have about Puerto Ricans.

Nora: Yeah.

Joyce: We may need to think of something about how to address things like that.

In this exchange, I assumed the role of critical colleague and made three attempts to coach Nora into a dialogue about examining our unit from the critical perspective of whether it was “unintentionally” presenting stereotypes. I did not explicitly express my beliefs about but framed them implicitly in the form of proposals or suggestions about what “we might look at” or what “we may need to think” about. Nora’s responses did not indicate opposition to my beliefs but did not go beyond superficial agreement. I made three more attempts to stimulate a dialogue on stereotypes and all three met with similar responses from Nora. It was not until my fourth attempt that Nora offered more than a single word response.
Excerpt 27

Joyce: I’m thinking that with high school students, some intercultural sensitivity, or something on stereotypes, needs to be involved in FL learning and learning about culture. That needs to be a precursor to this (the unit). But I don’t know how you feel about that.

Nora: Yep. We had talked about doing something with stereotypes. (Looking for notes) Um, a general activity, then [move] to a cultural sensitivity. (Reading from notes) “Statement put on board about Puerto Rico and students take a stand on how they feel.”

Joyce: That’s it.

Nora: (Still reading) “All people from Puerto Rico” and go from there.

Joyce: Yeah..

Nora: And then have students generate their own statements and ask them to identify which ones are stereotypical.

Joyce: So that they can then understand what a stereotype is.

Nora: Ok. I will work on an introductory lesson on stereotypes.

In this interaction, my speech pattern shifted, from implicit expressions of my beliefs (excerpt 26), to an explicit statement of what I believed. Nora’s “yep” (line 320) echoed her previous cursory responses, which I interpreted to mean her agreement with my stated beliefs. In my role as critical colleague, I again tried to push the discussion beyond the technical aspects of the unit. She resisted such a discussion. Only when the discussion turned to the concrete issue of lesson planning did Nora expand her participation in the dialogue to a more active form. This finding supports the claim that “teachers mainly think in terms of concrete class activities” (Deketelaere & Kelchtermans, 1996, p. 76).

Conclusion

We have seen that in the planning phase, platforms were revealed and a critical reflective dialogue emerged from (a) the collaborative discussions on the shared
scholarly readings, (b) Nora’s description of her learning community, and (c) collaborative discussions on the design of the curriculum unit on Puerto Rico. We have also seen that from the first planning meeting to the fifth, as Nora increased her focus on creating the day-to-day operational components of the unit, the less she examined her teaching practices. Further, the closer we moved toward the implementation phase, the more pronounced my role as critical colleague became.

However, it is important to note here that my role as critical colleague evolved out of the dialogic nature of my dual roles as researcher and collaborative peer, the combination of the theoretical and the practical. From my position as a researcher, I borrowed the critical component, which is inherent to the practice of research. This borrowing from the theoretical side, helped me to move my own thinking to a more critical position within the collaborative partnership. Also, for this project, I had two peer debriefers who functioned as my critical colleagues and from whom I gained a deeper understanding of the theory of critical thinking and its practical application to my own role as critical colleague. Further, my role as a researcher and critical colleague allowed me to step back and look at critical issues because, unlike Nora, I was not feeling the full pressure of facing the implementation of the unit. On the other hand, as a collaborative peer, I did have a vested interest in the practical application of the unit, its implementation. It was my position as a collaborative peer that allowed me to step back and realize the importance of the research before it was completed and while the critical component was still evolving.
CHAPTER 7

THE REPOSITIONING OF PUERTO RICO: THE IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

What do we do now? I’m not sure what I expected, but now we have to deal with what the students wrote. How can we just give these to Carmen? I’m not sure what to think. The students’ comments show very strong, stereotypical views of Puerto Rico. Yet, I think they also show that Nora’s students feel a strong sense of comfort or ease in her class to the point where they can express such views. Perhaps that comfort area is what will provide the space for growth? (Log notes. 10/3)

Introduction

In Chapters 5 and 6, we gained insight into Nora’s familiarity with the culture of Mexico and her admitted lack of familiarity with the culture of Puerto Rico. Further, we learned that the students in Nora’s Spanish II class were linguistically and ethnically homogeneous and had very limited contact with people from differing linguistic or cultural backgrounds including those from Puerto Rico. We also heard Nora’s claims that her students held stereotypes about Puerto Rico and Nora’s desire to address that issue. Thus, prior to this study, Puerto Rico did not hold a position of value or importance in the Spanish II curriculum at Longview Junior/Senior High School.

The new, collaboratively developed unit placed Puerto Rico in a highly visible position of status in the Spanish II curriculum. One of the major goals of the unit was to address the issue of stereotypes. Each team member brought to the group process her own identity and cultural belief system. Embedded in these identities and belief systems
were our individual views, assumptions, and experiences (Jeannot, 1994; Zacarian, 1996). Our multiple views produced tensions which arose out of our critical reflections and interactions on the issue of stereotypes as we worked to recontextualize the students’ and our own taken-for-granted or static, stereotypical views of culture (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992). The process of addressing the students’ stereotypes transformed all participants in this study, the collaborative team members and the students, in differing and significant ways. This chapter will provide an in depth analysis of the team members’ interactions as we engaged in the process of addressing stereotypes through the repositioning of Puerto Rico in Longview’s Spanish II curriculum.

Addressing Student Stereotypes: Initial Steps

The implementation phase of the unit began seven weeks after our fifth planning meeting. This phase lasted fourteen weeks and was signified by an emphasis on the teaching and continued collaborative planning of the unit. During this phase, Puerto Rico as the targeted area of study was repositioned in Nora’s Spanish II curriculum to a place of high visibility and status. The process of this repositioning transformed all participants in this study, the collaborative team members and the students, in different ways. A significant part of this transformation consisted of our (re)thinking about stereotypes.

As explained in the previous three chapters, prior to this study, Puerto Rico did not hold a position of value or importance in the Spanish II curriculum at Longview. Further, we learned that Nora’s Spanish II students were linguistically and ethnically
homogeneous, knew little concrete information about Puerto Rico, and had very limited experience with or exposure to people from Puerto Rico. Also, we heard Nora’s claims that her students held stereotypic views about Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans who lived on the island and on the US mainland.

Nora, Carmen, and I believed that presenting the students with a unit that integrated some aspects of the culture of Puerto Ricans living on the island together with information about the island of Puerto Rico itself (e.g., history, topography, geography, climate, flora, and fauna) would be an effective way to stir the students’ critical thinking about their initial (mis)conceptions and stereotypical views about the island and its people. It was important to us that we develop a unit that was intellectually stimulating, engaging, fun, and included innovative ways to present information and to assess the students’ learning. In designing the unit, we took into consideration several factors. These included (a) Nora’s teaching style and strategies, (b) the differing learning styles and strategies of her students, and (c) the institutional demands on Nora to cover the material in Longview’s Spanish II curriculum.

Our decision to develop a culturally-based, thematic unit on Puerto Rico with the Vejigante celebration at its core was also influenced by practical considerations. These included Nora’s own interest in learning about the celebration and Carmen’s stating that she (a) had material on the subject, (b) had taught about the celebration in her own classes, and (c), had personally participated in the celebration at two different times when she lived on the island, once as a child and once as a college student. (See Appendix I for the planning web for the unit and Appendix L for the outline of the unit.)

The unit, then, was not a unit on stereotypes per se. However, we strongly
believed that the unit we were creating and implementing would provide Nora’s students’ with opportunities to make connections between their (re)thinking about their perceptions of Puerto Rico and its people and their perceptions about the Puerto Rican population living on the US mainland. Nevertheless, we were also aware that providing the opportunity did not necessarily guarantee that connections would be made. We could not predict (nor did we even attempt to guess) what kinds of connections the students might generate. Our hope was that there would be some movement in the students’ thinking toward making these connections. As such, we also hoped that the product of our collaborative endeavor would serve as a beginning step in the movement toward eradicating the students’ stereotypic views.

Since our hunt for stereotypes was deliberate, we anticipated finding them. What we did not anticipate, however, was our reaction to them or the influence that the process of addressing stereotypes would have on each of us team members. This first section will describe our approach to identifying the students stereotypes and will provide a synopsis of our findings.

The questions

Based on the information that Nora had provided for Carmen and me about her learning community, we decided that a crucial component of the implementation phase of the unit on Puerto Rico would be to identify the students’ prior knowledge and feelings about Puerto Rico. As part of the introduction to the unit, Nora and I developed an activity in which the students were asked to write on the following:

(a) three statements that they felt confident were true about Puerto Rico, its people and culture
(b) three statements that they felt “pretty sure” were true about Puerto Rico, its people and culture

(c) three statements that they felt were common misconceptions or stereotypes

(d) three things they would like to know about Puerto Rico, its people and culture.

We believed that this activity would help us to see if the level II Spanish students for whom we were creating the unit did, in fact, harbor stereotypes about the culture and people of Puerto Rico and if so, it would also help us to identify what these stereotypes were. The following are random samples taken from several students’ responses which serve to illustrate the nature of the comments to each of the above four categories.

(a) They live off our hard earned American tax money. They don’t speak English well. They are poor, live in crappy sections of town, and don’t have great jobs. They live with their whole families.

(b) They don’t like Americans and like to drive expensive cars. Most are rude. They harvest crops and work on farms. They have dark skin and dark eyes and grease their hair.

(c) They all sleep on the beach. They lack education. They are violent, live off welfare, and belong to gangs. They all have tans.

(d) Why did they come here and hate us and then expect us to be nice? Why don’t they vote for the President? Why does Puerto Rico not want to become a state? I would like to learn more about Puerto Rican teenagers, about what kinds of schools they go to, what they do for fun, and basically what kind of life they lead.

The responses of the students support Nora’s claim that many students at Longview Junior/Senior High School held stereotypical views of the culture and people
of Puerto Rico. However, despite Nora’s awareness of the stereotypes and her having provided me with that information, both of us were quite shocked by the extremely negative nature of these responses. Part of our design of the unit included having Nora’s students engage in two or three journal exchanges with Carmen. These responses were supposed to be the class’s first journal entry for Carmen. We were concerned, deeply concerned, that Carmen might be hurt and/or offended by these responses to the point of deciding not to continue to collaborate with us on this project.

In a journal entry to me, Nora stated that she thought we, as a team, needed to address these misconceptions “head on.” We also decided to inform Carmen about the nature of the stereotypes written by the students prior to her receiving them. Nora wrote Carmen a journal entry that began with general comments about her feeling “good about the project” now that she was integrating ‘what she needed to be teaching” (grammar, vocabulary, etc.) with the thematic, cultural focus of Puerto Rico and the Vejigante celebration. The second part of her entry focused on ‘preparing’ Carmen for the students’ responses. In this stretch of writing we see evidence of Nora’s willingness to address this potentially volatile and hurtful issue with Carmen.

I am also writing to address some concerns that you may have about the students comments [that Joyce is sending you]. Please do not take them personally. The average high school student [can be] very cruel not only to his parents and teachers but also to his peers. During the course of the day the average student will say horrible things to even his best friends. I am often not sure if they [the students] are just repeating “cool phrases” or if these [comments] represent true feelings. These comments are coming from students whose only knowledge of others is from news stories and TV/movies. Just to give you an example. We had an exchange student from Colombia. Only some students talked to him. The others just went around saying that he was a drug lord. If they only could have realized how utterly stupid and ignorant they sounded when they said that. Please do not be upset about this. I think that this unit will help to dispel stereotypes and misconceptions. 10/12
Here we can see the dynamic interconnection between Nora’s role as a collaborative partner and her role as a teacher. As a collaborative partner, Nora seemed to feel an obligation to Carmen to soften the thoughtlessness of her students’ responses. As a teacher, Nora also appeared to feel a responsibility to try and provide Carmen with ideas about the students that could mitigate her feelings. However, in the process of providing Carmen with these ideas, she was positioning herself as a mature adult, a dedicated and experienced professional who was above stereotypes herself. Hence, in this communicative exchange, we see Nora attempting to balance her allegiance to three separate but interrelated interests, Carmen, her students, and herself.

Nora’s first two sentences speak to her concern about Carmen’s possible feelings. Her discourse indicates a professional stance as she gave Carmen a request to “please” not to take the students’ responses “personally.” As such, she made an appeal to Carmen to depersonalize their responses. Nora then offered an explanation for her appeal.

She rationalized her students’ responses by identifying them with the “average high school student” who she claimed could be “very cruel” to the people with whom s/he shared daily interactions, parents, teachers, and “best friends”. Placing parents, teachers, and peers together with Puerto Ricans as targets of cruel comments lessened the affront to any one particular group. The implication in her statement was that, although her students’ responses revealed strong stereotypes, they were just (re)acting as “average” students and, therefore, could not be held accountable for what they wrote. She strengthened her rationalization with a reflective comment that she was “often” not “sure” if these comments represented their “true feelings.” There is an underlying
message in Nora’s rationalizations, i.e., that she, as their FL teacher, could not be blamed for their stereotypical responses. In essence, she absolved everyone from all blame; her students could not be held accountable for their statements because they were just ‘being students’ and she, as their teacher, could not be held accountable because students behaving like “average students” was not something she could control. In this sense Nora, the teacher, aligned herself with her students as not ‘blame worthy.’ Further, this alignment worked to protect Nora’s professed identity as a FL educator who was dedicated to addressing the issue of stereotypes in this Spanish II class.

Nora’s identity as such a FL educator was also protected by a discourse move which distanced her from her students. Note her description of the students who labeled the student from Colombia as a “drug lord: “how utterly stupid and ignorant they sounded.” Her use of the words “utterly stupid and ignorant” suggests an evaluative stance with which she distanced herself from students. In that distanced position, she identified herself not only as a teacher who was aware of her students’ stereotypes but also as a person and professional educator who believed that those who expressed stereotypical comments sounded “stupid and ignorant.”

In Carmen’s reply to Nora she thanked her for the “background” information and spoke about her feelings as she read the students’ responses. Carmen’s expressed “thank you” validated Nora’s decision to write to her prior to our sending the student responses. Carmen further validated Nora’s decision by stating that she “need[ed] to know” this information.
Thank you so much for filling me in with the background I need to know about your students. When I read the students’ responses, my feelings moved from anger to sorrow. I’m so proud of you and your effort in teaching language and culture in such a generous way. Whatever they get, it will be a real learning experience. Ultimately, they have the right to believe what they want. 10/15

From this reply we learn that Carmen was deeply affected by what she had read. Her claim that her feelings of “anger” moved to “sorrow” suggests an emotional reaction from her position as NLI and her identity as a Puerto Rican woman. However, her controlled, calm discourse indicate a more professional than emotional voice. In her move from one emotion to another, Carmen distanced herself from her identity as a NLI and aligned herself more closely with her identity as a professional educator. This positional shift foregrounded her professional status. Further, it was a distanced stance that allowed her to detach herself from her more personal and emotional reactions of “anger and sorrow” and depersonalize the students’ responses. In doing so, Carmen seemed to take up Nora’s appeal to “please” not take the responses “personally.” Carmen made a choice between her identities as a NLI and an educator and for this encounter she chose her professional identity from which to speak. Moreover, with this choice she aligned herself with Nora and succeeded in creating a communicative exchange between two professionals which was marked by her use of their common teacher discourse.

Carmen also acknowledged Nora’s “effort in teaching language and culture” and made a magnanimous gesture by telling Nora how “proud” she was of those efforts. In this discourse move, Carmen identified herself as a professional colleague who recognized that another professional, Nora, was taking on a tough challenge. In addition, by her acknowledgment of Nora’s efforts, Carmen defined her social relation
with Nora as one of peers, an understanding fellow teacher and a collaborative partner. It was from her position as a co-collaborator and social peer that Carmen absolved Nora of blame by praising her.

Carmen’s last two sentences provide us with some interesting insights into her professional ideology, which was presented in the form of an acknowledgment that one unit on Puerto Rico could not ‘fix’ the social problem of Nora’s students holding stereotypes. First, speaking from the voice of a teacher, she stated that “whatever” the students “get” from the unit would provide them with a “real learning experience”. Her use of the word “whatever” suggests that, as a teacher, she believed that not every student needed to “get” the same things in order to have a “real learning experience.” In addition, she stated that students “have the right to believe what they want.” With these two sentences, she revealed her beliefs that (a) teachers are likely to encounter student resistance to transformation of thought that would eradicate stereotypes, (b) not all students will experience complete transformation, (c) students’ thinking about stereotypes will be stirred and (d) that one unit on Puerto Rico cannot ‘fix’ the social problem of stereotypical thinking.

Discussion

In the interaction between Nora and Carmen, Nora positioned herself as a collaborative partner in order to promote collegiality and collaboration with Carmen. Nora focused her concern on how Carmen might react “personally” as a representative of the culture that the students had stereotyped so negatively. Erickson (1996) claims that interactions are often political or symbolic constructions of social identity in a
culture and as such signify members from non-members. He coins the term ‘situational comembership’ to describe the common social identity shared by members that is “fortuitously (and sometimes strategically) made relevant in a given encounter” (p. 296).

In our joint decision to have Nora write to Carmen, Nora and I identified ourselves as collaborative peers and comembers of two groups. First, as members of the dominant culture, we shared the commonality of being non-NLIs. Second, we were both ‘members’ of the group of FL educators. In turn, we identified Carmen as a non-member of both groups. As a NLI she was not a member of our cultural group and as an ESL teacher she was not a member of our professional discipline. The co-identities that Nora and I shared simultaneously pushed to the foreground our commonalities and our differences with Carmen. As such, Nora and I socially distanced ourselves from Carmen. Further, our desire to ‘prepare’ Carmen for the students’ responses could be viewed as a move to ‘protect’ Carmen. In that sense, Nora’s communicative exchange also situated Nora and Carmen in a social relation as collaborative partners that was a hierarchical in nature. Nora placed herself in an authoritative position of power over Carmen by her conceptualizing Carmen’s identity solely from the role as NLI. As such, restricting Carmen’s identity to that of a representative of the minority culture, Nora situated Carmen in a weakened social position.

Davies and Harre (1994) posit that the term role ‘serves to highlight static, formal, and ritualistic aspects” of encounters (p. 43). Our limited and static perception of her role as a NLI was a consequence of our constructing her identity solely from the perspective as a Puerto Rican woman. Focusing on her identity as the ‘other’ in the role of a NLI blinded us from thinking about Carmen from multiple perspectives and the
myriad possible contributions that she could bring to the process and product of our collaborative efforts. Carmen entered the collaborative team as NLI and her identity in that role was what ‘spoke’ to Nora and me in this interaction. From the perspective that our perception of Carmen’s role and identity was over-simplified, Nora and I had stereotyped both the role and the person who filled it. Even as Nora and I were engaged in the process of consciously working toward transforming students’ thinking on stereotypes, we were not able to see our own perceptions as stereotypical. That we did not, at this point, view Carmen from multiple perspectives, despite our focus on stereotypes, speaks to the complexity and pervasive nature of stereotypical thinking.

Moreover, Nora’s and my perceptions of the role of NLI brought to the foreground the cultural distinctions between ourselves as native speakers of American English and members of the dominant culture and Carmen as a Puerto Rican informant and member of the minority culture. More importantly, it pushed to the background the professional commonalities between the three of us which transcended those distinctions. As such, attention was not directed toward the mainstream discourses that Carmen as a professional educator shared with Nora and me. As representatives of the majority culture, Nora and I had drawn what Erickson (1996) calls a cultural “border” around the role of NLI. With regard to cultural differences, Erickson posits a distinction between culture as a border and culture as a boundary. A cultural border refers to “differences that are politicized” within which those who possess the cultural trait are “relegated to a position of disadvantage in power relative to those who do not possess the trait” (Erickson, 1996, p. 294). However, a cultural boundary is identified as a “cultural difference, ...the difference is recognized as an identifying marker that is not politicized;
It has no relationship to difference in the distribution of power or advantage between two
groups (p. 294). Cultural boundary, then, refers to difference conceived of as neutral
and non-judgmental.

Carmen's response to Nora indicates her critical reflection on her identity as a
collaborative partner and her social relation with Nora. In her response, she chose to
minimize her identity as a NLI and to foreground her identity as an educator. We see
evidence of this through her use of teacher discourse. With her identity as a
professional educator, Carmen showed resistance to being perceived solely as a NLI and
to the 'border' (Erickson, 1996) that Nora and I had drawn around our cultural
differences. As such, Carmen's resistance and subsequent expanded identity worked to
allow Nora and me to transform the cultural border we had constructed around the role
on NLI and Carmen to a boundary. This shift from 'cultural border' to 'cultural
boundary' assisted all of us team members in increasing our understanding and respect
for our differences and commonalities while being involved in our quest for innovative
solutions to the complex issue of stereotypes. In addition, this shift also affected the
dynamics of the social relations between the members of the collaborative team. Seeing
each other as peers with complex identities helped to promote a less hierarchical and
more collaborative social environment.

These findings have important implications for FL educators and educational
researchers. For those who choose to incorporate NLIs in a collaborative curriculum
development process, the findings at this point indicate that NLIs may contribute to the
collaborative curriculum process at multiple levels. Further, the findings suggest that
including NLIs in the implementation phase should provide communicative
opportunities for all parties to engage in a critical reflective dialogue that moves beyond mere technical and practical curricular concerns. In this study it provided collaborative members with increased opportunities to gain a deeper understanding of the complex issues of stereotypes from multiple perspectives. Since the decisions that teachers make help to shape the social realities for their students (Kramsch, 1993), I am making the claim that FL teachers need to critically examine their assumptions of their own beliefs and ideologies with regard to prejudice, discrimination, and stereotypes as well as examine those of their students.

Also, these findings seem to support the claim that Hispanic Americans in the United States often are victims of stereotyping by non-Hispanic Americans (Ovando & Collier, 1998). Most significant here is that these findings indicate that FL educators and researchers, not just students, can partake in the stereotyping of Hispanic Americans. Finally, the findings to this point display evidence that analyzing the discourse of collaborative curriculum team members can yield important information about the transformation of researchers and educators as they engage in thoughtful, critical dialogue regarding cultural issues.

The next step: Carmen’s response to the students

The topic of ‘what to do now’ was discussed at our seventh team meeting, a three-way meeting held during the third week of the implementation phase. Carmen suggested that rather than writing individual responses to each of the students, she would rather write one letter to the class and have each student receive his/her own copy. (See Appendix K.) She began her two paragraph letter by stating that the student
responses were “far from reality.” Using the language directly from the students’ work, she listed the misconceptions. She also used the students’ words in addressing some of the “facts” about Puerto Rico. In this paragraph, Carmen used the professional voice of a teacher and NLI who had factual knowledge to present to the students. In the second paragraph, there is evidence of Carmen’s progressive shift from her initial distanced social stance as a teacher and NLI to one that is in closer alignment with Nora’s students.

I hope by the end of your unit some of your concepts could be clarified and supported by facts. What you must remember [is that] “there is good and bad in everyone.” This is a line from one of my favorite “oldie” songs, “Ebony and Ivory.” When we don’t know much details about something or just speak from a particular experience we don’t always get the global view.... To be honest with you, I don’t like greasy hair either, and I’m glad none of the people I know, grew up with and met during my life in Puerto Rico greased their hair.

In this exchange, we see Carmen’s efforts to help the students transform their cultural borders to boundaries (Erickson, 1996). Nora’s students had voiced their understanding of cultural difference in a highly politicized way through their stereotypical responses. Just as Nora and I had placed a border around the role of NLI, the students had erected a border around the culture and people of Puerto Rico. In her response, we can see Carmen’s attempts at dismantling their border as she worked to stir their thinking to be more in line with looking at differences in a less judgmental manner. Her discourse indicates that her strategy in this endeavor focused on positive social interaction with Nora’s students by trying to bridge three gaps that distanced her from the students, culture, age, and status.

In her opening sentence, Carmen stated that she “hope[d]” the students’ “concepts could be clarified and supported by facts.” This statement carried a very
important underlying message about her beliefs as a NLI and as a teacher. In her opinion, the students’ conceptions were misconceptions and not based on facts. However, what I find interesting is that Carmen chose to wrap her opinion of the students’ stereotypical responses in positive, encouraging language. Her language allowed her to express her opinion from her knowledgeable perspective as a NLI and a teacher without the use of evaluative language. Thus, through her choice of non-evaluative discourse, Carmen was able to call attention to (a) the students’ lack of knowledge, (b) her “hope” for their improved position as cultural learners as a result of their experience with this unit, and (c) her own identity and status as a NLI and teacher. Further, her choice of discourse simultaneously allowed her to attend to her overall objective of building a positive social relation with Nora’s students.

In her second sentence, Carmen’s energies focused on bridging the status and cultural gaps between herself and Nora’s students and quoted a line from “one of her favorite oldies;” there is good and bad in everyone. This communicative act served as an appeal to the students’ and her own sense of ‘general’ knowledge about what “must” be remembered. Further, her discourse reflects that of a teacher talking to students. Her choice of the word “remember” positioned Nora’s students as already aware of the knowledge, i.e., not ignorant but rather capable of remembering what they have undoubtedly learned.

Her use of the word “you” (you must remember), while directed at the students, included a broader audience. As a result, Carmen’s directive “you must remember” seemed to carry a message for everyone, including herself, with the word “you” invoking the general meaning of ‘one.’ Thus, with this discourse move, Carmen had
aligned herself with Nora’s students. This alignment worked to minimize their social and cultural distances by moving to the foreground their shared status as people who ‘must remember’ that ‘there is good and bad in everyone.”

In her next statement, Carmen referred to the song Ebony and Ivory and one of her favorite “oldies.” Here she again minimized the social distance between her and Nora’s students by attempting to bridge the ‘generation gap.’ Stating that she considered the song an “oldie,” she claimed a youthful identity with the students, someone, who like them, was familiar with the song but certainly did not regard it as contemporary.

We can see Carmen’s continued efforts to position herself with the students when she talked about the difficulties in not “always get[ting] the global view.” Note her use of the word “we” two times in the sentence. Her discourse shifted from the general, impersonal third person form of ‘you’ that she used in the second sentence, to the still general, but more personal first person plural form of “we.” This shift signaled a strengthened alignment with the students; all of ‘us’ have difficulty seeing “the global view” when “we” do not have the “details” or are familiar with only “a particular experience.”

In her final sentence, Carmen addressed the students on a very personal, informal level. She created a story-line (Davies, 1993) through which she : (a) addressed and disclaimed one of the students’ stereotypes about Puerto Ricans, (b) presented herself as a NLI who shared a common feeling about a particular aspect of personal grooming, and (c ) supplied the students with “facts” in an effort to clarify their “concepts.” She referred to their claimed dislike of “greasy hair” and stated that she
was being “honest” and did not “like greasy hair either.” With this statement, Carmen positioned herself in alignment with the students’ view by calling attention to their common dislike of “greasy hair.” She followed with a claim that during her life in Puerto Rico, she did not “know, [grow] up with, or [meet]” anyone who “greased their hair.” Here she spoke through her identity as a native of Puerto Rico whose experience countered the students’ stereotype.

Carmen’s closing sentence expressed her desire to meet the students and also emphasized her willingness to join them in their cultural journey about Puerto Rico by answering their questions.

Espero poder conocerles y contestar cualquier pregunta que puedan tener. Buena suerte con el Español. Hasta pronto. (I hope to be able to meet you and answer whatever question(s) you may have. Good luck with Spanish.)

Discussion

Carmen’s progressive shift from her initial socially distanced position as a teacher and NLI to a stance that was more in social alignment with Nora’s students worked to build a positive social relation with the students. In her transition, she emphasized the commonalities between herself and the students without denying their differences. As such, her social alignment with the students was a type of invitation for them to join her in a critical reflective dialogue that promoted understanding, tolerance, and mutual respect across their differences (Burbules & Rice, 1991). Krampsch (1993), claims that as participants in a critical dialogue co-explore cultural differences and similarities, their dialogue can serve as “a means of entering another person’s frame of reference and developing cultural and social awareness” (p. 244). Thus, while inviting Nora’s students to join her in a critical reflective dialogue, she was offering to join them
as a co-explorer of their cultural differences and similarities with a goal of working
toward careful, respectful, non-dominating cultural understanding (Burbules & Rice,
1991). Further, placing herself with the students as a cultural co-explorer minimized the
hierarchical social positioning that is often accorded in school settings to those who are
deemed to hold greater knowledge and power.

Reconceptualizing Identity: Carmen’s Perspectives

Carmen found reading the students’ responses on stereotypes and composing the
reply letter to the class to be two very powerful transformative experiences. Together
these experiences were crucially instrumental in creating the opportunity for her to
reconceptualize her identity as a collaborative team member and her role as an agent in
helping to address the issue of stereotypes for Nora’s students. She also found that her
participation in this collaborative endeavor sparked an intrapersonal inquiry into her
identity as a Puerto Rican woman that included a critical look into her culture, values,
and traditions.

Carmen’s identity as a collaborative team member

During her exit interview, Carmen dramatically described these experiences.
She began with a reflection of her conceptualization of her “role in this [project]” at the
time of receiving the students’ responses. She stated that until the time that she received
the students’ responses, she had identified herself from the position of a collaborative
partner and teaching colleague and not from the position of a NLI. However, she
claimed that reading the students’ responses made it “very hard” for her to “clear” her mind from her cultural background and identity as a Puerto Rican woman.

Excerpt 28

101 Carmen: At that moment I was thinking about my role in this [project]. I entered in the role of [a] collaborative partner and teacher. At the time I received these [responses], it was very hard to clear my mind from my background and my identity. So, I moved from the teacher and partner to become the Puerto Rican woman. And I think that’s when I first felt sad....

The students’ responses stirred a shift in Carmen’s initial conceptualization of her identity as a collaborative partner from being one that was culturally ‘neutral’ to one that was influenced and shaped by her ethnicity and status as Puerto Rican woman. The responses did not allow Carmen to isolate or push to the background her identity as a Puerto Rican woman and thereby define her identity from a culturally neutral position. Rather, the responses collectively served as a ‘critical catalyst’ first, by exposing to Carmen the interdynamic and multiple layered nature of her identity as a collaborative partner, teacher and Puerto Rican woman and second, by confronting her to re-examine the influence of her multiple layered identity on her role as a NLI. In the following excerpt, we see further evidence of Carmen’s awareness of the complexity of her identity as she described how she moved “from one feeling to another” and “from one role to another” in order for her to meet her “need to answer [the students in an] educational [way]”.

155
Carmen: Then the word ‘ignorance’ came to my mind as I was reading. And that’s when I felt so sorry. And then I realized that it was not ignorance. It is just the reference that the people have in Nora’s class that they think that way. It was a prototype and that’s all they had. So, how to judge people based on the real information they have or their experience if they don’t know any more? So, I said “I need to answer them [the students] in a way that is educational, but at the same time clarify some of the misconceptions that they had.” I went back to the role of just being the collaborative partner and not being so much of the Puerto Rican woman. Even though I knew that I was answering from the Puerto Rican woman perspective.

In lines 106 to 110, Carmen attributed the students’ stereotypical responses first to their “ignorance” and then to their point of “reference.” As such, she posed to herself the possibility that their responses might not be due to a question of deep-seated anger or resentment but rather due to their limited experiences and exposure. It seems that that possibility played an important role in her ability to shift away from her identity as a Puerto Rican and move toward her identity as an educator and “collaborative partner.” Indeed, Carmen did claim to have gone “back to the role of just being the collaborative partner”(line 113). However, when Carmen acknowledged that she knew her answer to the students was “from the Puerto Rican woman perspective,” she gave evidence of her awareness that she could not be “just” a collaborative partner. I followed by asking whether she was consciously aware of her shifting from one role to another or from one emotion or if “it just happen[ed].” In her reply, Carmen claimed that, while her anger was a “subconscious” reaction to her “pain” and “hurt,” she was very consciously aware of her “need” to keep her anger and hurt feelings in check in her letter to the students.
Carmen: Well, I think that the anger feeling was just subconscious. It was basically a reaction to the pain and the hurt of whatever I was reading. And then I needed to process what they said and say: “OK. This is not about Carmen Perez. This is about what the people see Puerto Ricans are and what Puerto Rico is like.” And this second piece [the second paragraph of the letter] was [written] more on the very conscious level in a way so that it was not showing any hurt feelings. I disconnect[ed] from that hurt I had. I had to go through that process of moving from one feeling to another, moving from one role to another.

Tensions arose between Carmen’s complex identity as Puerto Rican woman and as a collaborative partner and teacher (lines 119 and 120). These tensions placed her on an emotional roller coaster as she moved from one feeling to another. There was a distinct contrast between what she felt when she identified herself from the perspective of a native of Puerto Rico (line 118) and when she shifted her identity away from “Carmen Perez,” the Puerto Rican woman to be more in line with Carmen Perez, the collaborative partner, the professional, the teacher (line 123). It is interesting to note that, it was her struggle with the complexity of her identity that helped her in her “very conscious” choice to “disconnect” from the pain and hurt that she felt in her identity as a Puerto Rican woman (line 119). Her struggle and subsequent choice to disconnect herself from the students’ comments allowed Carmen to reflexively position herself in a distanced position, which in turn allowed her to be more “objective” in her attempt to write “clear points” and not “create more of [the students’] misconceptions.” As we see in the following exchange, this was not an easy position for her to maintain yet one which she felt was extremely important in order for her to do her “job” in “this partnership.”
Excerpt 31

Carmen: I was very conscious about what to write and how to say it because I wanted to have clear points and not have any more misconceptions or create more of anything. So I think that letter was more than just answering [the students’ responses] or commenting on the information or points of view. It was more the aspect of: “If I say ‘this’ or ‘that’ would that create more of their misconceptions?” And I didn’t want to create anything else. I think what really helped me was constantly reminding myself what my job was here in this partnership. So if I could constantly say, “This is what it is about,” that really helped me.

Here we see further evidence of how Carmen’s struggle helped her to reconceptualize her identity. The students’ responses placed her in a position which (a) called her attention to the interdependent and dynamic nature of the multiple layers of her identity and (b) forced her to (re)examine the influence that each of these layers had on each other. Further, these tensions played a positive role in helping Carmen in her efforts to find a balance that allowed her accomplish her “job.” However, finding the balance, did not necessarily mean that Carmen could clearly define or easily separate the various layers of her identity. Nevertheless, as we concluded our discussion, she claimed that this “wonderful experience,” of shifting from “one [identity] to another” and being “three people at once,” “somehow” allowed her to be become “deeply” involved in our collaborative endeavor.

Excerpt 32

Joyce: Did you have to keep on reminding yourself, working with us, what your role was?

Carmen: Well, I switched from being a teacher, from being the informant, from being the Puerto Rican woman, so I was all these three people at once. And somehow when we were working together, somehow I was able to manage [shifting] from one to the other without even knowing it. (laugh) It was the most wonderful experience that I had because I never thought I could be able to go from all these roles at once and be involved so deeply.
Carmen’s identity as Puerto Rican woman: an intrapersonal inquiry

Carmen claimed that her participation in this collaborative endeavor sparked an intrapersonal inquiry into her identity as a Puerto Rican woman that included a critical look into her culture, values, and traditions. She described this inquiry as a “journey back into her culture” in which she experienced an “awakening of herself and her roots.” She spoke of this experience three times during the course of the project. The first occurrence was in a phone conversation during the first week of the implementation phase of the unit and emerged from a discussion we were having on how she viewed her role as a NLI when Nora asked her to look over specific lessons in the unit. In this exchange she spoke very passionately of her “emotions” and feelings of being floresciente (reborn).

Excerpt 33

Carmen: I was the colleague, looking at the lesson plans and not judging what people said, probably in a more general way. So, I didn’t feel like, ‘Don’t do this” or “Don’t do that” because I think something can be looked at in different ways. [Just] because I’m a native informant does not mean I’m the sole, whole, knowledge of Puerto Rico. I am just one perspective of the culture and how I see it, how I experience it. And that’s all I can bring to her (Nora).

Joyce: But you felt that really happened when you and she were working together on some of the issues? [You felt] that you were able to bring your perspective, a unique perspective?

Carmen: Yeah. And it really helped me to go back into my culture, to go back. It was like a lot of feelings and emotions. And re-evaluate my own beliefs and values. I went back into my culture and said: “Yeah, this is important for me.” And for whatever reason being in this culture for so many years, I haven’t been able to (pause), it was like (pause), um, floresciente

Joyce: Blooming

Carmen: Yes. Born, re-born, somehow.
Carmen referred a second time to her intrapersonal inquiry in her November eleventh journal entry. This entry mirrored her thoughts on her personal journey that were expressed in the above excerpt. However, we also see a deeper level of Carmen’s inquiry when she critically questioned her previously taken-for-granted views of her culture. Further, she expressed that “through the course of this project” she realized “how important” it was for her to “reconnect” with her roots and “re-discover” her culture. From this perspective, her entry presented itself more as a reflective journal entry than a dialogue journal entry.

Being away from direct contact with my country/culture has been somewhat damaging. I have realized through the course of this project how important it is for me to make an effort and re-connect with my roots. Many things I have forgotten, others are within me. My country is in constant changes and my memories might just be part of a past that probably doesn’t exist the same way at this present time. Some of what I call traditions perhaps are that in the life of today’s Puerto Ricans. I should embark on this endeavor of re-discovering and finding out about today’s culture in the Puerto Rican’s life. (11/19)

During her exit interview, Carmen again spoke about her cultural journey that was sparked by her participation in this “special” endeavor. She explained the how this endeavor created a in her a “need” that went outside the boundaries of the project to a very real, personal “need to spend Christmas in Puerto Rico” after thirteen years.

Excerpt 34

413 **Carmen:** And I think that what really made it special was because I was
414 working in partnership developing a unit about my country and my culture. I
415 was never asked before in my 13 years here in the United States. I have never
416 seen anyone interested to know, so I think that is why I got so involved. Well,
417 you know, after we worked together, it was the first time in 13 years I went to
418 spend the holidays in my island. And I have to thank this partnership because I
419 never even thought about it.
420 **Joyce:** That’s really something.
421 **Carmen:** I had this need that I had to spend Christmas in Puerto Rico.
Carmen’s visit to Nora’s class occurred during the thirteenth week of the unit. The purpose of her visit was to multi-fold. First, Nora, Carmen, and I thought it was important for the students to be introduced to the third member of our collaborative team and meet in person the author of the letter to the class. We thought that this personal encounter would minimize any mystique that might have existed about the person who read their comments and responded to them. Second, since the students had limited prior exposure to Puerto Rico and its culture and people, we three felt that it was equally important to provide students with, what would be for them, a unique opportunity to pose any questions they might have directly to a native language informant. Third, we considered Carmen’s visit one more opportunity for students’ to make connections between their (re)thinking about their perceptions of Puerto Rico and its people to their perceptions about the Puerto Rican population living on the US mainland. In other words, we considered it an important step in the process of addressing the students’ initial stereotypes. Carmen’s reflections on the purpose of her visit in her exit interview capture the essence of our intentions.
Carmen: I wasn’t thinking about, “OK. This is my opportunity to teach these kids exactly what it is like.” I wasn’t there to change their minds, because I knew that one person talking was not going to really change the way they thought. But I thought [that] it would give them an opportunity and exposure to another perspective that will help them analyze their perspective better and then maybe go back into what they thought. And probably this experience could have some kind of an impact on their new perspective. I thought maybe that they’ll be able to talk about this woman who came to class and I thought that it was going to help. I thought that [this experience] is very different from reading books, the experience of learning a language or learning a culture from reading books or watching a movie. Having a live experience at any level makes a big difference. And I thought that [my] coming to the classroom and having the kids receive information about a country [that] they’re studying from a person who is native from that country would maybe help them clarify some of their questions or misconceptions.

The day before Carmen’s scheduled visit, Nora told the class that ‘Ms. Perez,’ the woman with whom she and I had developed the unit was coming. Nora also told the students that she expected them to ask Ms. Perez questions. To encourage their participation, for homework, Nora asked them to prepare three or four questions. The personality of the class, which Nora and I had observed to be very outgoing and energetic, led us to be optimistic that the students would indeed engage in a lively dialogue with Carmen. However, Nora, Carmen, and I found the students’ behavior during Carmen’s visit surprisingly and disappointingly subdued. We felt this way even after we took into consideration the different class structure planned for the visit and the expected ‘polite,’ comportment of the students with a visitor in the room. A brief synopsis of the unit and the students’ activity level up to the time of Carmen’s visit will provided the necessary context to better understand the dramatic difference between what we had anticipated from the students during Carmen’s visit and what had actually transpired.
The unit consisted of a large number of activities which required active student participation that often included physical movement. The majority of class time was devoted to students working in small groups, comprised of two to four students. Often these groups were assigned to complete two or three different activities within a designated time period but were allowed the flexibility to select their initial activity. All of these activities were structured to encourage student-to-student communication. As a result, the classroom buzzed with students voices as they worked to complete their tasks.

Many of the whole class activities required physical movement of the students around the classroom. For example, in one activity that occurred early in the unit, students were given a piece of paper that indicated a particular geographic location in Puerto Rico. The student that had ‘San Juan’ was asked to stand in the center of the room. The other students were then instructed to create a ‘living’ map of the island by placing themselves in the correct geographic positions in relation to ‘San Juan’. In another activity, the students learned the chant of the Vejigante and paraded around the classroom chanting and shaking their homemade vejigas. (Yes, high school students did this.) The unit also included several less physically active lessons. The students watched three videos on pertinent topics. These included the history of Puerto Rico, the legend of the Vejigante, and an instructional video on how to make a Vejigante mask.

Neither Nora or I described this class as reserved or quiet. The students were very energetic, spoke openly, and responded positively to the high participatory structure of the daily activities. Taking into consideration what we all had understood to
be the personality of the class, Nora and Carmen decided on the following format for the
day of Carmen’s visit: Carmen would provide a quick, general introduction to include
where in Puerto Rico she lived, when and why she came to the mainland and then she
would discuss her personal recollections of the Vejigante celebration. Carmen had
planned to speak no longer than ten minutes. The rest of the class time would be
devoted to engaging in a dialogue with the students based on the questions they would
pose.

What surprised us, then, was not their expected quiet, polite demeanor for their
guest as she spoke, but that the students did not actively participate in an interactive
dialogue with Carmen, despite repeated invitations to do so. In her introduction,
Carmen told the students to “feel free” to interrupt her at any time to ask her questions.
No one did. Carmen also paused four times during what had turned into more of an
informal lecture than a dialogue and directly asked the students if they had any
questions. No one spoke. There were only four student-generated questions during the
forty-seven minute class period and all four were asked during the last ten minutes of
the class.

- What’s the point of the *Vejigante* if he just scares little kids?
- What’s the weather like?
- Are people trying to make Puerto Rico a state?
- What are the stereotypes in Puerto Rico of the people in the US?

Out of these four, only the last one, posed during the last five minutes of the
class, dealt with a critical issue that we had hoped would be the content of the majority
of questions. In addition this question was the most pertinent with regard to helping us meet our objective of stirring students’ thinking about stereotypes.

The content and timing of this one, critical question merits discussion. The question echoed the questions in the lesson on stereotypes that Nora had presented as an introduction to the unit (see page 143). However, the student’s question had reversed the position of who was harboring stereotypes about whom. As such, the question also had reversed the position of who was being expected to divulge delicate and potentially hurtful perceptions of a culture. Thus, the student’s question placed Carmen in the same uncomfortable position that the students themselves were in when they were asked to talk about stereotypes of Puerto Rico. Just like the students were positioned by Nora, Carmen was positioned by the student to talk about some potentially hurtful misconceptions and stereotypes directly to representatives of the cultural group to whom the stereotypes were directed. Also, the question indicated that the student identified Carmen, not as a Puerto Rican woman, but as the NLI for Puerto Rico. Thus, Carmen was placed in the authoritative position of speaking not just for herself but for Puerto Ricans as a whole.

It is important to note here, however, some important contextual differences between the students’ and Carmen’s positions. The students were asked to write their comments as a homework assignment, which gave them time to think about their responses. In addition, the context of the students’ position afforded them a certain degree of anonymity on two fronts. First, because their comments were in written form, they were read privately by Carmen without the students being present. Second, at the
time they wrote their comments, they had not personally met Carmen and, therefore, had not established a personal connection.

In contrast to the students, Carmen was positioned to respond spontaneously, within a very limited time frame, and without anonymity. Further, she had to respond to a question that was the most relevant to one of our main objectives, knowing that there was no time for an extended dialogue. Carmen did, however, have the benefit of reading the students comments and of working through her feelings as a NLI before this classroom encounter. She also knew that the students had read her letter.

Posing this question was as enormous a risk for the student to ask as it was a challenge for Carmen to answer. This was a student, and the only student, whose question had placed a visiting teacher, a friend of her Spanish teacher, an adult, and a Puerto Rican in a delicate position. Up to this point, her sole contact with Carmen was via a distanced position though her letter to the class. Before posing her question, she had ‘known’ Carmen for only forty-five minutes. Yet, during that short time frame, she appeared to have felt a level of comfort with Carmen that allowed her to take the risk. Although Carmen only had the time to formulate a quick answer, she did respond.

Excerpt 36

50 Carmen: Well, some people think that they are the most wonderful people, 51 hospitable, helpful, progressive. All the positive things. Others think, ‘Yankee 52 go home.’ Just like people here say the same thing [to Puerto Ricans], ‘You 53 don’t belong here.’ So, I cannot say that everybody thinks the same way.

Carmen’s use of impersonal, collective nouns and pronouns, such as “some people” and “others” (lines 50 to 52), placed herself in a distanced position from the Puerto Rican population whose views she was asked to represent. Only in her concluding sentence in line 53 did she display her personal opinion from the perspective
of her own individual identity. Carmen chose to first mention all the “positive things” that “some” Puerto Ricans on the island think of people from the mainland. In doing so, she placed those who were part of the mainstream US culture (to which the students belonged) in a very positive light. Then, in an interesting discourse move, she placed the two seemingly opposing cultural groups, in the same position when she likened the feeling “Yankee go home” which she claimed was held by some Puerto Ricans to a similar feeling, “You don’t belong here” which she claimed was held by some people on the US mainland.

The student’s question and Carmen’s response held the potential for opening the door to a critical, interactive dialogue. Unfortunately, time afforded us only a flashing glance at the one thing we had hoped would transpire. The very few questions posed by the students, the fewer non-critical questions, and the subdued nature of the students made us wonder if and in what ways the students were connecting Carmen’s visit and their studying of Puerto Rico in general to the issues of stereotypes. This issue is discussed in the following section.

The Students’ Critical Reflections

The repositioning of Puerto Rico in the Spanish II curriculum proved to be a significant, positive factor in transforming the initial stereotypes of the culture and people of Puerto Rico that were held by Nora’s students. The influence that the repositioning of Puerto Rico had can be seen by comparing the students’ responses to questions on Puerto Rico that were written on the first day of the implementation phase
to the students' assessments of their initial responses that were written as a culminating activity of the unit.

Nora and I gave the students their original responses at the end of the implementation phase of unit. We thought that their own responses would serve as a tool with which they could reflect on and assess their own progress in identifying and hopefully minimizing their stereotypical conceptions of the culture and people of Puerto Rico. Also, we reasoned that comparing the 'before and after' student responses would be one way that we could evaluate our own success at meeting our goal of addressing and shifting students initial stereotypical views. We hoped that by examining the students reflections we could gain important information on if and in what ways the students had made connections between their studying of Puerto Rico and its people to their perceptions about the Puerto Rican population living on the US mainland.

On the last day of the unit, Nora returned to her students their original responses and asked them to write for homework how they felt about their early responses. Seventeen out of the twenty-three students in the class turned in the assignment. Out of the seventeen students who responded, fifteen students, or 80%, indicated that they felt their feelings had changed dramatically over the course of the unit. There were two common themes that emerged from the students' second responses. First, although expressed in various ways, it was clear that the majority of the students considered meeting Carmen in person and having a chance to listen to someone from Puerto Rico talk about various aspects of Puerto Rico as the most significant factor that influenced a change in their attitudes and feelings. This is a significant finding for FL educators who are involved in exploring innovative approaches to curriculum reform that include
critical issues. Nora, Carmen, and I expected to see the students involved in active participation with Carmen in the form of asking questions and subsequently engaging in a critical dialogue. When the students’ actions during Carmen’s visit did not meet our expectation, we were disappointed and questioned the importance of the visit in terms of its role in stirring students’ thinking about stereotypes. We had narrowly defined student learning and making connections with active, voiced student participation. However, despite their quietness and seeming non-engagement, the students’ critical reflections revealed that what they felt helped stir their thinking about stereotypes was not the opportunity to ask questions to a NLI, but to listen to a NLI. This finding dramatically points to the learning potential in “legitimate peripheral participation,” a term used by Lave & Wenger (1991) to describe observation (and listening) as a legitimate form of participation for learners. Had we not given the students their original statements and asked them to reflect on them, there is no indication that we would have been aware that any connections had been made by any of the students. What is significant for FL teachers in this finding is that it highlights the need for teachers to be aware that students may act differently than expected when asked to deal with hard issues, such as stereotypes. Also it is important for teachers to be aware that a seemingly lack of student enthusiasm or active participation does not necessarily indicate a lack of learning. Therefore, if learning can occur ‘under the surface,’ it is crucial that teachers explore creative and alternative ways to assess this domain of student learning.
Second, it was also apparent that the students' found learning general information about Puerto Rico, such as the history of the island and its relationship to the mainland, to be an important contributing factor in changing their beliefs not only about Puerto Rico about also about the Puerto Rican population living on the US mainland. One student wrote that she enjoyed being presented with "new things" that she had not considered "important" until given the opportunity to study them in this unit. The following is taken from one student’s reply. I selected this text because it serves as a representative sample of the students’ responses. However, I also chose this particular response because of the unique, personal nature of the last sentence. For this student, it appeared that the unit on Puerto Rico offered an opportunity not only to gain new information but also to critically reflect on and make connections with what he was learning in class to a very personal experience involving his friendship with Manuel and Ana.

I feel I believed Puerto Ricans were all gang bangers and all lived in the ghetto. But of course I was totally wrong. Many Puerto Rican people are very cultured and religious which surprised me. I also thought Puerto Rico was all jungle, like many of the Central American countries. But they have cities like San Juan and Ponce. I suppose my views of Puerto Rico shouldn’t have been even close to what they were because Manuel and Ana are some of my good friends.

Addressing stereotypes was a major objective for our curriculum. Our goal was to stir student thinking in an attempt to dispel the misconceptions on the Puerto Rican population who live in the US mainland that Nora’s students held and to stir critical thinking about stereotypes. It seems that, for this group of Spanish II students, studying about Puerto Rican culture and history led to not only an appreciation of the culture of

19Manuel and Ana were brother and sister and the only two students of Puerto Rican heritage at Longview Junior/Senior High School during the time of this study.
Puerto Rico but, for at least one student, also led to an increased understanding of the Puerto Rican minority who live in the US mainland and about whom the students held stereotypes. Thus, it appears that, through the repositioning of Puerto Rico to a status of value in the curriculum, we were successful in reaching our goal. As Nora stated in her exit interview, “we’ve taken a first step.”

Excerpt 37

390 Nora: I think that we broke the stereotypes. .... I mean, I think we’ve taken a first step. Obviously there’s a lot further to go, but I have not heard the stereotypes at all from that group [of students] after our unit. Never.

Nora’s Critical Reflections on Stereotypes

The multidimensional design to curriculum development used in this study was a dialogic one, in which the process of the development of the curriculum played an integral role in its own product (McCutcheon, 1995). The process and product interacted with each other as Carmen, Nora, the students, and I co-constructed new knowledge not only about the teaching and learning of culture but also about our personal selves and each other. For Nora, the interdynamic nature of the repositioning of Puerto Rico in her Spanish II curriculum, collaborating with Carmen and me on the design of the curriculum, and addressing her students’ stereotypes “head on” all worked together to offer her unique opportunities to think anew about her own attitudes, beliefs, and needs as a teacher and learner of Puerto Rican culture.

The topic of Nora’s future needs as a cultural learner of Puerto Rico emerged for the first time during our last meeting. At the time of this meeting, Nora was in at the
mid point, the seventh week, of teaching the unit. We were talking about the integration of culture into the curriculum. Nora claimed that teaching this unit made her “realize the value and the excitement” of the “connections” that were possible in a content based unit. She further added that she enjoyed the idea of “not just teaching the language in isolation” and liked the “languaculture” (Agar, 1994) concept. From her perspective, at this point in the implementation phase, she felt that the “traditional way” of separating language and culture would have been “incredibly disjointed.” Nora then explained what she had expected from her participation in this project with regard to her “understand[ing]” of Puerto Rican culture.

Excerpt 38

996 Nora: [I believed] that I was going to come out and really, really understand
997 more of the Puerto Rican [culture], and I do, I think, to some extent, but for
998 some reason I think that I still have a long way to go on that.

Nora stated that she believed she “was going to come out” of this project being able to “really, really understand more of the Puerto Rican” culture. There seemed to be a tension between Nora’s original expectations about what she would “really understand” as a cultural learner about Puerto Rico and what she perceived she was actually understanding. We can see this tension in the way she vacillated back and forth from questioning whether the experience fell short of allowing her to “really, really understand more of the Puerto Rican” culture, to stating affirmatively that she did understand the culture (I do), and then back to questioning her affirmation (I think). Her closing statement that she “still” had a “long way to go” suggests that she was beginning to come to terms with her struggle as a cultural learner; that even if she did “come out” of this experience “really, really understand[ing]” Puerto Rican culture, that
as a learner, she “still” would have a “long way to go.” In the remainder of this communicative exchange, Nora stated that she was “pretty happy” with her understanding of Puerto Rico and that she “enjoyed talking with Carmen”, felt “comfortable” with her, and liked her “a lot.” She also introduced the topic about a “problem” she was having “at this point” in her experience as a cultural learner.

Excerpt 39

1001 Nora: I think maybe my problem at this point is that I’ve enjoyed talking with Carmen and I feel comfortable with her. I like her a lot. I need to talk with somebody at a different class. And that would be where I need to pursue the next thing [in order] for me to have an understanding.
1005 Because I will be honest with you and there still is that same feeling that some of my students have.
1007 Joyce: What is that same feeling that some of your students have?
1008 Nora: If you want to come to this country, then learn to speak English and come here with a purpose and educate yourself, and don’t freeload. We’ve got a person (Carmen) with my same belief system. I need somebody to talk to and to get that [other perspective]. So that’s the next step that I need.

Nora stated that she felt her “problem” with her cultural learning was that she “need[ed] to talk with somebody” from a “different class.” Her “problem” appeared to stem from the fact that she and Carmen were members of the same socioeconomic class. This seemed to present a problem for Nora with regard to her cultural learning. Here, it was not their differences that posed a “problem” for Nora, rather it was their commonalities, their “same belief system.” By identifying their commonalities and placing them in the foreground, Nora did not simply position Carmen as the distant and distinct ‘other.’ Further, their common bond shifted their relationship to one more of equal status. She claimed to feel “comfortable” with Carmen and acknowledged her need to expand her native language resources beyond someone whom she considered to have the “same belief system” as her own. This seems to suggest that Nora’s “problem”
was due in part to the fact that Carmen did not represent the stereotype that Nora still felt.

In line 1005, Nora stated that was going to be “honest” with me and tell me that there was “still [that] same feeling that some of her students have.” In this discourse move, she cautiously placed herself with her students as sharing some of the same feelings, i.e., stereotypes. I use the term ‘cautiously’ because of the way Nora phrased her “honest” statement. Note her use of the impersonal expression “there is.” In choosing an impersonal expression, Nora did not explicitly claim ownership of the “same feeling” that her students had expressed. Rather, her ownership was implied. Her caution suggests that she was wrestling with examining her own assumptions on her own innocence with regard to holding stereotypes about the culture and people of Puerto Rico and with how much of a risk she was willing to take in order to engage in a critical dialogue with me about those assumptions.

When asked to explain what she meant by the ‘same feeling,” Nora framed her reply in the discourse of the dominant culture. The three issues she mentioned (learn to speak English, educate yourself, and don’t freeload) were also part of the students’ discourse on stereotypes. Thus, in this discourse move, Nora aligned herself with her students and the dominant culture to which they all belonged. With this alignment, Nora placed herself with her students in a situational comember relationship (Erickson, 1996) by positioning herself with her students (a) as a comember of the dominant culture who held “that same feeling” about the culture and people of Puerto Rico and (b) as a co-learner of Puerto Rican culture.
During her exit interview, I showed Nora this excerpt and asked her how she came to realize what her “next step” needed to be. She spoke dramatically about how the collaboration with Carmen helped her to think critically about and make connections between (a) her conceptualization of a NLI, (b) the role of NLIs in her own cultural learning, and (c) her ‘comfort zone’ with the culture of Mexico. I had asked her to talk about how she viewed the role of a NLI. She began her response by pronouncing that she wanted to make a “statement” about how important it was to remember that a NLI “can give you ONLY his or her perspective.”

Excerpt 40

504 Nora: OK. I just want to make a statement that a NLI can give you ONLY his or her cultural perspective, his or her own background of what Christmas was like or what the *Vejigante* holiday was like. Whatever it is. And that there are variances in the culture. But it’s still one step beyond what a textbook is telling you.

Nora strongly emphasized that she believed that a NLI could “ONLY” provide the cultural perspective that s/he experienced from “his or her own background.” With this statement, she placed NLIs in a position of questionable value, since their perspective was limited to their personal experiences and “there are variances in the culture.” However, in line 507, Nora shifted the value of a NLI to a somewhat higher status when she stated that the perspective of a NLI was “one step beyond what a textbook” could provide.

In the next exchange, I told Nora that I remembered her telling me how she felt “frustrated, disappointed, and confused” about Carmen’s role as NLI during the beginning phase of our collaboration. She explained that her frustration was due to her
expectation that Carmen would have “all the answers” and also explained how she came
to terms with that expectation.

Excerpt 41

Joyce: What did that mean to you? I remember that you were expressing a little
frustration and maybe even disappointment as if you were expecting something
that wasn’t happening.

Nora: (laugh). I was. In the beginning I hadn’t worked through that she
[Carmen] was ONLY going to be able to present her cultural perspective. I
wanted her to have ALL the answers. It wasn’t until I thought about Pepe, my
friend in Mexico, that I came to the realization that both Carmen and Pepe are
going to be giving only their perspectives and opinions. I had to work through
[the fact] that [that] was OK. In the beginning I hadn’t come to the place that
one view is OK because it’s one step beyond that very impersonal textbook. It’s
real. At least it’s something that you can fall back on and say: “But this IS really
a person and this is REALLY how it was for their family.” But I hadn’t worked
it through. I think that’s where I was having a frustration with her [Carmen]
because I wanted her to have ALL the answers. And I guess I came into it [the
collaboration] expecting that. And she [Carmen] didn’t [have all the answers].
It wasn’t until I realized that she was only one individual from one culture who
is giving me her perspective that I came to terms with it.

Nora presented two, interrelated issues that she claimed she had to “work
through” in order to come to terms with her initial frustrations; (a) Carmen did not
“have ALL the answers”; (b) Carmen’s limited, personal perspective was valuable
because it was “real” and “one step beyond” the “impersonal” perspective presented in
textbooks. Further, Nora made an interesting connection between what Pepe, her friend
from Mexico, and Carmen could offer her as NLIs. It seemed that her expectation that
Carmen would have “ALL” the answers about Puerto Rico shifted when she connected
Pepe with Carmen and positioned them both as NLIs (lines 514-516). She went on to
explain how this connection led her to rethink about her self-claimed familiarity with
 Mexican culture.
Excerpt 42

Nora: Through Carmen I got a glimpse of Puerto Rican culture. My understanding and familiarity with Mexican culture came through my friend Pepe. I came to realize that the only part of Mexican culture that I am familiar with is Pepe's Mexican culture! I was becoming aware of the fact that she's NOT the whole culture. And he's not [either]. It was not until I made that comparison [that I] pulled it together in my mind.

Thus, it seemed that Nora's awareness that Carmen presented only one view of Puerto Rican culture heightened Nora's realization that Pepe, also represented only one cultural view. Further, for Nora, this awareness also appeared to spark a realization that as a cultural learner, she needed more than the perspective of one NLI, more that what Carmen (or Pepe) could offer.

I asked Nora if she thought that working with Carmen helped her in her personal development as a cultural learner, specifically with regard to any issues she might have had about Puerto Ricans.

Excerpt 43

Nora: Yeah, I think so. I really did not know anybody who was really Puerto Rican. And so, the only thing I had were more or less some stereotypes myself.

Her answer was interesting. She openly stated that she did have stereotypes and that she attributed her harboring "some stereotypes" to the fact that "she did not know anybody who was really Puerto Rican." Thus, this suggests that for Nora, a significant factor in helping her to face her stereotypes and be more open to change was the direct, personal contact with Carmen, even though Carmen herself did not represent the stereotype.

Nora went on to give an example of how her contact with Carmen helped her to transform her initial conceptualizations about the culture and people of Puerto Rico.
She stated that Carmen was a “continual spirit” in her classroom and that during her teaching of the unit “there was a presence in the whole unit of the three of us.” She further explained how she entered the collaborative venture with “some prejudices” and that she felt that she was “changing through the whole thing.”

Excerpt 44

Nora: I was changing in the sense of, I was gaining an understanding of Puerto Rico. I don’t know if you want to hear this, but I went in with some prejudices. I went in with some stereotypes to some extent.

She also stated that talking directly with Carmen about her stereotypes and prejudices helped her to “make sense” out of what she had considered “strange.”

Excerpt 45

Nora: When I got an answer from Carmen, it just made sense. So I think I was changing with my stereotypes about Puerto Rico, its place, its people, its culture. A LOT of different things were changing in me.

At this point the topic shifted to the issue that we three collaborators belonged to the same social class. This was the same “problem” that Nora had originally described during our last meeting (see excerpt 39). I asked Nora if she thought that the curriculum unit we produced had been influenced by our shared social class. She stated that in retrospect she did feel that the unit represented “middle class values, cultural values, and beliefs.” Her evaluation of that aspect of the unit seems to support the claim by Deketelaere & Kelchtermans (1996) that curriculum materials are always made with “certain type of children (mostly middle-class) and teachers (mostly qualified, competent and committed professionals) in mind” (p. 78). They also claim that being aware of this potential is probably “one of the most central conditions for curriculum
developers if they want to come up with products that are really ecologically valid and (as much as possible) free from unintended side-effects” (p. 78).

Nora then described some steps that she had taken in an attempt to address her need for continued growth in understanding various perspectives of Puerto Rican culture and to address the issue of promoting middle class values in the unit. She stated that she had made some “connections with other Puerto Rican people.” Further, she added that she “probably would never” have pursued these connections prior to her involvement with this project.

Excerpt 46

Nora: You know, I have to say that I pursued some connections with other Puerto Rican people now, which I probably would never [have done] before because it was such an unfamiliar area and I was not comfortable with it.

Joyce: So you think this[project] has made you feel more comfortable reaching out?

Nora: Yes. A lot. I have become friends with Ana and Manuel’s mother and I’m excited about [the] perspectives that she can offer me.

Discussion

These interactions provide evidence of what can arise when FL teachers engage in a critical reflective dialogue that focuses on the teaching and learning of culture. We saw Nora struggle as she engaged in a critical examination of her own assumptions on her innocence about stereotypes. We also saw that, for Nora, engagement in a critical reflective dialogue with Carmen and me helped her shift her original thinking about the culture and people of Puerto Rico. In addition, a significant part of Nora’s transformation involved questioning the “belief system” she shared with Carmen as well
as critically examine the “feelings” that she shared with some of her students. It was from Nora’s position as ‘teacher as cultural learner’ that she was analyzing her “needs” and the “next step” in her understanding of the Puerto Rican population which lives in the US mainland. Further, her position as a cultural learner connected her and her students together as cultural explorers on a mutual journey of discovery and reflection. From her position as a co-leaner with her students, Nora was apprenticing (Freire, 1985) the transformation that she was attempting to achieve with her students. Her apprenticeship in the transformational process might have allowed Nora to better understand the struggle her students were experiencing.

Further, it was her involvement in the process of collaborative curriculum development and our continued collaboration during the implementation phase of the unit that provided Nora with opportunities to reflect on and “honest[ly]” discuss her “problem” with me. What our collaborative approach to curriculum development offered was more than learning about the culture and people of Puerto Rico and how to teach these areas per se. This approach to curriculum development transformed the process from being one that concerned itself primarily with technical aspects of curricular issues to becoming one that also included learning how to engage in an intercultural construction of reality - how to become sensitive to other ways of looking at the world. The collaborative approach positioned Nora as a cultural learner within the process of curriculum development. As a result, the task and the process intimately influenced each other.

The integration of culture is a complex issue. It requires that FL educators engage in critical reflection on individual experiences, feelings, and perceptions as well
as on pedagogical and instructional choices to include whose culture is taught and legitimized (Crawford-Lange and Lange, 1984; Kramsch, 1993; Lloyd, 1989). As we have seen here, it means more than the mere presence of cultural information in the curriculum or in daily lesson plans. I am claiming that an important step in FL curricular reform that includes the integration of culture is for educators to critically examine their own beliefs, ideas, and assumptions about social issues. This is a crucial and necessary step in the transformation of student thinking which should be a major part of curricular reform. Nora’s decisions to (a) reposition Puerto Rico in her Spanish II curriculum in an attempt to address and eradicate her students’ stereotypes, (b) join her students as a co-learner, and (c) openly engage in a critical reflective dialogue on her own beliefs were revolutionary steps that speak to her excellence in teaching, her commitment to her professional and personal development and curricular reform in FL education. These were not easy steps and I commend her for her willingness to reflect on and to talk openly about tough, personal issues during this process.

Conclusion

The implementation phase was fourteen weeks in duration and began seven weeks after the planning phase. It was signified by an emphasis on (a) the teaching of the unit and (b) continued collaborative deliberations on and modifications of its design. It was during this phase that the collaborative team solicited, analyzed, and responded to the students’ stereotypes about the culture and people of Puerto Rico.
The students' responses supported Nora’s claim that many students at Longview Junior/Senior High School held stereotypical views of the culture and people of Puerto Rico. Further, for this group of Spanish II students, studying about Puerto Rican culture and history led to (a) an appreciation of the culture of Puerto Rico, (b) an increased understanding of the Puerto Rican minority who live in the US mainland and about whom they held stereotypes, and (c) critical reflection on their stereotypes.

It was seen that including the collaborative team members in the implementation phase was a crucial component in the design of this study. It provided collaborative members with increased opportunities to engage in a critical reflective dialogue in order to gain a deeper understanding of the complex issues of stereotypes from multiple perspectives. For Nora, the interdynamic nature of her teaching the unit on Puerto Rico in her Spanish II curriculum, continuing her collaboration with Carmen and me, and addressing her students' stereotypes all worked to together to offer her unique opportunities to think anew about her own attitudes, beliefs, and needs as a teacher and learner of Puerto Rican culture.

The word 'collaboration' was used throughout this study to describe both the process of curriculum development in which Nora, Carmen, and I participated and our partnership within the process. As one reads this thesis, it is important to remember how this term was defined; a process of negotiation in which meanings are constructed, contested, and evaluated (Bloome & Willett, 1991). The collaborative experience described and analyzed in this study cannot be understood from a static notion of collaboration with strictly defined roles for each member. Such a notion does not capture the essence of the shifting social relations, identities, stances, and ideologies.
that, for each of us, was constantly changing as we learned from each other. As evidenced in this study, the negotiatory aspect of collaboration does not allow the process to be neatly packaged with clearly defined parameters and predictable outcomes. Yet, as also evidenced in this study, transformation and growth can emerge from this loosely defined, unpredictable, and ‘messy’ process.

In conclusion, I want to mention an exciting and unanticipated outcome of this project; it created ripples that transcended the borders of the classroom and the parameters of the research. In the margins of the project, people felt the impact of these ripples in unintended, yet very concrete, very human, and very personal ways:

- For one student, his participation in this project led him to take another look at his social relations with two people who were Puerto Rican, that he already knew, and whom he claimed to be his friends.

- For Nora, this project led her to pursue connections with Puerto Ricans beyond Carmen.

- For Carmen, it led her on a journey into her own culture which allowed her to re-connect with her cultural heritage and re-examine what had become a taken-for-granted view of her culture, values, and traditions.

- For me, this project helped me to gain a deeper understanding into my own teaching practices and collaborative enterprises.
Establishing the communicative goal for FL education presents many new challenges to FL educators as they participate in the complex task of curriculum reform in order to align their curricula with the National Standards for Foreign Language Learning (1996) and many state curriculum frameworks. Integrating culture into the FL curriculum compels FL teachers to think anew about how they conceptualize culture. Also, it obliges them to reflect critically on the social and political impact of their pedagogical ideologies with regard to their choices on cultural issues and to critically examine their routinized instructional practices. (Kramsch, 1993; Tripp, 1993).

Curriculum reform of this magnitude takes time. Professional development is one of the most important vehicles for helping FL educators teachers to deal with educational changes, to include FL curricular changes (Gilsan, 1996). Further, small-scale professional development programs, such as one-day workshops, have limited value in promoting reform since they often do not provide sufficient impetus for critical self-reflection, critical reflective dialogues with peers, or implementation of new ideas (p. 79). Alternative approaches to professional development of a long-term nature that are designed to encourage FL educators to engage in (a) critical reflection, (b) innovative approaches to curriculum development, and (c) research opportunities are more likely to produce significant reform and adherence to standards. However, neither time for critical reflection nor participation in research about the process of curriculum deliberation is part of the present institutional ideology for public school teachers.
Collaborative curriculum deliberation offers intriguing possibilities to this challenge. Its promise lies both in its potential to support teachers as they work through the many complex issues involved in the process of curriculum development and deliberation regarding the integration of culture and to stimulate a critical reflective dialogue on these same cultural issues.

McCutcheon (1995) claims that a major tenet of collaborative deliberation is that the participants develop a social construction of their reality by seeking intersubjective agreement (p. 147). Further, it is claimed that participants involved in the interactive process of socially constructing meaning use language as a symbolic resource to continually reassess and transform ideologies (Carbaugh, 1996; Gee, 1990; Schiffrin, 1994). Positioning is a conversational phenomenon which influences the social meaning of what is being said by participants in a speech community (Davies & Harre, 1994). Its focus is on the way in which discursive practices constitute members of a speech community in certain ways and at the same time is a source through which members can negotiate new positions (Davies & Harre, 1994). Examining the positioning moves that occurred within the process of social interaction of the collaborative team served as a window through which we viewed the ways the collaborative team members dynamically reassessed and transformed their ideologies, social relations, and identities over time (Carbaugh, 1996; Davies & Harre, 1994). In addition, it is claimed that in collaborative group settings, the process of working on a task becomes an integral component in the final product, with the interaction between product and process being dynamic, and on-going (Cohen, 1994; McCutcheon, 1995; Zacarian, 1996). These claims were important aspects of this investigation.
The design of this project called for me to perform in the dual roles of researcher and collaborative partner. These two roles were interdependent and interactive, with scholarly research informing and influencing the collaborative dialogue and the dialogue influencing my on-going research. Thus, it was as a researcher/collaborator that I inquired into the interactive process of collaborative curriculum development and deliberation in a team comprised of a FL educator and a NLI. I used this dual role as a perspective through which to answer the following set of primary research questions: (a) how are ideologies as they relate to social relations and identities initially evidenced in the critical reflective dialogue of this speech community; (b) how are the initial ideologies, social relations, and identities socially re-defined and transformed by this speech community during the process of curriculum development and deliberation; and, (c) how are these transformations related to the process and product of this speech community? This research project was primarily focused on an interest in studying how ideologies, social relations, and identities were evidenced and transformed during the collaborative deliberatory process.

This project was based on the tenets of ethnographic research (Carspecken, 1996; Ely et. al., 1991; Erickson, 1996; Geertz, 1973; Gumperz & Hymes, 1972; Hymes, 1980; Moerman, 1988; Saville-Troike, 1996; Spradley, 1980). Three types of analysis were performed from the collected data. First, a broad analysis was conducted and consisted of a detailed description of the situated context of the speech community. A second analysis focused on the team meetings, pre-class meetings, phone conversations, and dialogue journals (speech encounters) in order to gain a deeper understanding of the “communicative practices” or normative patterns that occurred.
over time (Carbaugh, 1996). The third stage of analysis was a microanalysis of selected episodes of analyzed communicative practices regarding the ideologies, identities, and social relations of the collaborative team members.

It is believed that this project will add an important contribution to the on-going discussion of collaborative curriculum development and deliberation, the collaborative process, issues concerning professional development, as well as the teaching and learning of culture in the FL classroom. However, it should be noted that this study has limitations in important domains.

First, as Peshkin (1988) states, subjectivity is inherent in every research process. The design of this research project placed me in the dual roles of collaborative team member and as well as researcher. Further, the CT and I held the point of view that collaborative curriculum development and deliberation that includes a NLI can offer unique opportunities for professional development by offering support for teachers as they introduce and experiment with curriculum changes. These roles and perspectives might have contributed to the subjectivity in this area.

However, despite these limitations, I believe that a great deal can be gained from this investigation. It adds to the knowledge base used to inform the FL profession, the curriculum development field, university researchers and practitioners who are involved in the investigation of the collaborative process in collaborative research designs and/or the exploration of the connection between collaborative curriculum development and professional development.
Findings

The findings in this study indicate that the studying of Puerto Rican culture and history could lead not only to an appreciation of the culture of Puerto Rico, but also to an increased understanding of the Puerto Rican minority who live in the US mainland. Further, the findings indicate that positioning of the teacher as a cultural learner with her students was more productive than the positioning of the teacher as a didactic instructor of culture in stimulating student rethinking about stereotypes. It was found that the NLI contributed to the collaborative curriculum process in significant ways and at multiple levels. Further, the findings suggest that including a NLI in the implementation phase provided communicative opportunities for all parties to engage in a critical reflective dialogue that moved beyond mere technical and practical curricular concerns. In this study it provided collaborative members with increased opportunities to gain a deeper understanding of the complex issues of stereotypes from multiple perspectives.

Implications

I believe that this investigation has added significantly to the knowledge base used to inform the following four areas: (a) the FL profession regarding the needed shift in its theoretical conceptualization and practical application of culture in FL teaching, (b) the curriculum development field regarding alternative approaches to curriculum development, (c) university researchers and practitioners regarding the collaboration
process in collaborative research designs, and (d) alternative models for professional
development. Nevertheless, since very little research of any kind has been performed in
the FL classroom (Bernhardt & Tedick, 1991; Haas & Reardon, 1997; Lotito & Perez-
Erdelyi, 1988; Milleret, 1992; Phillips, 1997; Tedick, & Walker, 1996), it is important
that further research in each of these areas continue as FL educators work to engage in
the complex process of curriculum reform in general and in the integration of culture in
particular. In addition, future research needs to focus special attention on gaining a
deeper understanding of the collaborative process as university researchers work toward
increasing collaborative partnerships between higher education and FL practitioners to
include teacher/researcher collaboration. As a general recommendation I suggest
providing more opportunities for FL teachers to participate in a collaborative curriculum
development process that include NLIs.

The collaborative approach to FL curriculum development that was created for
and implemented in this study is a multidimensional approach that holds intriguing
possibilities for FL educators. Because of its potential, it is my hope that FL teachers
will also implement this approach in their own learning communities. It is with this
hope in mind that I offer the following considerations. These considerations are the
reflections of the team members and are a result of a ‘brainstorming’ session that was
held in preparation for a presentation at a conference. They are not meant to be
exhaustive or prescriptive. Rather, they are meant to stimulate thoughtful reflection on
important matters that will help to make the collaborative experience a rich and exciting
one from which all participants can benefit.
What Is a Native Language Informant and Where Do I Find One?

In this study a native language informant was defined as a person whose first language is the target language of study and whose ethnic and cultural background are representative of the target culture of study. Possible sources for NLIs are listed below.

Possible Sources

- parents
- community members
- colleagues (teachers in other disciplines as well as other FL teachers)
- staff members
- ESL/Bilingual teachers
- students
- cultural centers
- E-mail partners
- colleges/universities (teaching Assistants, graduate students, international students, professors)

There is a wide variety of collaborative projects that a team may work on. As the primary researcher for this study, I found it beneficial to have a general idea of an area or topic of interest. This topic can serve as the initial impetus for discussion in the search for those who hold mutual interests. The following list represents a sampling of issues that were important for participants in this project to discuss openly when considering their decision to become involved.
Suggested Issues to Consider When Selecting Collaborative Team Members that Includes a NLI

- nebulous area of feeling comfortable with each other (patience, trust)
- flexibility (roles and responsibilities may change in ways participants could not imagine)
- acknowledgment that project will involve personal time, not knowing how much
- familiarity with issues concerning FL teaching and learning
- familiarity with American public school system and its limitations
- one native language informant, one person’s perspective
- awareness on all parties of signs of over generalizations/stereotyping
- selection of members who have same area(s) of interest but different or varied experiences within that area

What’s in it for me?

Nora posed this question to me when I first talked to her about joining me in this research venture. From the onset of this investigation, there were straightforward and tangible outcomes for me and Carmen: I would be gathering information for my thesis and Carmen would be using her experience as a NLI to serve as material for a paper in a course taken as an independent study in her Masters degree program. The potential rewards for Nora were not so tangible nor were they guaranteed. She had anticipated ending up with some new and exciting teaching materials that would be co-developed by the team. She also hoped that her participation in this project would provide her with some insight on improving her techniques and classroom strategies. Because there were
no guarantees that any or all of Nora’s anticipated benefits would be realized, her question haunted me. Periodically during the project, I reiterated the question to both Nora and Carmen: “What ARE you two getting out of this?” I also asked them what they considered to be the benefits for Nora’s students and for other FL practitioners, NLIs, and students who might become involved in a collaborative endeavor that included NLIs. What follows is a synopsis of our discussions on these issues.

Potential Benefits for Collaborative Team Participants

From the perspective of the FL teacher

• unique opportunities for professional development and/or personal growth for all participants

• participation may be used as source of paper/project for formal academic purposes (e.g., independent study)

• opportunities for formal teacher/researcher partnerships

• opportunities to become cultural learners with students; focus on cultural learning as a life long endeavor helps to forge connections between teaching and learning

• opportunities for publications and presentations

• opportunities to engage in thoughtful, critical dialogue with other colleagues/professionals

• opportunities for critical reflection on routinized teaching practices and underpinning ideologies

• opportunities for teacher as researcher

• support for FL teachers as they work through the many complex issues involved in the process of curriculum development regarding cultural issues e.g., stereotypes
• opportunities to critically examine and increase understanding of broader social and political implications on choices regarding cultural issues

• first-hand experience cross-cultural communication and negotiation of meanings

• active participation in curriculum development

• explore and expand cultural awareness and own interests

• opportunities to reflect on own culture and comparison and contrasts with target culture of study

• facilitation of direct access to an insider’s perspective through native language informant

• facilitation with interpretation of authentic materials

• help in developing new and different classroom materials, activities

• help in minimizing insularity of FL teaching

• opportunities to forge and/or strengthen ties between school and community

• professional satisfaction

• opportunities unique perspective to educational research

From the perspective of the NLI

• All of the above mentioned benefits

• opportunities to support FL teacher

• opportunities to “journey” into one’s own culture (personal inventory of culture, values, and traditions)

• opportunities for intra cultural and intra personal inquiry - acculturation vs assimilation

• family involvement (sharing, discovering)

• general awakening of oneself and roots, a chance to reconnect
From the perspective of the researcher

- insights into the collaborative deliberation process
- insights into professional development issues
- opportunities for new, and strengthened collaborative endeavors between academy and practitioners
- insights into the many challenges of integrating inquiry into practice
- opportunities to explore teacher’s unique position in research community

From the perspective of the students

- cultural focus helps to stir thinking about stereotypes
- beneficiaries of teacher’s cultural explorations as materials, thoughts, perspectives are brought into classroom practices
- opportunities to see teacher as cultural learner with them
- beneficiaries of teacher’s energy and excitement about cultural exploration
- opportunities to engage in critical thinking skills by reflecting on own culture and comparison and contrasts with target culture of study
- opportunities to meet new people and forge personal connections/friendships
- opportunities to strengthen connection between language and culture
- opportunities to see and hear live native speakers in their class and talk directly with them
- have fun
In summary, the potential benefits felt by the participants in this study should strongly encourage FL educators to become involved in collaborative endeavors that include NLIs. The style, format, and length of such collaborations will depend on the goals and objectives of the project.

Conclusion

This study is only part of the ongoing dialogue about collaborative efforts in the field of educational research in general and in foreign language education in particular. It expands on the knowledge of the teacher/researcher relationship and alternative approaches to curriculum development. This investigation also suggests further work that needs to be carried out in order to add to that dialogue. It is my hope that the next chapter of research will reveal an even deeper understanding of the complex issues facing FL educators as they work toward curriculum reform that includes the integration of culture in all aspects of FL teaching and learning. It is also my hope that readers use the ideas and concepts described and analyzed between these pages to imagine many new possibilities for collaborative approaches in FL curriculum reform.
## APPENDIX A
### DATA COLLECTION SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Phase of Unit</th>
<th>Implementation Phase of Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources of Data Collection</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sources of Data Collection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 3-way meeting between CT, NLI and myself (June, 1996, 1½ hrs)</td>
<td>2 meetings with CT, 2 hrs each meeting (Oct, Nov, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>field notes</em></td>
<td><em>audio taping and transcription</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 meetings with CT, each 1½ - 2 hrs (Apr, June, July, Aug 1996)</td>
<td>14 weeks on-site participation observation, 5 days a week, 47 minutes each day (same class, Sept 23, 1996-Jan 7,1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>audio taping and transcription</em></td>
<td><em>field notes</em> <em>log notes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 phone conversations between CT, NLI, and myself (10-90 min)</td>
<td>36 dialogue journals between CT, NLI, and myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>audio taping and transcription</em></td>
<td><em>down loading and printing hard copies</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 pre-class meetings with CT, September 23, 1996-January 7, 1997 (5-15 min)</td>
<td>1, 3-way meeting between CT, NLI and myself (Oct.1996, 1½ hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>audio taping and transcription</em></td>
<td><em>audio taping and transcription</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The CT and the NLI met three times without me and had several phone conversations during this project. I gathered Information about these meetings and conversations via dialogue journals exchanges and subsequent conversations I had with these participants.*
APPENDIX B

COOPERATING TEACHER CONSENT FORM

While you have already given your verbal consent to participate in this study, it is necessary to also obtain your written consent. If you have any questions about this form, please do not hesitate to contact me before signing it.

By signing this consent form, I volunteer to participate in this qualitative research study conducted by Joyce L. Szewczynski and understand that:

1. This study is being conducted for the purpose of collecting data to be used in Joyce L. Szewczynksi's doctoral dissertation. The general focus of this dissertation is the teaching of culture in a foreign language classroom in an American public school. The initial areas of interest include observing how the teacher's beliefs about culture are evidenced in classroom instruction and how the role of the cultural informant is evidenced in the teacher's classroom practices. This topic is subject to change during the data collection period.

2. My participation in this study involves the following:

   * allowing Joyce to observe one second year Spanish class daily during the implementation of this unit, approximately 14 weeks starting the last week in September, 1966

   * meeting with Joyce at least 3 times in the spring to discuss issues pertaining to the logistics of the research and to the project design

   * meeting with Joyce and a native speaker of Puerto Rico at least 3 times during the summer to develop materials and discuss issues around culture

   * keeping a dialogue journal during the research period.

   I understand that she will be taking notes and video and audio taping my class. Participation in this study also involves audio taping the meetings and informal interviews with Joyce and with the native speaker. Transcripts of these interviews may form part of the data base for Joyce's research. I have the right to review these tapes and transcripts upon request.

3. Some direct quotations may be used in publications. Pseudonyms will be used in all cases. The identity of the teacher and students will remain confidential. The site location will not be revealed although the level of the language and the language will be included in the study.
4. The video and audio tapes and field notes will be kept confidential and will not be released to the public.

5. The findings from this study might be used in a journal article, a newsletter, a presentation to a professional group or a book. If data from this study were to be used in any other way, Joyce would contact me to obtain my written consent.

6. In signing this form I am agreeing that I will make no financial claim against Joyce L. Szewczynski for the use of this data.

7. Participation in this study is completely voluntary and I may withdraw at any time without repercussion.

I have read and understand the contents of this form. I understand that by signing this form I am voluntarily agreeing to participate in this study.

__________________________________________________________________________

Researchers's Signature Date

Participant's Signature Date

Permanent Address:

Phone:
APPENDIX C

NATIVE LANGUAGE INFORMANT CONSENT FORM

While you have already given your verbal consent to participate in this study, it is necessary to also obtain your written consent. If you have any questions about this form, please do not hesitate to contact me before signing it.

By signing this consent form, I volunteer to participate in this qualitative research study conducted by Joyce L. Szewczynski and understand that:

1. This study is being conducted for the purpose of collecting data to be used in Joyce L. Szewczynski's doctoral dissertation. The general focus of this dissertation is the teaching of culture in a foreign language classroom in an American public school. The initial areas of interest include observing how the teacher's beliefs about culture are evidenced in classroom instruction and how the role of the cultural informant is evidenced in the teacher's classroom practices. This topic is subject to change during the data collection period.

2. My participation in this study involves the following:

   * meeting with Joyce and the cooperating teacher (CT) at least 3 times during summer to help develop materials and discuss issues around culture;

   * meeting with Joyce and CT at least 4 times during the implementation of the unit, starting with the last week in September;

   * keeping a dialogue journal during the research period with Joyce and the cooperating teacher;

   * having phone conversations with the cooperating teacher as the need arises.

   I understand that she will be taking notes and audio taping our meetings and informal interview. Transcripts of these meetings and interviews may form part of the data base for Joyce's research. I have the right to review these tapes and transcripts upon request. I may be asked to be a guest speaker in the cooperating teacher's class at some point during the research period.

3. Some direct quotations may be used in publications. Pseudonyms will be used in all cases. My identity as well as that of the teacher and students will remain confidential. The site location will not be revealed although the level of the language and the language will be included in the study. My ethnic origin will also be included in the study.
4. The audio tapes and field notes will be kept confidential and will not be released to the public.

5. The findings from this study might be used in a journal article, a newsletter, a presentation to a professional group or a book. If data from this study were to be used in any other way, Joyce would contact me to obtain my written consent.

6. In signing this form I am agreeing that I will make no financial claim against Joyce L. Szewczynski for the use of this data.

7. Participation in this study is completely voluntary and I may withdraw at any time without repercussion.

I have read and understand the contents of this form. I understand that by signing this form I am voluntarily agreeing to participate in this study.

____________________________________  __________________________
Participant's Signature    Date                          Researchers's Signature    Date
Dear Parents and Guardians,

Joyce L. Szewczynski, a doctoral student and the University of Massachusetts, Amherst and an Assistant Profess of Spanish at Springfield College, is interested in conducting her doctoral research in Ms. _______’s fourth period, second year Spanish class. In order to collect data and write her dissertation she needs a parental consent form for each child indicating whether they can be included in the study. Please read the following description of the study and what it entails and return this form to school with your child.

This study will focus on the teaching of culture in a world language classroom. Topics of interest include how the teacher's beliefs about culture are evidenced in her instruction and how the reflections of one's own culture and the target culture are communicated in class discussions.

Joyce will be present in the class beginning the third week in September. She anticipates that the project will last approximately 14 weeks. During this time she will be observing the teacher and students, taking notes, and video and audio taping the classes. Students will be asked to keep dialogue journals during the time frame of the research. These journals and some student-generated paper work will also be part of the data base for this research. Any transcript data pertaining to your child can be made available upon request at any time. Field notes and video tapes will be reviewed by Joyce and the classroom teacher, Ms.______, and Ms.______ who will be collaborating with Joyce and Ms.______ to develop classroom materials.

Some direct quotations may be used in the study. The identity of all students, teachers and the site location will remain confidential. Pseudonyms will be used to help ensure anonymity.

Data collected from this study will be used to write Joyce's doctoral dissertation. It is possible that the results will also be used in a journal article, newsletter, presentation to a professional group, or in a book. If the findings are to be used in any other way, your written consent will be requested.

Signing this form indicates that you will make no financial claim against Joyce Szewczynski, Ms.______ or _______Junior/Senior High School at any time in the future for the use of data collected in this study.

You may withdraw your consent for your child to participate in this study at any time without repercussion. Participation is entirely voluntary. Grades for the term will not be affected by whether you give permission. If you have any questions about this form or the study, please contact Joyce Szewczynski at 748-3665 (office). A copy of this form will be provided for your records.
Sincerely,

____________________________________  ________________________________
, Principal                              Joyce L. Szewczynski, Researcher

_____ I give my consent for ___________________________ to
    (Name of Student)

participate in Joyce L. Szewczynski's study.

____________________________________  ________________
Signature of Parent or Guardian          Date

_____ I DO NOT give my consent for ___________________________ to
    (Name of Student)

to participate in Joyce L. Szewczynski's study.

____________________________________  ________________
Signature of Parent or Guardian          Date

PLEASE HAVE YOUR CHILD RETURN THIS FORM TO MS. _____
THANK YOU.
APPENDIX E
LONGVIEW'S 1989 LEVEL II SPANISH CURRICULUM GUIDE

SPANISH II

A. Spanish pronunciation

B. Verbs
1. Review of the present indicative of regular and irregular verbs
2. Review of commands (polite)
3. Stem-changing verbs—class I
4. Reflexive verbs
5. Preterite of -ar verbs
6. Preterite of -er and -ir verbs
7. Preterite tense of irregular verbs
8. Imperfect tense of -ar verbs
9. Imperfect tense of -er and -ir verbs
10. Imperfect tense of irregular verbs
11. The uses of the preterite and the imperfect tenses
12. Future tense of -ar, -er, and -ir verbs
13. Future tense of irregular verbs
14. Conditional tense of -ar, -er, and -ir verbs
15. Conditional tense of irregular verbs
16. The passive voice
   a. The true passive with ser
   b. The passive with se

C. Grammatical Structures
1. The definite article
   a. Use of the definite article
   b. Omission of the definite article
2. Adjectives
   a. Review of the forms, agreement and position of adjectives
   b. Review of possessive adjectives
   c. Review of demonstrative adjectives
   d. Adjectives used as nouns
   e. Past participles used as adjectives
3. Pronouns
   a. Review of subject pronouns
   b. Review of direct object pronouns
   c. Review of indirect object pronouns
   d. Position of object pronouns
      (1) with conjugated verbs
      (2) with infinitives
      (3) with commands
   e. Reflexive pronouns and position of same
   f. Pronouns that follow prepositions
   g. Demonstrative pronouns
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4. Negative expressions
5. Interrogatives
6. Uses of the infinitive
7. Cardinal numbers
8. Ordinal numbers
9. Dates

D. Vocabulary
1. Vocabulary of lessons 15-40
2. Vocabulary from cultural units
3. Vocabulary from reading selections

E. Civilization
1. Spain and the Spanish-speaking countries
   a. Location and capital
   b. Geographical features, including important mountain chains, rivers, lakes, etc.
   c. Products and industries
   d. Important regions and major cities
2. The people of the Spanish-speaking world
   a. History (general)
   b. Customs
   c. Recreation and leisure time
   d. Food
   e. Holidays
   f. Work
   g. Music
   h. Art
   i. Education

F. Reading—selections come from the text and from other outside reading materials. The reading selections vary according to the interests and abilities of the class. Some of the various reading selections that can be used are listed below:
1. La America del Sur (text)
2. La Llama (text)
3. Una solucion practica (text)
4. La Navidad (text)
5. Una leyenda peruana (text)
6. Espana en America (text)
7. El Chocolate (text)
8. La leyenda de la Virgen de Guadalupe (text)
9. Los deportes (text)
10. Fiestas (text)
11. Selections from Cuentitos Simpaticos
12. Selected Spanish and Latin American poems

G. Composition
1. Direct composition
2. Free composition (limited at this level)
APPENDIX F

SUMMARY OF BENNETT’S DEVELOPMENT MODEL OF INTERCULTURAL SENSITIVITY (Bennet, 1993)

Ethnocentric states and stages

1. Denial
   a. Isolation
   b. Separation
   c. Strategies to move beyond denial include activities that will help students become aware of distinct differences: food fairs, slide show, etc.

2. Defense
   a. Denigration
   b. Superiority
   c. Strategies to move beyond defense include activities that help students gain positive self-esteem and activities that promote their own cultural pride.

3. Minimization
   a. Physical universalism
   b. Transcendent universalism
   c. Strategies to move beyond minimization include simulations that focus on differences and importance of differences, culture conflict situations, reports of personal stories, etc.

Ethnorelative states and stages

4. Acceptance
   a. Behavioral relativism
   b. Value relativism
   c. Strategies to move beyond acceptance include cross-cultural interaction in reflective settings. Debriefing experiences are important to help students recognize how they are adapting to others or asking others to adapt to them.

5. Adaptation
   a. Empathy
   b. Pluralism
   c. Strategies to move beyond adaptation include practice of adaptation skills, exploration of ethics and morals that are culturally different, negotiation of meaning.
6. Integration
   a. Contextual evaluation
   b. Constructive marginality
   c. Strategies to increase integration include development of ethics to guide choices and actions.
APPENDIX G

QUESTIONNAIRE PREPARED BY THE AATF

How important is it for your students to acquire the following skills or knowledge, up to a level corresponding to their language proficiency?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Necessary:</th>
<th>Desirable:</th>
<th>Unimportant:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The main nonverbal behavior patterns (intonation, gestures, closeness, and other unspoken communication) that help native speakers to understand and to feel at ease with one another:</td>
<td>Should be an organized component of FL teaching</td>
<td>--but only as an optional enrichment. Language competence alone is sufficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Courtesies, gift giving and other social conventionalities; holidays and religious festivals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The knowledge needed for travel, shopping, banking, etc.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Major current events:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The values, habits of thought, and assumptions about human nature and society--with due regard for change, regional and other variation--that give insight into behavior, institutions, literature, and art:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Governmental and other agencies that affect everyday life:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Geography, and the historical events, personalities and masterpieces most often referred to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Knowledge of how to observe, analyze (and adapt oneself to) any culture and society: [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

9. Understanding toward others' customs and beliefs: [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

10. A perspective on one's own culture from outside it: [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
APPENDIX H

DAMEN'S SEVEN STEP APPROACH TO PRAGMATIC ETHNOGRAPHY (Damen, 1987)

1. **Choosing a Target Group.** Choose a cultural or ethnic group about which you know very little, but would like to know more.

2. **Choosing Informants.** Choose an informant (or informants) who is a native of the culture in question and who is willing to serve as a source of an insider's, or -emic view of the target culture.

3. **Providing a Foundation for Inquiry.** This step involves searching and using secondary sources relative to the general features of the culture group under study.

4. **Informant Interviewing.** You should plan to conduct at least four or five hour-long interviews in order to establish confidence, to elicit information, and to explore implications of the information received during the course of the inquiry.

5. **Analyzing Data and Forming Cultural Hypotheses.** This step is concerned with the analyses of the data received through secondary sources and by informant interviewing, and the formulation of cultural hypotheses reflecting patterns relative to expected and/or appropriate behavior.

6. **Looking in the Mirror.** In this step the interviewer's frame of reference is brought to a conscious level. This involves self-questioning and understanding that no one individual represents all possible beliefs and values or views of a particular culture.

7. **Putting theory and Knowledge to Work.** You, the investigator as teacher are asked to bring the insights gained about culture learning in general or about a specific cultural group into the realm of practice and weave them quite literally into the process of selecting teaching materials, developing lesson plans, and directing the protected or administered classroom (p. 68).
APPENDIX I
CURRICULAR WEB FOR UNIT ON PUERTO RICO
APPENDIX J

NORA’S ‘NEED TO DO’ LIST

What I Need to be Doing!

Checking to see what they know from Level 1
  • Weather
  • Numbers
  • Courtesy Expressions
  • Basic Structures
  • Could they function in the Present Tense—Common Regular and Irregular Verbs?
    • Clothes
    • Colors
    • Train vocabulary
    • Etc.

Teaching My Level II Curriculum
  • Reinforcing direct object/indirect object pronouns
  • Working on airport vocabulary and related functions
    • Working with beach vocabulary
    • Introducing the past tense
APPENDIX K
CARMEN'S LETTER TO THE STUDENTS

October 30, 1996

Dear students:

I would like to comment to each and one of your responses to the questions about facts, ideas and misconceptions of Puerto Rico and their people, Puertorricans. Many of your misconceptions are far from reality because not everyone in the island has tans, drinks alcohol, uses drugs, has dark skin, are very poor, lives by the ocean or in run down places, carry guns, lives on welfare, kill each other for shoes, harvest grapes or apples, sleeps on the sides of streets, don’t speak good English, grease their hair, wants to come to the U.S.A. However, what is a very assertive fact is that the main language is Spanish, they pay government taxes, some work hard others don’t, the weather is usually warm-hot, it has one of the world’s major tropical forest, there are mountains, there are palm trees along the coast, some drink tropical drinks, Puerto Rico is an island in the Caribbean, some people are poor others are rich, there is the country site and the city, like any other place in the globe.

I hope by the end of your unit some of your concepts could be clarified and supported by facts. What you must remember- "there is good and bad in everyone". This is a line from one of my favorite "oldie" song, "Ebony and Ivory". When we don’t know much details about something or just speak from a particular experience we don’t always get the global view of whatever we are referring to. To be honest with you, I don’t like greasy hair either, and I’m glad none of the people I know, grew up with and met during my life in Puerto Rico greased their hair.

Espero poder conocerles y contestar cualquier pregunta que puedan tener.
Buena suerte con el Español. Hasta pronto.

Sinceramente,

ESL school teacher
APPENDIX L

OUTLINE OF THEMATIC UNIT ON PUERTO RICO

I. Activities on Stereotypes

II. Traveling to Puerto Rico
   A. Geography
      1. Ser/Estar
      2. Vocabulary
         a. east, west, north, south, etc.
         b. island, sea, South America, North America, Central America, countries
         c. adjectives - big, small
         d. introduce comparisons - bigger, smaller etc.
      3. Weather including Temperatures for Number Practice
         a. Authentic Documents - weather reports
         b. Presentation of Weather Forecasts from various regions.
   B. Packing for our Trip
      1. Vocabulary
         a. clothing
         b. colors
         c. numbers for quantity
         d. justify choice of clothing by combining with weather
         e. read authentic document making suggestions about what a traveler should bring on a trip to Puerto Rico
      2. Verbs and Structure
         a. poner, traer, hacer, tener
         b. expressions - hacer un viaje, hacer la maleta
         c. direct object pronouns
   C. Watching a Video about Puerto Rico
   D. Getting a Hotel Room
      1. Using Internet to Research possible hotels in San Juan
      2. Reading authentic documents to find hotel possibilities in San Juan (for those without access to Internet)
   E. Traveling to the Airport by Train
      1. Vocabulary - Train station
      2. Verbs and Structure
         a. salir, reinforce traer, hacer, poner and tener
         b. time of day
   F. In the Airport - Preparing for our Flight
      1. Vocabulary
         a. airport vocabulary
         b. time - reinforce
         c. numbers - reinforce
         d. listening activity - listen to departure information and obtain specific information such as departure gate, time of departure, etc.
      2. Verbs and Structure
         a. direct object pronouns - reinforce
         b. saber and conocer
         c. Plan Activities for San Juan
   G. Read an Authentic Document about San Juan
      1. Writing Activity - Planning 2 days of Activities in San Juan
         a. Vocabulary and Structure
            i. numerous cognates
            ii. review of ir + a construction
            iii. time of day - reinforced
2. Oral Activity - Inside/Outside Circle. Using writing activity above students tell others about their place in San Juan
   a. vocabulary practice - new cognates
   b. structure practice - ir + a
   c. using expressions "to react to things"

III. A Visit to a Museum in San Juan - Using artifacts and identifying text, the teacher sets up a museum in the classroom. Students move through the museum at leisure and write notes and/or sketch pictures about what they view and learn in their visit.
   A. History of Puerto Rico
   B. Products of Puerto Rico
   C. Cultural Elements
   D. Flora and Fauna
   E. Food
   F. Instruments and Music

IV. A Visit to El Yunque
   A. Reading about El Coqui
   B. Vocabulary - El Bosque de Lluvia Tropical

V. A Visit to la Playa de Luquillo
   A. Vocabulary and Structure
      1. Vocabulary of the Beach
      2. Saber and Conocer - reinforce
      3. Review present and future using ir + a and introduce preterite
   B. Listening Activity - Cloze activity from song about la playa
   C. Writing Activity - Write a post card from La playa de Luquillo.

VI. A Visit to Ponce
   A. Celebrations
      1. Pre-activity - Celebrations in the U.S.
      2. Learning about a Puerto Rican tradition/celebration - Carnaval and Lent
      3. El Vejigante
         a. Authentic Reading about El Vejigante
         b. Describing the mask and costume of El Vejigante
         c. Learning what the Vejigante does - Gouin Series
         d. Learning the chants/estribillos of the Vejigante
         e. Learning the songs and games that the children play.
         f. Classroom Celebration

VII. A Class Visit by the Native Language Informant
   A. Answer final questions of students
   B. Help to dispel stereotypes

VIII. Final Project - Each student may develop a project of his/her choice to demonstrate knowledge of some aspect of the language/culture of Puerto Rico and its people, as gleaned from the classroom lessons and activities or obtained from further student investigation.
APPENDIX M

KEY TO TRANSCRIPTION NOTATION

The following transcription notation used in this paper had been adapted from Atkinson and Heritage (1984).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>micropause of less than .2 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!</td>
<td>animated intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>falling intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITAL LETTERS</td>
<td>emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[     ]</td>
<td>transcriber notes, details of the scene, clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pause)</td>
<td>pause of longer than 4 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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