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Abstract

Effective EFL classrooms carry students beyond obtaining language proficiency to seeking authentic relationships and purpose in the world. In this portfolio, I present my approach to teaching English as a foreign language by adopting Constructivism as a guiding lens, analyzing multiple relevant artifacts pertaining to my two years’ work in teaching observation, practice, and reflection. The theoretically-informed statement of my teaching philosophy and evaluation of artifacts showcase my pedagogical knowledge and skills in adhering to the TESOL Standards for ESL/EFL teachers.

This paper consists of three parts: In part one, I focus on how the overarching principle of constructivism speaks to my previous language learning experience and how it has taken root in shaping my teaching values. It also lends support to different components of my philosophy. In part two, regarding artifact analysis, I demonstrate my professional knowledge in explaining, problematizing, and justifying how different EFL artifacts, chosen for each TESOL domain, meet or fall short of what the standard underscores. For the third part, looking ahead, I propose my future prospects in education—endorsing constructivism as a fundamental teaching disposition gained from previous discussions. I also address the potential challenges in advocating for a sustainable constructivist classroom culture and offer solutions and approaches in professional development.
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Philosophy of Teaching

Language learning is a progressive journey. Instead of simply dispensing knowledge, EFL teachers should provide a relevant way of motivating students and participating in the construction of intelligence. In the past two years, Peabody has created a space for my fundamental teaching dispositions to incubate and gradually take shape. By working closely with English language learners, colleagues, and dedicated professors, I came to realize that a quality EFL classroom should possess features that engage students with an authentic language environment and foster their learning autonomy and self-efficacy. In this part of the portfolio, I will introduce my teaching philosophy, adopting constructivism as the guiding theory to support each subsection. I regard these parts as essential in facilitating a student’s language learning. Respectively, they include promoting culturally responsive pedagogy, in alignment with strategic scaffolding; implementing multimodal instruction; and practicing critical literacies consistently. To illuminate what motivates me as a language teacher, I will also embed my personal experiences alongside theory to demonstrate why I advocate for those ideas and offer snippets of how they played out in my current teaching context.

Guiding Principle of Constructivism

The fundamentals of constructivism have the capacity to shape the dynamics of my ideal language teaching environment. When teachers and students are co-constructing meaningful classroom discourse in a shared space, they activate a palette of skill sets. Many researchers and scientists have elaborated on constructivist learning theories and pointed out that when language classrooms are characterized by a learner’s “active engagement in authentic and meaningful pursuits as individuals and within communities of learners” (qtd. in Aljohani, 2017), optimal
learning occurs. This underscores the centrality and diversity of learners. To echo this point, Windschitl (1999) in his article highlights that in honoring diversity in learning, teachers are moving toward sustaining a constructivist classroom culture. His claim also feeds into the rationale behind multimodal instruction that is elaborated later. Under the scope of constructivism, it is essential that learners have concrete, contextually meaningful experiences through which they can actively practice repertoires of language and apply the language in authentic learning scenarios.

The constructivist approach is particularly powerful in contrast to my almost decade-long English learning phase where grammar drills and rote memorization dominated my way of interacting with the language. Communicative competence being absent in test-oriented instruction, my sense of achievement from English tests shattered when I first came to the U.S. I questioned what all those years of English education had done for me and struggled to shake off the effects of the test-oriented language learning that had been imposed on me. Fortunately, it didn’t take long for me to have professors who inspired me to relish the beauty of poetry and encouraged us to produce our own words regardless of imperfections in grammar and word spellings. I have had seminars and student-led sessions at Peabody where I was led to engage with meaningful content so that as a learner I could train myself to reorganize knowledge, critically analyze, and see things through different lenses. Those moments of interacting with authentic language materials, moments when the clash of thoughts sparked creativity and curiosity, preceded the transformation that took place inside of me. Henceforth, as a natural extension, I ventured into building a constructivist classroom as a prospective educator.
Knowing Students’ Backgrounds and Demands

Before constructing any content and making any instructional decisions, I consider it crucial for teachers to know who their students are and why they are investing in the language. When I contemplate a future teaching culturally and linguistically diverse learners, instilling Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (CRP) to set an appropriate classroom atmosphere would be essential. The fact that students all come from different cultures and have a variety of linguistic backgrounds means that they have assorted sets of skills, past experiences, and cultural beliefs that will affect how I should approach them at their instructional level. It would be a disservice to learners to not investigate their backgrounds, which can inform their language demands and motivation. Gay (2010) describes caring as a “multidimensional process” that highlights teachers’ responsiveness in cultural diversity and their competence in carrying out its inclusion in the educational process (pp. 58). In my own practicum experiences, I have seen ethnically diverse students display a higher level of concentration and participation than usual when they are making personal connections to a poem on immigration, contributing thoughts and feelings that emerged from their own histories. The classroom teacher was well aware of the unique narratives and skills her students were bringing into the classroom discussion, therefore acknowledging their intercultural experiences, listening attentively, and acting responsively.

As for students’ personal goals, teachers need to investigate an individual learner’s varied language investment—what would be the end goal for him or her with the target language? This is also a premise for high-quality teaching since without knowing a student’s end goal, it would be challenging to tailor instruction to meet their needs and gauge their progress accordingly. For
someone who aims to launch a career path in medicine, his language teachers would be remiss not to provide the academic language accommodation necessary for medical areas and collaborate with content subject instructors in providing customized instruction. Bonny Norton (1995) proposed that the conceptions of investment further “capture the complex relationship between relations of power, identity and language learning” (p. 17) than that of motivation.

When learners invest in the target language, they better understand the types of resources needed to “increase the value of their cultural capital” (Norton, 1995, p. 17). Thus, for caring teachers, knowing an individual’s type of investment in English is the precondition of structuring flexible instruction that serves them more effectively and holds students accountable. At its core, the concept of CRP is intertwined and partly overlaps with constructivism, which attaches great importance to situational and contextual learning, multicultural contexts, and individualized learning (Aljohani, 2017).

**Importance of Strategic Scaffolding**

While a language teacher’s sensitivity to a student’s background information benefits instructional design and delivery, this consideration alone does not represent what it means to meet students where they are. In other words, language teachers need to scaffold their students’ learning strategically by integrating the various kinds of support learners will receive from teachers, peers, and the learning context (Birjandi & Jazebi, 2014). Scaffolding practices are of great importance in EFL classrooms, in that learners at different English language proficiency levels need appropriate accommodations contingent on their developmental stages in order to explore and understand the content in a more accessible way. Scaffolding is also inextricably connected to principles of constructivist foreign language teaching because the constructivist
classroom is characterized by “learner-oriented” and “real and complex learning situations” (Wolff, 1994), which necessitates scaffolding practices. Besides, collaborative learning is prevalent in the language classroom that embodies constructivism, through which peer scaffolding usually takes place. For teachers to create effective scaffolds, I regard Vygotsky’s (1987) concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) as a great tool. A learner has the potential to progress from their actual to their potential development level via scaffolding, which occurs during interaction with superiors (Khaliliaqdam, 2014). Therefore, with appropriate guidance and tasks of cooperation, language learners can arrive at their next stage of language performance. In my previous practicum experiences, the lesson usually turned out to be successful if structured in a purposeful manner. The instructor attended to different types of learning manipulatives that include linguistic, cognitive, social, and cultural components (Birjandi & Jazebi, 2014). The teacher also facilitated a students’ academic growth relentlessly through refining the individual’s level of task difficulty. Therefore, it would not be hard to conclude that productive scaffolding practices result in the efficacy of the learners’ co-construction of knowledge and learners’ growth in autonomy.

**Promoting Multimodality in New Literacy Practices**

Having said that scaffolding in EFL teaching contexts can substantially stimulate language learning, I extend this perception to promote multimodality in language classrooms; diversifying teaching and learning tools can fundamentally transform classroom experiences. The power of multimodality dwells in literacy practices both in and out of classrooms. As Vacca, Vacca, and Mraz (2013) noted, a literate person needs to interact with texts “that have multimodal elements such as print, graphic design, audio, video, gesture, and nonstop interaction” (p.33). What they
indicate here is that literacy is no longer confined to interactions with print text. Instead, it encompasses a broader range of skills and content across media platforms. It means that students nowadays will learn to design, enact, and engage in new media reading practices, along with the traditional print culture. For students who speak English as an additional language, multimedia opens up opportunities for them to learn the language via an environment of impactful input and multisensory elements. The book *Reading in a Participatory Culture* presented a vivid example of how the canonical literary text *Moby-Dick* by Herman Melville was remixed and appropriated for a contemporary theater adaptation. This process of capturing new media literacies as “a set of social skills and cultural competencies” (Kelly & Jenkins, 2013, p. 48) can galvanize a networked community that shares a passion for productive dialogue. These practices also put demands on students’ “multimediating,” which “[captures] the active processes of engaging in a variety of media environments” (O’Brien, 2011, p. 79). Students need to be explicitly taught skills to curate their digital reading practices and build their connection to texts across formats. The needs of literacy have dramatically shifted, and so should our classroom instruction.

As a language learner and experimenter, I have developed a further understanding of how literacy can be conceptualized and taught through experiential and inquiry classes that favor multimodal instruction. One of the highlights of my experience at Peabody is a travel class I took that explored the writer E.B. White. As a whole class, we traveled to Maine and closely observed original literary documents and listened to authentic stories related to the author. Inspired by different types of visuals, audio, and other sensory elements, I created a canvas project using colors and collages of different textures as my final project. When everyone was presenting their own individual products in class, we were actively practicing literacy skills by interpreting
multimodal elements and building relationships with the text, other people, and the world we had perceived. Being the only English language learner in that class, I came to realize that having the freedom to communicate via other forms of literacies helped me gain confidence in self-expression. This, in turn, fostered the nurturing of specific language skills over time. Research also supports a student’s access to analyzing multimodal texts, because different modes of communication (language, images, graphs, sounds, music, gestures, etc.) create meanings in concert that cannot be gleaned otherwise (Lirola, 2016). Therefore, I value distinct communicative affordances that multimodal texts carry, contributing to more personal, memorable, and meaningful learning experiences. In the future, I would capitalize on the dynamic interaction that emerges via the intermingling of different modes of communication and encourage students to demonstrate their sense-making process, making use of all means of resources. Increasing a multilingual learner’s readiness for composing multidimensional works will open up numerous ways of self-expression and help them critically evaluate, synthesize, and analyze all sorts of content as independent thinkers.

**Building a Critical Literacy Mindset**

To implement the idea of multimodality in the classroom, teachers need to teach critical literacy skills so that students can effectively engage in and evaluate a variety of texts. This discussion of critical literacy can center upon various aspects of teaching; in this paper, I mainly use it as an approach to building a type of classroom discourse that supports a student’s critical thinking.

In reality, EFL students are often held back from the practices realized through critical literacies. Those practices can be easily considered “beyond the capacities of those still in the process of
learning a new language” (qtd. in Bacon, 2017). Among the educational contexts that I have observed in Nashville, this bias unfortunately is not uncommon. EL teachers tend to approach literacy as teaching the “word” (languages) but not the “world” (critical literacy), which means they tend to omit attempts at expanding the range of classroom dialogue to include dimensions like “disrupting the commonplace, interrogating multiple viewpoints, focusing on sociopolitical issues, and taking action to promote social justice” (Lewison, Flint, & Van Sluys, 2002). When survival language and grammar drills are offered in a constrained manner, ELs lose the potential to achieve goals bigger than the language itself. There is no denying that for those at low proficiency levels, it can be a challenge to incorporate content calling for sophisticated language. With that being said, a student’s language proficiency should not dictate his or her engagement with higher-order activities. Bacon (2017) in his analysis of critical pedagogy also favors this stance and justifies the path to “[increasing] alignment between language learning and critical engagement toward mutual reinforcement and critical praxis” (p. 431). Therefore, despite challenges, it is important for language teachers to create curricula that support the critical reading of texts. In the long run, it will position teachers and learners as co-constructors of knowledge, analyzing and producing texts through multiple perspectives and across a variety of social issues and topics.

To conclude, when I consider my future in education, I envision nurturing and sustaining a constructivist classroom culture. From my experience, it contains several components. When working with a culturally diverse student group, I would first endeavor to identify who the students are and what funds of knowledge they can potentially bring into the classroom. Secondly, a constructivist classroom should manifest the power of authentic and purposeful
instruction. Teachers should lead students to “search for patterns, raise questions; and model, interpret, and defend their strategies and ideas” (Fosnot, 2005) by attending to appropriate scaffolds and multimodal resources. As students venture out into their lives, they do not just gain language proficiency. Regardless of where they are or what their goals become, a student’s self-belief and perception of the world is what ultimately lasts.
Artifact Analysis

Professional Knowledge Area 1: The Learner

This first professional knowledge area centers upon the learner, which lays a foundation for all EFL pedagogical theories and instructional practices. Language teachers should always prioritize knowing their students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds, including their learning styles, attitudes, and social investment. All those factors of influence need to be considered in the cyclical process of planning, enacting, and refining lessons. By grounding language practice in students’ actual needs, language teachers are forming a student-centered classroom dynamic, which will forge meaningful and productive relationships in classrooms.

TESOL Domain 4: Identity and Context

Teachers understand the importance of who learners are and how their communities, heritages, and goals shape learning and expectations of learning. Teachers recognize the importance of how context contributes to identity formation and therefore influences learning. Teachers use this knowledge of identity and setting in planning, instructing, and assessing.

Identity and context are two important concepts that have multifaceted characteristics unique to individuals in their language learning process. Teachers can incorporate students’ existing cultural and linguistic repertoires into EFL classrooms in order to influence student engagement and enhance overall communication quality. Therefore, I will gauge how teachers leverage students’ background resources to determine the quality of the artifacts under this category.
Artifact A

The first set of artifacts under this category consists of two parts of the Community Immersion Project completed in *Foundations of Emergent Bilingual Education* course. The Experience Paper (part 1) specifies one example of exploring Hispanic students’ cultural identities through collecting their community literacy artifacts such as food histories and art pieces in Casa Azafran, a local Nashville community center. The observation informs ways to connect with students, and using that knowledge to refine lessons. The School Visit Paper (part 3), extends the scope of contexts from the community level to school-wide support for EL students at Croft Middle School in Nashville. The paper’s contents reveal that the school’s accessible services and resources for EL students influence their students’ performances. The observation results discuss ways that community and school resources can nurture a constructive classroom culture.

This project showcases how my observation of the Hispanic community leads me to contextualize EL instruction to its representative group of students, acknowledging their funds of knowledge from their own cultures and identities. Since Casa Azafran is a place that “promotes the social, economic and civic integration of Latino families in Middle Tennessee” (“About Casa Azafran,” website), it has a rich amount of visible cultural pieces that celebrate their identities and historical legacies. Honored as an indispensable fabric of Hispanic and Middle Eastern cultures, food traditions and arts are well represented in that vibrant community center. One distinct example is their Mesa Komal Kitchen that incubates the spirit of entrepreneurship among immigrants. It displays the “dirty pages” hanging on the wall, introducing recipes with unique cultural heritage and family histories. Those collective pictures and descriptions characterize cultural awareness and identity related to Hispanic students. In the paper, I propose that teachers
can develop learning modules around food topics, drawing inspiration from Moll’s (1992) candy project in the context of international commerce. As part of interest elicitation, warm-up discussions around students’ family food traditions and varied culinary elements are conducive to creating a space for students’ funds of knowledge to become collective intelligence. The paper presents another distinct example that relates to “Culturally Responsive Pedagogy” (Gay, 2010), which is leveraging art literacies. Since colorful art pieces that celebrate landscapes, people, and other cultural elements are considered important cultural assets, they will be of great use in the classroom across topics and contexts, if incorporated strategically by teachers.

Switching gears from the community influence to school-wide contexts, I have found the part 3 school visit paper go further in complicating TESOL domain 4. Having collected information about how the school accommodates its EL population, I broaden my knowledge of EL services in a targeted school context. Based on the paper, Croft Middle School provides EL students and their families with services of different levels: it ranges from a ten-week family engagement program to partnerships with non-profit organizations, which address a variety of social, emotional, and academic needs EL students can possibly encounter. The interviews I conducted for this project also tell that the school holds its international fair every year to promote intercultural conversations.

Regardless, this artifact is not clear if there is a direct link between provision and utilization, so it falls short of TESOL Domain 4, which demands a process of transferring knowledge to actual teaching practices. In other words, it does not specify how teachers might take advantage of those programs and to what extent students are benefitting from those practices. Thus, it is
inadequate to pay only one visit to get a more thorough picture of how those programs actually go in reality. Periodic conversations, surveys with students and faculty members, and other tools and research focuses for a longer period of time are ways to solve this problem.

In regard to the classroom environment, there are mainly two specific instructional practices that shaped the learning context in my case. The first centers on the ELA classroom teacher Ms. Levy’s decision to use bilingual children’s books and other culturally familiar literature to boost her students’ reading motivation; the second relates to her daily meditation practice with her students, which exerted an influence upon the environment and context of students’ learning, albeit irrelevant to cultural identity. In detail, the paper points out that culturally familiar literature with which most Hispanic students can relate increases the chance for their incidental learning. This decision of Ms. Levy’s exemplifies the part of the domain that underscores the importance of teachers understanding the role of learners’ heritages in shaping their ways of knowing.

Besides, the part where it highlights the teacher’s daily meditation practice with her students as a pre-class routine serves as a good example of her caring for her students’ emotional needs. The disadvantaged socioeconomic situations that the majority of the students are faced with could force them to bring in unexpected issues to school. Though this practice may appear insignificant, it demonstrates the teacher’s consideration of the students’ real-life conditions and her action of transferring her knowledge into the way she maneuvers in-class activities. Five minutes of meditation may not directly solve students’ problems, but it serves as a positive way to reduce students’ anxiety and lower their affective filter impacting the quality of learning.
Given my theoretical inclination, it stood out to me in this artifact that the practices in this community and school investigation go in tandem with culturally responsive pedagogy (CRP, Gay, 2010), including leveraging students’ funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992). The fact that different agents associated with EL groups generally have displayed an inclination of employing a culturally responsive stance while each at different levels complicates this TESOL domain. Despite those pedagogical decisions reaping varied outcomes, there was an active atmosphere for collaboration seeking as they move forward. It is noteworthy that the concept of culturally responsive caring “is grounded in attitudes but must exemplify actions” (Gay, 2010, p.54). Far from being straightforward, in reality, it takes the teacher’s long-term commitment to build classroom norms that conform with the big concept. In this artifact, I observed that Ms. Levy understood her students’ life experiences and demonstrated her empathy through giving them moments of peace away from family struggles. True caring manifests through an action-provoking teaching stance regardless of circumstances.
TESOL domain 6: Learning

*Teachers draw on their knowledge of language and adult language learning to understand the processes by which learners acquire a new language in and out of classroom settings. They use this knowledge to support adult language learning.*

Essential as fostering a culturally responsive teaching stance is, a sustainable and constructive language learning environment still would not be as accessible to students without the teachers’ foundational knowledge of second language acquisition. To help ELs acquire and use their second language for social and academic purposes, teachers need to be equipped with knowledge of how students learn a new language across different developmental stages. As a result, teachers’ pedagogical applications can stand on a solid ground of expertise in language acquisition.

**Artifact B**

I have selected my SLA Case Study Report as an example of my attempt at delving into facets of language acquisition through the opportunity to examine, in more depth, an EL student’s language performances and development. In this artifact, I collect oral and written language samples from Alicia (pseudonym), a native Chinese speaker pursuing her master’s degree at Peabody College. The case study focuses on specific linguistic skills, which are respectively pragmatics, phonology, and grammar, broken down to morphology and syntax. In these separate analyses, I draw on different research-based language learning theories and frameworks to explain language phenomena presented in the collected samples, and that analysis feeds into her customized instruction.
Within this domain of learning, my teaching philosophy empathizes the importance of Els’ complicated social identities and language varieties. This artifact justifies this idea by illustrating how language elements under multiple theoretical lenses influence the learner’s language learning process. As far as sociocultural factors, the study acknowledges that factors such as motivation and extrinsic social elements like power dynamics contribute to the way she interacts with the English language. Having had received test-oriented language instruction for years, Alicia experienced the transition from having “instrumental motivation” to “integrative motivation” (Gardner & Lambert, 1972) as she embarked on her academic life in America. This is an instance of how I discovered that her changing social investment had exerted an impact on her language learning behaviors. Given what I have stated in my teaching philosophy about reconceptualizing the relationship between the language learner and the social world, I take the position that Alicia’s investment in the target language helped her “acquire a wider range of symbolic and material resources” (Norton, 1995, p. 17) as her social identity constantly altered across time and space.

It is noteworthy that in the analysis I point out that gender acts as a variable, imposing cultural expectations on female students’ career trajectories. In one of the pragmatic scenario elicitation tasks, Alicia expresses her concern over a Ph.D. offer because her family enforces females’ traditionally designated roles in society. This, to some extent, influences her end goal for learning English. While a commitment to a Ph.D. study demands advanced English expertise in specialized academic areas, lower levels of degrees put fewer pressures on how well she is expected to master the language in order to accomplish her career and life pursuits. My analysis
of her case reflects what is asked by this learning domain in that I include social factors outside of classroom settings in understanding her learning motivation.

Another aspect of examination under this domain is to look at how the learner’s first language affects her second language acquisition. I incorporated explanations that correspond with the idea of cross-linguistic transfer, which is essentially consistent with the rationale of using home languages and accepting language varieties in the classroom. To illustrate, when analyzing Alicia’s phonological performance, I note that her L1 Mandarin came to influence her pronunciation of the segmentals in English. Differences such as the lack of long and short vowels contrast as well as syllables in Mandarin pinyin system ending with vowel sounds result in her interchanging /i:/ and /i/ in articulation or adding /Ɛ/ sound in pronouncing “and”. In the paper, I further draw on Best’s (1995) *Perceptual Assimilation Model* (PAM) that explain the reason why those errors were made. The model helped me conceptualize that non-native sounds are usually assimilated into existing native categories, with which information I can better identify her difficulties in distinguishing two different phonological systems and offer targeted assistance.

I utilized this information to propose an individualized instructional plan tailored to her areas of weakness. One specific strategy in improving her phonological skills relies on language activities that highlight prosodic features so as to improve her metacognitive awareness. Another accommodation has a focus on her pragmatic skills: engage Alicia in more “controlled and free communicative production activities” since she has not reached a stage of handling differing linguistic choices subject to social situations. One commonality among all the introduced suggestions resides in favoring meaning-focused language instruction, in that all language
practices should be purposefully constructed and delivered at the learner’s instructional level. With that being said, this case study does not produce a plan systemic enough to implement, reducing the impact that this report could potentially have.

In sum, the two artifacts shown above exemplify my inquiry-based approaches in understanding language learners’ identity, language learning context and process. First, the snippets of the community immersion project investigate ELs’ language learning environments at scales of communities, schools, and classrooms. This artifact does not only confirm the prevalence of culturally responsive caring, but it complicates how the concept actually plays out in reality, especially in facing uncontrollable social variables. Secondly, I use my SLA case study paper as an example to comprehend the intricacies of language acquisition. Relevant frameworks and theories such as transfer from L1 to L2 have laid a foundation for improving my pedagogical instruction.

Based on all the discussions in this first professional knowledge area about the learner, it is not hard to conclude that language teachers need to gather as much information about their students’ backgrounds and needs as possible to guide their teaching goals. Regardless, teachers’ understanding of their learners will closely interact with learning contexts and be frequently informed by it. In the next section, I will shift gears to learning contexts and explore their relationship with the learner.
Professional Knowledge Area 2: The Learning Contexts

This professional knowledge area investigates *The Learning Contexts*. It is important because only through purposefully contextualized learning environments can learners fully engage in pedagogical practices. Language learners demonstrate their meaning-making process in the classroom space where teachers tailor instruction to students’ language proficiencies and needs; teachers refine activities upon a non-linear, rigorous examination of a variety of classroom tools and strategies.

TESOL Domain 4: Instructing

*Teachers create supportive environments that engage all learners in purposeful learning and promote respectful classroom interactions.*

This particular TESOL domain emphasizes the active role of language teachers in promoting students’ learning processes. It necessitates teachers being advocates for their students’ voices. A caring teacher is persistent in both interpersonal and instructional efforts. They strive for “multiple entry points for learning and multiple pathways to success” (qtd. in Gay, 2010, p.50). Pedagogy-wise, the teacher has to decide the constituents of classroom context and the trajectory of classroom discourse, all of which call for high-quality instruction embedded in varied scales of teaching practices. Supportive classroom environments are essential in achieving specific learning objectives. Meaningful interactions occur when content materials are delivered through carefully designed scaffolds.
Artifact C

In this section, I am going to use a digital storytelling project I completed for the class Reading and Learning with Print and New Media, and evaluate the assignment through the lens of creating a supportive environment, not only in the context of digital learning but for the enrichment of classroom interactions.

The objective of the assignment titled “Where I’m From” was to create an expression of our identity through digital storytelling. Individually, my classmates and I started brainstorming specific items that were significant to us in our upbringings, and then crafted lines that made complete poems. We merged images, songs, and audios in our final video production (see appendix) via Animoto, a free online program suitable for professional presentations.

Throughout the whole process, the professor provided us with sufficient instructional support. First of all, in the handout we were given (see Appendix Artifact C part 1), she laid out the rationale behind this project. The rationale consisted of discovering the answer to the question of “where are you from.”, which is usually more complicated than merely the country and city we live in. We identify with things that have shaped who we are as a person. Personal items that store our memories, family jokes, and sayings constitute indispensable parts that make us unique individuals. She justified the advantages of conducting this creative piece of work in getting a closer glimpse of others’ lives and stories compared to traditional self-introduction. For the next step, the professor exhibited the importance of modeling (see Artifact C part 2). We had access not only to the mentor text “Where I’m From” by George Ella Lyons, but the professor’s own digital story as well. Explicit examples were offered to set us on the right foot, giving us an
immediate sense of what the final production would look like. Additionally, when it comes to the final video making step, the professor offered us her account to log in and upload our work, to save our time and energy on navigating the website’s accessibility. In the end, when our videos got to be played on the first day of class, everyone was appreciative of their colleagues’ openness in sharing who they were; they were watching and listening attentively and respectfully, and at the same time making personal connections to others’ experiences. This project managed to create a very engaging space for us to have genuine interactions with our peers, which adheres to the goals presented in TESOL Domain 4.

The entire process of digital composing can be tied into my advocacy of multimodality in my teaching philosophy. First and foremost, what I observed is that the teacher took an active role in modeling for students. She explored the video tool alongside students and offered a vivid demonstration to better instruct us in producing our own videos. As I mentioned in my teaching philosophy, in addition to motivating students to learn, teachers should participate in the construction of shared dialogue based on the practice of constructivism. Kang (2018) states that “new opportunities for students and teachers to co-construct meaning and learn from one another will emerge” (p.739) if teachers themselves are willing to explore and experiment with the tools. Besides teacher modeling, we as students were learning to navigate Animoto and design our videos purposefully to construct and present our narratives. Those narratives were creative and meaningful to individuals and the significance did not reside in what we told, but how we told what we wanted to get across. From where I stand, the process of creating reinforces the power of authenticity that language learners will be able to strengthen along their journey. As challenging as that project may have appeared in the beginning, our final product was an
outcome of “multimediating” (O’Brien, 2011) that led us to gather and constantly make decisions on multimodal elements. We had to consider whether words, images, and sounds made sense together and whether pieces should have been added or deleted depending on how we intended to connect ideas and make transitions. Though there were times when we were fumbling over technology glitches and had doubts on consistencies among varied parts, moments of spontaneity sparked our sense of autonomy and connected us to “broader themes, emotions, experiences, and identities” (Pacheco & Smith, 2015, p. 303). This digital storytelling project captured the idea in my theoretical framework that authentic literacy practices characterized by heterogeneity bring about self-efficacy and autonomous learning.

Overall, this artifact serves as an example of how multimodality, especially with digital platforms can diversify students’ learning experiences, facilitate their meaning-making process, and encourage critical pedagogy to come into play. It is one example of how multimodal instruction nurtures a genuine communicative atmosphere and allows creativity to prosper. When students are thoughtfully instructed via a variety of learning manipulatives, it is foreseeable that students gain momentum in their learning process.

However, there’s no denying that the process of instructing relies heavily on the content of what is being taught, leading to the next focus on curriculum. Curriculum provides direction for instruction, which would serve no direct purpose without the former. Therefore, to maximize student learning via supportive environments, curriculum needs to support an intentional instructional agenda based on students’ needs and be compatible with other aspects of language learning.
Professional Knowledge Area 3: Curriculum

TESOL Domain 1: Planning

Teachers plan instruction to promote learning and meet learner goals, and modify plans to assure learner engagement and achievement.

TESOL Domain 1 emphasizes the teacher’s preparation of lessons with an eye to “promoting learning and meeting learner goals.” It is followed by constant modifications and refinement of previous plans. Therefore, the following artifact will examine the alignment of the lesson objective with methods of instruction, as well as a discussion on further modifications to the lesson.

Artifact D (Part 1)

I have selected the video analysis project I completed for EDUC 6540 Methods and Materials for Educating ELL, a written product after reflecting on a video of my instruction to a whole class in the 5th grade. The Planning domain will be illustrated primarily through Part one of the reflection—macro-analysis, which centers on how I designed and sequenced the activities to scaffold students’ learning, followed by thoughts on instructional refinement.

First and foremost, it is important to introduce the learning goals I set for the lesson. In alignment with Common Core Standards (Point of View in Literature), the goal was that “students can describe how a narrator’s point of view influences how events are developed by writing a response using evidence and explanation” (Literacy. RL. 5.6). As part of the other contextual information brought up in the analysis, most of the 20 EL students in that class are
active ELs (WIDA 2-5) with a variety of cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and the anchor text *The Party* by Pam Muñoz Ryan narrates teenage girls’ struggles with their sense of inclusion and confidence at school. Students were expected to demonstrate their understanding of the narrator’s changing perspective throughout the story, drawing on text evidence.

To meet this goal, I incorporated a series of scaffolding strategies into my lesson plan. In my analysis, I drew on two different conceptual frameworks, respectively Hammond & Gibbons’ (2005) Scaffolding in Action chart and Gradual Increase of Student Independence (GISI) proposed by Echevarria et al. (2017), to reveal layers of planning rationales via different angles. There are some specific instructional decisions worth highlighting. One prevalent component that helps contextualize students’ learning and promote objective achievement was the adoption of semiotic systems in teaching Point of View. I modified the plot diagram (see Appendix Artifact part 2, p.111) and used it to assist students’ sense-making process—how the narrator’s emotions influence the description of events, prompted by questions such as “how does Pam feel about the party/herself” at each plot element. By dissecting the whole story into separate guiding questions, I made the objective more accessible to students. Additionally, as a reminder, I encouraged students to use annotation systems to pinpoint crucial text evidence, prompting them with “Where in the text do you know that?” As a result, students found it easier to locate key information and produce their writing. This is an example of how I tested out the idea that embedded charts and other cognitive scaffolds contribute to students’ meaning-making process. Besides, as visual aids belong to part of multimodal instruction, their value was also justified in this teaching scenario.
While scaffolding instruction requires strategic planning, initial planning is never sufficient without further modifications and adjustment. In my macro-analysis, I laid out the areas in need of refinement, i.e. differentiating language objectives and bringing in a critical literacy aspect of classroom discourse for my future curriculum design. To specify how I proposed to modify language-based expectations for the lesson on point of view: I suggested that “students at the lowest ELP can aim for producing descriptive words or phrases in the worksheet, while those at a relatively higher ELP should be able to write simple sentences using language and vocabulary that explains the focus question clearly” (p. 92 in artifact D part 1). This ties into my theoretical inclination that it is essential teachers consider students’ ELP and use collected information to meet students where they are on their learning trajectories.

In a lot of school districts, teachers plan their lessons based on the textbooks and pre-assigned content to meet their standards. Regardless, our evaluation of the content quality should precede teachers’ planning and further inform implementing and assessing. The next session will be discussing if and how students are learning what they need for communicative purposes.

**TESOL Domain 7: Content**

*Teachers understand that language learning is most likely to occur when learners are trying to use the language for genuine communicative purposes. Teachers understand that the content of the language course is the language that learners need in order to listen, to talk about, to read and write about a subject matter or content area. Teachers design their lessons to help learners acquire the language they need to successfully communicate in the subject or content areas they want/need to learn about.*
One of the dispositions language teachers should possess is to always be on the lookout for quality content that is worth investing in. As Widdowson (1990) states, “The effectiveness of language teaching will depend on what is being taught, other than language, that will be recognized by the learners as a purposeful and relevant extension of their schematic horizons (p. 103). This statement emphasizes the role of content in helping English language learners access the required knowledge and skills to perform across different contexts. Those knowledge and skills are not refined in language proficiency but expand to broader and more fundamental areas such as students’ critical thinking and their awareness of social justice. Under the lens of the curriculum, an ideal teaching plan should embed those layers of consideration. In the following part, I will be looking at the same lesson in the previous domain but coming from a different perspective, as a view of how content allows space for students to develop transferrable skills and help them grow intellectually as a whole.

Artifact D (Part 2)

I decided to keep looking at the lesson I analyzed for the previous planning domain but will be discussing how the content has been taught and could be taught differently. Overall, there are mainly two aspects of problems in the content area that fall short of what this domain emphasizes. First, the content in the language classroom was not used to promote students’ communicative competence; second, the curricula tended to focus more on the breadth than the depth of what students are learning, thus leaving little space for critical literacy practices.
Since the lesson on teaching Point of View was categorized under the literature area, students should be engaging with narrative features in this type of genre-specific texts. This is evidenced by explicit teaching on words such as “perspective” or “narrator/narratives”. Though an IRE pattern during instruction was conspicuous, students were absorbing and interacting with the language relevant to the content. However, the problematic part resides in the lack of opportunities to use content-rich language for genuine communicative purposes. Since most of the students were active ELs and therefore struggling readers and writers in English, classroom activities were largely seen in controlled formats, causing them to over-rely on form-based linguistic support such as sentence stems in their speaking or writing practices. As I stand by the idea that authentic tasks calling for higher-order thinking can be made accessible for ELs performing at lower language proficiency levels, I take issue with limiting their language practices to only decontextualized, form-based activities.

As an alternative, I mentioned in my analysis the importance of enriching the content by exploring critical literacy aspects across the texts. This layer of consideration calls for teacher’s application of a Dialogic Inquiry Tool (DIT) in language arts classrooms. In this particular artifact, I envisioned multiple discourse paths that the teacher and students could have taken. In thinking about what difference it would have made if the story was narrated from other points of view, questions like “How does the same scenario can be rewritten from another point of view that may disclose other sides of the story?” or “Should the narrator’s point of view be cautioned against due to certain biases?” can facilitate students’ ability in perspective-taking. When those questions are posed, teachers should aim for focusing on the process of meaning expression and authentic thoughts behind students’ articulation, instead of prioritizing their language accuracy.
School or state standards ought to be met based on the grounds that students are actively engaging in sense-making dialogue, which aligns with my teaching philosophy—a communicative and meaning-focused classroom culture reigns.

The second layer of problems opens up a discussion on the benefits students can get out of “deep” rather than “broad” conversations. Due to my preference for critical literacies, one question is how EFL teachers can create space for practicing critical skills? In other words, how can teachers weave elements of critical discussion into their lesson plans? Pally (1997) suggests that sustained content study (or studying one area over time) allows students to accrue information, question, synthesize, and evaluate what they read. Students’ familiarity with certain disciplines will not only boost their targeted vocabulary maps for reading and writing, but it can further facilitate the expansion of that of other content areas. Once they have developed a learning pattern for one area of expertise, they can apply that pattern to new content areas and keep strengthening skills involved over time. With this artifact specifically, through learning the topic of Point of View, students can practice their perspective-taking skills by collecting and comparing different opinions and positions. That requires the teacher to bring in new but relevant content under similar teaching objectives for students to engage with so that they can transfer their skills across a variety of social contexts. This is essential to point out because in reality, most of the content structures in ELA curricula, especially those for ELs, lack the longer and intensive practice of one academic topic before students are ready to perform commensurately with native speakers. Therefore, school administrations and classroom teachers need to stay alert and be critical about the curriculum they are given and find a way to exercise their responsibility in making necessary adaptations for the overall quality of the content.
To conclude, the above lesson plan and analysis paper offered an example of how I tapped into scaffolding strategies to achieve learner objectives. It measured to what extent the language instructor capitalized on content to promote genuine communicative purposes. It went on to discuss the benefit of “deepening” the content, an advantage of integrating critical literacy practices into language classrooms. Having said that, the design and implementation of every pedagogical decision relies on an evaluation process to gather further information about revising and refining instruction. Therefore in the next section, I will explore the last TESOL domain on assessing learner performance with the aid of language assessment tools.

**Professional knowledge Area 4: Assessment**

**TESOL Domain 3: Assessing**

*Teachers recognize the importance of and are able to gather and interpret information about learning and performance to promote the continuous intellectual and linguistic development of each learner. Teachers use knowledge of student performance to make decisions about planning and instruction “on the spot” and for the future. Teachers involve learners in determining what will be assessed and provide constructive feedback to learners, based on assessments of their learning.*

Assessing language learners’ performance is a crucial step for all language teachers to improve their teaching quality. The use of assessment information will largely affect the effectiveness of classroom communication and influence the cyclical pattern of teaching and learning. Teachers should take advantage of performance-based and authentic assessments to activate students’ repertoires of knowledge and skills necessary for real-world contexts.
Artifact E: IPA Plan

I have selected an assessment plan adopting the prototype called the Integrated Performance Assessment (IPA) to show an example of performance-based assessment and focus on how it interacted with other parts of instruction as well as the ways it could assist teachers to create rich instructional contexts.

In this artifact, I created a multi-task assessment which was framed within a thematic context on “Time Travel.” This topic intersects with science content knowledge, but students are given all the information from the anchor text to complete all the tasks. They first completed an interpretive task presented in a comprehension worksheet, then applied the theories and concepts they learned in an interpersonal task, which took the form of 10 minutes of peer conversation on time travel. Finally, they produced a writing piece as a presentational task. After each task, I offered separate rubrics to guide the students’ task completion and the teachers’ scoring. For instance, I adapted the rubric for the interpretive task from the original version and specified test categories in the worksheet, such as key concept retrieval practice, word recognition, and main idea detection. The criteria ranged from “exceeds,” to “meets,” to “does not meet expectations,” each characterized by descriptors. For test prompts that are more subjective, such as asking the author’s perspective, it put more responsibility on teachers’ judgments of students’ performance. Noteworthy is the fact that those tasks are interrelated and built upon one another, thus providing students with multiple encounters of the same content but different formats. This underlying rationale is consistent with my theoretical inclination that students have to closely engage with authentic materials across multiple contexts not only in their classroom learning time but during the assessment stage as well.
Since the overarching purpose of the IPA was to help identify students’ strengths across the communicative modes and to recognize which skills need further development in meeting learning objectives (Adair-Hauck, Glisan, Koda, Swender, & Sandrock, 2006), the most conspicuous problem with this assessment artifact resides in the lack of a try-out step, with students being measured by the protocol and rubrics. No matter how theoretically solid the IPA assessment appears, it has to be put into real practice with students of varied learning performances. There are many nuances in reflecting on “how authentically it is assessing students and how to better differentiate levels of difficulties to increase its effectiveness,” after the first round of implementation. Without this step, the connection between instruction and assessment is difficult to build. Ideally, assessment should have a positive “washback effect” on instruction, informing and improving the curriculum and teaching and learning practices beyond the test (Poehner & Lantolf, 2003; Shohamy, 2001). In my philosophy, I pointed out that language teachers should internalize the concept of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPDs), which means teachers have to gather authentic student data to support their learning process and guide them in their ZPDs. To reflect on this artifact, for the presentational task, I inserted the option of individual meetings for students who need further individualized writing assistance. They are expected to benefit from constructive feedback and gain momentum in their learning trajectory. However, this has not yet been tested.

As I rethink how the IPA plan could be further specified, there are concrete steps that could be taken to evaluate and improve learner performance on IPA tasks. Wiggins (2004) suggests a procedure of “modeling, practicing, performing and feedback” to gain a positive washback effect. When teachers and students view samples of student work and review the criteria to
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determine what constitutes performance at each level, they naturally have a clear direction of what they want to achieve (Adair-Hauck et. al., 2006). This also reflects part of the Assessing domain where teachers are supposed to involve learners in determining what will be assessed. Thus, this particular assessment instrument has to reap the benefit from students’ actual assessment results in the future. In the long run, assessment serves as an indispensable part of a cyclical, recursive model of language teaching and learning.
Application to Practice

Future Prospects in Language Education

The previous sections shift from my teaching philosophy to artifact analysis, a process of using a theoretical, analytical lens for investigating the actual EFL related products I have observed or produced throughout the program. Ultimately, what matters more than the quality of the artifacts is what I take from the evaluation process in guiding my future practice.

One perpetual goal of my future classroom returns to the backbone of my beliefs in teaching—creating and sustaining a culture of constructivist language teaching and learning. As shown in the artifacts, there are a variety of instructional practices that successfully reflected the concept of constructivism. It includes lesson plans and observational papers highlighting cross-cultural awareness, learner-oriented values, and critiques for curriculum or content quality. However, constructivism embodies more than a fragmented collection of practices. As Windschitl (1999) states, “it is a coherent pattern of expectations that underlie new relationships between students, teachers, and the world of ideas” (p. 752). It means that constructivism should work as an essential fabric of classroom dynamics, weaving the way multiple agents interact with one another. Learners’ way of connecting with peers, relating to the teacher, and taking on the subject matter will create different types of communicative affordances.

As I further envision distinct classroom norms under constructivism in my future teaching, I would put a lot of effort into refining multimodal instruction to promote students’ critical literacies. Experience has shown me the power of having diverse learning resources as a practitioner. John Medina, author of *Brain Rules*, found that those in multisensory environments
always have an advantage in “[recalling] with better resolution that lasts longer, evident even 20 years later” (2018). Therefore, I would bring in authentic language materials in forms of visuals and auditory texts, for instance, and at the same time be actively nurturing space for digital tools in my classroom to enhance students’ new literacy skills. As they engage with multisensory learning manipulatives, creativity and imagination thrive, helping them prepare for real-world success. I have been internalizing and actualizing the belief that authentic and meaningful learning occurs when they become active content evaluators and creators.

**Challenges and Professional Development**

As appealing as constructivism seems, crafting instruction based on it is not straightforward. I can foresee one of the first challenges to be embracing the difficulties in shifting teacher-centered instruction, considering that it is part of my personal history. Windschitl (1999) warns that “teachers are more likely to be guided by…the familiar images of what is ‘proper and possible’ in classroom settings” (p. 753). That puts demands on me as a teacher to think and act boldly despite the confines of traditional classroom culture. This brings in a new demand: to equip myself with a sophisticated range of strategies as students conduct learning through questioning-driven, problem-based, or multimodal activities. The ability to maneuver “messiness” in class does not come overnight. Instead, it requires consistent experiments, adjustments, and critical reflection on my role as a teacher, supported by a well-articulated rationale for every instructional decision I make.

To grow as a committed language teacher, I anticipate drawing on a wide range of professional development resources. I consider student-centered approaches as the anchor of my evolving
teaching trajectory, so I would carve out time for refining my teaching strategies such as scaffolding, modeling, and facilitating in response to students’ needs, through rich conversations with students both in and out of classroom settings. In the sphere of getting different types of supports across multiple agents, striving for a culture of constructivism should be a collaborative endeavor. Teachers, school principals, and administrators need to work collaboratively and systematically in discussing and investigating constructivism in our own contexts. Peer support can be carried out via workshops, seminars, or book study, in nurturing an active environment for teachers to deepen their understanding of its principles and limitations. Besides, parent groups and the school board should be invited to the whole conversation about how to ensure the idea of constructivism applies to the current school context. A thorough and well-founded plan needs to be orchestrated to justify classroom practices in accordance with constructivism.

When it comes to the areas of multimodal instruction and critical literacies, I can also make good use of social media as a vibrant platform for professional development. It is a promising practice to curate a learning network where I can learn different skillsets and grow as part of a community. There is no denying that digital content involves untested ideas and carries varying degrees of information reliability. Yet, as teachers need to prepare 21st-century students for a connected world, I cannot afford to avoid the digital wave, in order to grow my skills in selecting and analyzing the content mindfully alongside my students.

Students in the 21st century need to be prepared as the “Four Cs”: proficient communicators, creators, critical thinkers, and collaborators (NEA, 2012). A constructivist classroom culture will contribute to the realization of these roles we expect students to grow into. In the field of
teaching English as a second language, teachers do not only take on the role of guiding their students to grow language proficiencies but more importantly, they help learners experience the world of ideas and encourage them to use language as a tool to step up in the world and find their own voices. The real power, in advocating for constructivism in a foreign language learning setting, lies in engaged students who set off on their own learning adventures.
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Appendix
Artifact A: Community Literacy Experience Project

(This project is for the class EDUC 6520 *Foundations of Teaching Multilingual Students*. It consists of two parts. Part one focuses on our community experience to Casa Azafrán, while Part 3 looks at the school context.)

Part 1
It is always eye-opening to explore a cultural group through the lens of its community literacies. The experience is analogous to beholding a magnificent canvas, drawn in assorted shades and colors that collaboratively, convey the meaning of the whole piece. That is how I would describe my visit to Casa Azafrán: every swatch of fabric, vibrant color, and the presence of many languages in every corner spoke to the spirits that a diverse community, not merely Hispanics, celebrate. Their literacies connect and further energize a wide range of industries, “from health, financial, and legal services to cultural, culinary and educational enrichment” (About Casa Azafrán), and can contribute to ELL teaching and learning.

The changes of Hispanic demographics in Nashville have been fueling the thriving networks within its community. Among cities in Tennessee, Nashville is estimated to witness the largest increase in Hispanic population in the future, after tripled-digit growth between 1980 and 2014 (The Tennessean, 2016). In 2017-2018, Hispanic or Latino population consisted of approximately 10 percent of total in Nashville (Suburban stats). The exponential growth of Hispanic immigrants and refugees boosts the necessity of strengthening the ties across varied social and economic spheres of life. This active atmosphere of meaningful interaction and
connection permeated the rooms in Casa Azafrán. One of the sections that particularly impressed me was the Mesa Komal Kitchen funded and operated by Conexión Américas, introduced as a “center for Microenterprise” (see Figure 1). This place was also described as a “culinary incubator” (see Figure 2) in that it has been nurturing the immigrant spirit of entrepreneurship by providing an open space for newcomers to start out their business upon their arrival in the U.S. Along the hallway outside of the kitchen hung a leaflet titled “dirty pages” (see Figure 3), which referred to “well-worn recipes that help bind [10 Nashville women] to the cultures of their heritage.” Each food tradition has been embedded with irreplaceable individual stories, histories of immigrant families and even of their home countries. When passed on to young generations, those recipes will enrich their “funds of knowledge” (Moll et al., 1992), which can be applied to change the dynamics of classroom teaching. In the article by Moll et al., this idea has been exemplified through the “candy” learning module, bringing in knowledge on international commerce (see Theory into Practice, 1992, p.138-139). Utilized strategically, community centers like Casa Azafrán can also help young Hispanic ELLs practice the concept of “legitimate peripheral participation” (Wenger, 1998). For those who may be familiar with certain aspects of cultures but less competent in the new language, teachers can initially focus on content-based activities, capitalizing on students’ prior knowledge such as cooking, and gradually combine higher level of instructions to help students become more adept at the English language and American culture.

To construct a more dynamic and flexible language teaching classroom, language teachers can attach more importance to arts. Compared to “traditional writing text, spelling, punctuation and other conventional literacies”, arts-literacies are invisible. Yet, they are essential to nurturing
“personal and social capabilities, critical and creative thinking, and ethical and intercultural understanding”, the way of knowing called “being wide awake” by Maxine Greene, American education philosopher (Lemieux et al., 2018). Since language learning is not the end, but the means of accessing the real world’s discipline-specific literacies, ELL teachers should apply artistic practices in language teaching. The elements of visual arts infiltrated Casa Azafrán. A rich representation of colors and shapes expressed individual identity and celebrated diverse cultures within all of Latin America. “Landscapes, people, neighborhoods, food and festivities…are given life by [Latin American] artists to show their love for their fellow countrymen, culture and identity” (De Soto, 2012). The mosaic titled “migration” (see Figure 4), boldly colored, was the very first piece that caught my attention. Containing more than 7,000 hand-cut tiles and representing the ties of Hispanic and Middle Eastern cultures, its entwining forms “reinforce the idea that [immigrants] become something new in interaction, but in the process [they] do not lose what [they] are” (Ridley, 2012). Considering the ample historical elements stored in the place, it would be feasible for language teachers to include those materials in their class and thus facilitate their students’ identity awareness. By doing so, teachers would be demonstrating the power of “Culturally Responsive Pedagogy” (Gay, 2010) by offering them agency framing their voice.

Entertained from a broader perspective, arts possess the potential to sustain a constructivist classroom culture. As Windschitl argued, when “students are required to produce…physical models, or performances in the form of plays, debates, dances, or other artistic representations”, they can develop a “deeper and elaborate understanding of subject matter” (Windschitl, 1999). I collected some pieces from Casa Azafrán’s art gallery (see Appendix A), funded by a social
enterprise nonprofit called Poverty & the Arts (POVA). Among those paintings, homelessness was the shared theme, expressed by specific cultural imagery. Take one painting titled “The Blue Boat” (see Figure 5) for instance: it can be used in an ESL writing session on the topic of home. The teacher can design a learning module starting from the cultural implication of the “boat” such as nostalgia, along with the colors used in the whole piece ---blue, yellow, green, etc. By eliciting students’ interpretations of its relation to home, they are to be guided to create their own imagery and tell their own stories in ways of drawing or writing. In this process, students will be learning arts-specific vocabulary or metaphors, share thoughts, collaborate with others and thus enrich their understandings of what home means to other spirits.

To conclude, a vibrant and closely connected community like Casa Azafrán generates valuable literacy resources for teachers who work with young immigrant ELLs. Community literacies bridge various cultures in the American “melting pot” society and in the meantime, they shape the unique identity exclusive to the Hispanic immigrant group. When teachers take efforts to appreciate the food traditions of students’ home countries, tap on their artistic talents, and make a good use of all sorts of visible or invisible cultural elements, they will have more chances to build meaningful and productive relationships in their classrooms.
Images:

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 5
References


Part 3 School Visit Paper

Taken as a glimpse of U.S K-12 schools, my visit to Croft Design Center Middle School in late October was eye-opening in the sense of informing me of the support their ELLs receive across different levels. Belonging to Metro Nashville Public Schools (MNPS) system, Croft is currently serving 703 students in grades 5-8 and has 40 teachers on staff, according to Quick Stats (2018-19), Public School Review. With a 0.69% diversity score (Top 5% in TN), it has 62% of minority enrollment in which Hispanics takes the lead of 36%, followed by 20% Black students and 6% Asian students in sequence (Public School Review). According to the information provided by the school Principal, Dr. Jeremy Lewis, among the whole student body, 40% have Limited English Proficiency and 19% (around 140 students) are served by the EL program directed in a combination of push-in and sheltered approaches. These numbers and facts have largely confirmed with my on-site observation of the school’s demographics, with Spanish being the main language heard within the school hallways, other than the English language.

Having diversity as one of their most apparent attributes, Croft has unavoidably been given the underlying mission to address the social, emotional and academic needs of their minority students. The mission includes engaging with not only students and teachers, but also with caretakers and community members in project-based experiences. In terms of the language support at the school-wide level specifically, the Principal introduced their 10-week program called Parents as Partners from Conexión Americas. Delivered 100 percent in Spanish, this parenting program aims at bridging the language gap, increasing family engagement in their children’s education and therefore boosting the Latino community connection in a broader sense. As one of the major partners with Croft, Conexión has also been running an after-school program.
with Nashville After Zone Alliance (NAZA) tailored to their Spanish speaking students.

Additionally, every May, Croft holds their International Fair, in which the school opens its doors to ethnically varied community members to get involved in their multicultural conversations, operated in the form of speeches and hands-on activities. Ideally, these systematic programs would serve as a foundation to cultivate agency in ethnically diverse students outside of the classroom.

Distinct from online research and one-on-one interviews, my actual observation time in Ms. Levy’s 8th grade ELL class has generated a more rewarding experience. Both her explicit and implicit interactions with her students have brought about multiple layers in terms of my reflections concerning how the ELLs were treated. Having taught 6th and 8th grade in Croft for 2 years, Ms. Levy displayed strong love for her students and a high level of compassion for her job, despite difficulties at times. That spirit was reflected through the thoughtful arrangement of vibrant decorations within her everyday teaching space, among which building worldwide horizons was a dominant theme. Signs that mirrored national flags and world maps attached on the wall, a terrestrial globe along with books and photo albums across disciplines stood on a closet, besides a relaxing area made up of carpets and back cushions. Other designs such as inspirational cards, well-organized schedule boards and informative learning tips and strategies all contributed to nurturing and humanistic learning environment for her students.

One detail that particularly caught my attention was all the children’s literature spread over the tables evenly. Most of those books were bilingual English and Spanish versions, carefully chosen by Ms. Levy herself from the Nashville Public Library (NPL), who partners with Croft to “give
students easy access to the best educational resources” (Limited Libraries). She intended to build on their reading proficiency by offering them as much exposure as she could, using culturally familiar literature such as La Mariposa by Francisco Jimenez. The book narrates a story where a schoolchild’s journey of learning language was fueled by his interest and imagination of butterflies. Another book that I flipped through portrayed an immigrant boy who used his “tiger mask” on Halloween to gain confidence and to eventually obtain his autonomy in his new community. Lively illustrations, repetitive refrains and graded vocabulary were strategically combined in specific plots so as to facilitate young readers’ comprehension. Overall speaking, books containing themes like acculturation and self-identities can easily resonate with Ms. Levy’s linguistically diverse students and elicit their sense of empathy.

Nevertheless, there exists a gap between what has been offered and what has actually been utilized. As I was wondering to what extent the students were actually benefiting from the aforementioned accessible resources, on the time schedule appeared a relevant session called “DEAR”—Drop Everything and Read, which lasted for 15 minutes from 11:00 A.M. to 11:15 A.M. every day. However, the school librarian admitted that not many teachers were actually following this particular activity, on the grounds that the time often conflicted with other plans considered “priorities”. Thus, this well-intentioned practice had unfortunately been reduced to more of an unenforced rule. It is necessary that Croft and other local schools capitalize on the power of books to build on students’ literacies. This recognition becomes more urgent for ELLs as they need adequate reading opportunities as one of the major language inputs. As Krashen (1989) pointed out, that more comprehensible reading input leads to greater “consciously learned competence”. Thus, instead of depriving students of that limited time, teachers should act upon
the consensus that reading matters and cooperatively assist students in finding books—courses in magazines or newspapers. Schools should ensure DEAR time actually exists and even seek the possibility of creating more time slots for quality reading. Having that idea extend to EL curriculum, ESL teachers like Ms. Levy can consider bringing literature into their classroom teaching, using “literature circles” with their students to increase not only their reading skills and comprehension but also their motivation. Operated in a group-based form, the implementation includes steps such as asking students to write “literature response journals”, guiding them to work on “extension projects” based on book topics and collecting on-time feedback before they finally discuss in groups and share their learning experiences (Carrison & Ernst-Slavit, 2005). According to Carrison and Ernst-Slavit (2005), some struggling readers saw notable growth in their oral performances as a result of the meaning-making practices listed above.

In aspects of Ms. Levy’s pedagogical instructions design and her classroom management, she organized the class in the way that further spoke to the idea of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (CRP). There was a unique meditation session set up for every class before students were led to work on real language tasks. She would gather all the students around a table and let them rub some oil of varied fragrances they preferred in their palms. Students closed their eyes, placed their hands in front of their noses, exhaled and inhaled several times, accompanied by her comforting words. This special class ritual helped students calm down and clear their minds, and more importantly, it demonstrated that the teacher felt enough to care for her students’ real emotional needs, considering the situation that some of them were facing numerous tensions outside of the classroom, causing mental blocks to classroom learning. Meditation may not solve
their problems, but Ms. Levy’s considerate intent has an impact in tightening bonds between her and her students.

It should be noted that Croft Middle School does have social workers and counselors, but those service providers are predominantly monolinguals. The language barriers make it difficult for students of limited English proficiency to communicate their needs and get the help they need. The fact that Ms. Levy could only speak a little Spanish does not support effective bilingual communications either, but the difference resides in that she as an English teaching professional, was adept at using language comprehensible to her students so that their needs could be easier to address. Also, through day to day interactions, she apparently knew more about her students’ situations than school counselors, which gave her advantages of helping individuals in their one-on-one meetings. She extended her role as a motherly caregiver, providing mental and emotional support both in and outside of the classroom.

In regard to her task-based instructions, she held her students accountable by closely tracking their performances using language that was encouraging, communicated in a patient and authentic attitude. Before the reading task that those students were assigned to for the day, there first came a review session tailored to ELLs of different levels. Croft levels their English learners from 1-6, and those in lower levels were grasping the basic alphabet while more advanced learners were engaged in more sophisticated vocabulary tasks. Though understandably, it is more challenging to guide lower level learners to follow her instructions, she responded promptly to correct distracting behaviors, using words “dear, let me see your hands” or “Try your best! Make it happen!”; More disciplined students were praised as role models; As a way of encouraging
peer collaboration, she suggested, “if your friend is struggling, help him out!” When they proceeded to analyze the article, she induced her students to ask questions and put them down. To incorporate speaking skill, she later invited students to the front to present their thinking. This step varied with speakers of different levels in its effect because some of them simply refused to speak out loud. She supported struggling speakers with extra patience, giving them credit for taking a little more effort than they did last time.

From Ms. Levy’s styles of teaching, particularly the interactional pattern in her class, she was clearly advocating her students as a “warm demander” (Kleinfeld, 1973, 1974, 1975). Her persistent verbal encouragement essentially shows that she “[honors] their humanity, [holds] them in high esteem”, as Gay (2010) defines the spirit of truly caring for students. However, it takes time for ELLs, especially those in their initial transition period, to increase their engagement in learning activities, moving from “neutrality…considerable passivity…and emotional flatness” (Goodlad, 1984) to a stage where the teacher’s expectations are met with a more active and engaged learning mindset. Therefore, ESL teachers at all levels should acknowledge that language teaching and learning is a long process that requires their persistent support so that they flexibly adjust their expectations and instructional practices towards learners with diverse abilities in different stages.

To conclude, my one-day observation findings spanned across the spectrum of the ELL support system at Croft Middle School. Assorted programs were carried out on the school-wide level to meet the needs of linguistically diverse students and their families; ELL classrooms such as Ms. Levy’s embodied a culturally responsive atmosphere, reflected not only through exterior
decorations and arrangements but also through internal teacher and student interactional dynamics across discourses. Yet, for local K-12 schools, there is still much to be desired as to implementing what has been and will be designed to further advocate for language-minority students.
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Artifact B: Second Language Acquisition Case Study

(This is a semester-long case study for the course EDUC 6530 Educational Linguistics/Second Language Acquisition.)

Part I: Introduction to the learner

Participant Overview

Alicia, a first-year International Education and Management Policy (IEPM) M.A. student at Vanderbilt University, agreed to be my interviewee for this analysis. We first met each other at one of the orientation events for international students in late August 2018, and because we were coincidently from the same city (Taizhou, Zhejiang) in China, it was easy for us to build connections.

With 13 years of English learning experiences, she described herself as an intermediate level in terms of the English proficiency overall. In May 2018, she graduated from Zhejiang University, one of the most distinguished institutions of higher education in China, with her bachelor’s degree in Management of Land Resources. Noteworthy is the fact that during her undergraduate time, the curriculum she had only required first-year comprehensive English courses twice a week and those courses were mainly designed in a test-oriented fashion. After she passed the College English Test (CET) level 4 and 6, a test that is tailored to non-English major undergraduates, she intentionally took some elective education courses, where English was the primary instructional language in class. That experience laid a basic knowledge foundation for her future graduate school application. However, her whole exposure to English was quite limited before coming to the states this summer.
In terms of her previous knowledge in more specific aspects of a language, i.e., phonology, semantics, grammar and pragmatics, some were found to be more advanced than the others. Throughout her former schooling in China, she had never received any form of systematic or formal phonological training with the English language; She had never heard about the term IPA (International Phonetic Alphabet) before. Therefore, her phonological awareness was shaped primarily through language input in natural settings without scaffolding. Also, though she could not specifically name the terms that indicate the meaning or the internal organization of words, their features and content were communicated through her linguistic system. As for pragmatics, since she had not had much experience of using English in different social contexts to achieve certain communication ends, that part of awareness is also in the initial developing process in a second language setting.

**Language Sample Collected**

In order to examine her language ability through a different lens, both oral and written samples were collected to show her language use across registers.

In total, I collected approximately one-hour oral language data from two sessions of interview throughout the semester. Specifically, I conducted six pragmatic scenario elicitation tasks, three narrative tasks, one persuasive task and one expository task with Alicia’s cooperation. It should be noted that though Alicia was willing to participate in the interview, she was concerned about her speaking skill. Therefore, there was also a nearly 5 minutes warming-up chat in the very beginning of the interview, for the purpose of alleviating her anxiety to have an unthreatening communication atmosphere. The two interviews were both arranged in a private study room in the Peabody library, which ensured a high-quality recording. In addition to oral samples, I also
collected several Alicia’s written samples that had been produced within the last three months. In
detail, she provided me with five pieces of emails with various types of recipients, one
composition she wrote in preparation for the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL)
about the internet influence on youngsters, and one recent academic essay for her American
Education History and Policy course about intelligence testing. Besides, she also completed a
semi-controlled writing assignment to supplement my pragmatics research.

Influencing Sociocultural Factors

Alicia’s English language development trajectory has mainly been affected by both intrinsic and
extrinsic sociocultural factors, which are interrelated and have been co-functioning to shape her
language ability. As for intrinsic factors, her motivation and further investment take crucial roles
in her previous and future language learning. In Alicia’s past learning experiences, English as an
art subject was combined into school curricula in a test-based form, which indicates that she was
long exposed to a teacher dominant classroom environment where there were lots of rigid
language drills and exercises rather than communicative activities. Her goal was to get good
grades in English while involving in a rigorous study of other subjects at the same time. Thus,
the reason why she learned English could be categorized into “instrumental motivation,” versus
“integrative motivation” (Gardner & Lambert, 1972). Since immediate or practical goals have
been driven her to continue English learning, her proficiency was to a great extent subject to the
content and the standards that her formal English education required.

However, as Alicia embarked on her graduate program in the U.S, she invested in English as her
second language, expecting to have a good return on that investment (Peirce, 1995). Bonny
Norton (1995) noted her notion of investment is not equivalent to instrumental motivation which
she deemed “a property…a fixed personality trait”; she perceived an investment in the target language a constant process of “organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world” (p. 18). According to her concept, Alicia is not only exchanging or gaining material resources through language, but more importantly, she is in an active position of identifying the relationship between her and her surroundings, using English as a medium to better structure her identity, position her role and see where she goes from the place she is currently in.

Concerning extrinsic factors, social elements that reflect power dynamics have unavoidably exerted an impact on the way Alicia learned English. Since American English has been widely considered mainstream or standard English in China, it has long been the dominant accent that Alicia was exposed to. Therefore, she admitted that she had a difficult time understanding her peers who are from other English-speaking countries and carry varieties of accents. Her linguistic repertoires are also a miniature of language ideology demonstrated through social literacy practices. Besides, gender is an interesting aspect that is worth noticing in Chinese society. In the scene where she explained to the professor about why she turned down the Ph.D. offer, she brought about as a girl she could not afford to spend too much time on studying, considering her parents’ concerns on women’s traditionally designated responsibility. This factor may in a sense influence her decision making in terms of the prospect of her career path, in which her need and perception of using English would also change accordingly.

Part II: Learner’s Oral and Written Language Abilities

Introduction
The English language can be divided into three major functional components, namely form, content, and use (Owens, 2011). Following this thread, I will examine the participant Alicia’s overall English language proficiency, using both her oral and written samples through a different lens. It will move from the scope of sound units (phonology), symbols that are at or below the word level (morphology) and that are above the word level, i.e. phrase and sentence structure (syntax), to the lens of the meaning or content of words and word combinations (semantics), which will be followed by a further close look at her language ability in achieving communication ends in different social contexts (pragmatics).

**Phonological Analysis**

By referring to the Second Language Acquisition Chart, I would describe Alicia’s overall language proficiency mostly in Level 3 and has been in transition to Level 4 (see Image 1). In the narration and persuasion elicitation tasks where her utterances were more continuous, many of her sentences were of short or medium length, which displayed a limited vocabulary; she showed a high frequency of using filler words such as “um” and “yeah”, along with lots of basic grammatical errors made unconsciously and repeated self-correcting or rephrasing behaviors. With these phenomena detected, her performance in fluency was noticeably being affected. Nevertheless, for most of the time, her pronunciation was clear and intelligible and hardly caused any confusions or misunderstandings.

When de-structuring four levels of recognition in phonological awareness, i.e., phoneme, syllable, word, and prosody, I found Alicia performed better in some areas than the others. Her most apparent strengths resided in some aspects of supra-segmentals (rhythm, stress, and intonation) (Celce-Murcia, Brinton and Goodwin 1996). She applied lots of rising intonation in
the middle of the sentences or at the end of short pauses while falling intonation appeared more often when a sentence ended. This tendency created some natural flow in her speech under contextualized scenarios. In terms of stress, she had little difficulty knowing the right syllable to place the stress on, such as the third syllable of the verb “recommend” and the first syllable of the adjective “primary”. Having that being said, there were exceptions due to the missing of certain syllables: she failed to produce the irregular pronunciation of the plural word “fishes” /ˈfɪʃəz/ but simply added a devoiced consonant /s/ sound to the original form. The occurrence of this incorrect generalization is probably because the speaker was driven to the language patterns she was more exposed to in the second language environment so that her brain was not able to activate the less used variations in a moment.

If I focus more on her pronunciation of segmentals, her L1 influence became more apparent. I noticed that she frequently substituted the diphthong /eɪ/ for the long vowel /iː/, as heard in words such as “we”, “week”, “freedom”, “these” and “agree”. The long vowel /iː/ and the short vowel /i/ were interchanged at times, as in words “relationship” and “kids”. This happened because Mandarin does not have long and short vowels contrast as they do in English, so that Chinese learners may not produce or perceive those duration differences of the vowels in English (The Education University of Hong Kong). Additionally, she tended to drop the last consonant, like /ʃ/ in “fresh”, or added an extra vowel at the end of the word, such as /ɛ/ in “and”, because syllables in the Mandarin pinyin system generally end with a vowel sound. As the Perceptual Assimilation Model (PAM) explained that non-native sounds are usually assimilated to the existing native categories (Best, 1995) so that Alicia naturally mapped unfamiliar phonological patterns with the nearest equivalents in her existing native categories. In this process, she was
also drawing on her metalinguistic skill to understand and even generate new rules in her unique language system.

**Grammar Analysis**

**Morphological Ability Analysis**

The attempt to calculate Alicia's Mean Length of Utterance (MLU) had drawn my attention of the English language structure in microlevels, i.e., how words formed and the functions of the parts, when morphological awareness was at play. While morphemes that of inflectional with markers such as "-s" or "-ed" are not difficult to locate, others of derivational may be less clear-cut, since our perceptions of morphemic status can be obscured by words' historical developments, according to CSUN (2013). I selected portions of her language data from the expository assignment and two pieces of her written samples respectively, using Microsoft Word where I inserted space in between two morphemes, counted their total number sequentially divided by the number of utterances. Roughly measured, Alicia's verbal score on MLU was 16.36, as a result of 360 morphemes over 22 independent utterances, while her written portion saw approximately 27.96 after 727 morphemes were spotted over 26 utterances. It should be noted that though her written language samples seem to generate a more significant number of morphemes per utterance than that in the spoken ones, the variety of morphemes was not seen much growth correspondingly in the former case. According to her writing sample, she has displayed a good command of knowledge in inflectional morphemes by correctly adding "-ing" or "-ed" to the original words, such as the case in "increasing", "educating", "learning"; or "are given", "be addicted to". As for the "-ing" forms, some of them are used as adjectives while others mark gerunds as the subject of the sentence. Besides, derivational morphemes as in "-ly"
"able" and "-al" are also within her certain level of mastery. Some of the examples are "totally" and "admittedly" as adverbs and "remarkable" or "electrical" as adjectives. Her ability to apply different kinds of morphemes to different parts of speech demonstrated her basic sense of morphological awareness.

In the meanwhile, her weakness has been revealed under the morphological scope. In her oral sample, her tendency to repeat words that contain the same morphemes became more apparent. That occurred because she was expected to keep talking before she had time to organize her thoughts immediately. As a result of her paying more attention to the content than the form, Alicia consistently altered tenses which were supposed to be aligned with the context. Specifically, "simple past tense" and "simple present tense" were the most frequently alternated, as in "go-went" and "begin-began" when she introduced the Werewolf game.

**Syntactic Ability Analysis**

Under the functional syntactic category, one of the most conspicuous characteristics I noticed in Alicia's samples was the variation on the linking devices that she used for the different register. In her oral sample where our conversation contexts were more casual, she merely employed some common conjunctions, primarily "and" and "so"; while in her writing sample, more complicated and academic connectives, like "due to", "first of all", "in addition", and "in this sense" functioned as linguistic markers to hang ideas and information together. Though it seems that she intentionally used logical devices, the problem resided in that without adequately developed ideas supporting her arguments; those markers instead made the flow of the sentences and paragraphs a little choppy and rigid. Besides, regarding her strategies to avoid repetition, she
relied on anaphor taking the form of pronouns, to refer the antecedent of the sentence in both oral and writing samples, whereas she barely utilized synonyms to replace the phrase as mentioned earlier. For example, in her TPO practice, she reiterated "cell phone, online games and social networking website" the same way five times in total within around 500 words' essay, when similar expressions like "electronic devices" "virtual space" or "digital platform" could be taken into consideration. As for the use of proper word order, some of the basic sentence patterns such as "SV" and "SVO" are more common in the oral sample than that in the writing ones, where patterns like "SVOC" appeared more often. For most of the time, there weren't obvious errors as to the word order, while they did occur when it comes to some collocations. In her writing sample, there was a phrase called "value conception system" which rarely appeared in the formal English discourses. Rather, she could use "the conception of values" to get the meaning across. With respect to other sides of her oral production, subject-verb agreement turned out to be an area where she struggled a lot. Errors like "before the game beginning" or "the game begin" are related to the verb form changing when "begin" was placed in different sentence structure. Additionally, her samples showed inconsistencies of the article "the" and propositions, as in "give up on the halfway" or "God has right to…" when a "the" should be inserted before "right." It is those function words which have little lexical meaning but serve to express grammatical relationships with other words within a sentence that are easy to overlook.

**Global Grammar Assessment**

In general, according to the samples analyzed, Alicia's grammar performance had been found more advanced in writing than in speaking, measured from both morphological and syntactic scales.
Noticeably, she was able to produce more complex and advanced sentence structures as of subordinate clauses in writing, linked by a more diverse pool of connectives than that in oral utterances mainly consisting of simple conjunctions. In that sense, she did have access to a broader range of morphemes perceived in function words; Yet, her production of content words was much more restricted, as a result of lacking synonyms and other expression equivalents as replacements. To add, her use of tenses in writing outperformed that in her speaking, since written process allows revising and polishing texts while the latter calls for immediate response. Therefore, grammatical accuracy tends to be more challenging in Alicia's speaking tasks, predictably with more repetitions, incomplete sentences and corrections which lead to more syntactical errors, including the issues of word order, small words usages such as propositions and articles, or missing plural "s". Specifically, for instance, on the word order, there were some uncommon collocations in her written language as she tried to incorporate multiple ideas into limited syntactical space.

**Semantic Analysis**

As Owens (2011) defined in Language Development, “semantics is a system of rules governing the meaning or content of words and word combinations” (p.23). To evaluate Alicia’s language ability on the semantic scale means to observe how well she was able to master the meaning and the content of words in specific content areas. Yet, the crux of the task resides in what components consist of ones knowing a word? In order to have a relevant theory base, I refer to Nation’s (2013) framework of the dimensions that involved in knowing a word (See Image 2), divided into three categories: form, meaning and use, in which receptive and productive
knowledge were also presented to help distinguish each item that falls under them, and to supplement the understanding of word knowledge.

According to Alicia’s oral performance over the interviews, she displayed the ability to activate her vocabulary webs or schema in response to a topic that involved relevant concepts. For example, in a narrative task where the topic is about a specific traveling experience, concepts like “tourist attractions”, “cities”, “weather”, or “food” were naturally implied to complete her story. By looking at her answer, she was able to generate various kinds of descriptive adjectives to depict her experience in Japan, such as using “traditional”, “beautiful” “neat” and “modern” in describing some of the cities she visited; words like “delicious” and “scary” were included to express her feelings toward some of the activities she participated in. Her lexical density in this task was 54.2%, which was surprisingly slightly higher than that in one of her written samples, 53.8%, according to Textalyser. This result indicated that the construct of her semantic maps varies in degrees of complexity as the topics shifted.

Both the breadth and depth of her word knowledge (González-Fernández & Schmitt, 2017) in specific contexts is based on her world knowledge, which refers to her “autobiographical and experiential understanding and memory of particular events” (Owens, 2011, p. 23). It is understandable that Alicia had owned much experiences and memories in traveling which gave her access to a rich content knowledge filled with language resources that were more active and retainable than in those scenarios where she could draw much less personal experiences if without further research on the topic. From analyzing her draft on discussing the impact of social networking on children, which is a more narrowed topic, it is noticeable that though she was
aware of discussing the relevant concepts such as “addition to online games” “online violence” and “moral behaviors”, she struggled with diving deeper into levels of arguments that require more sophisticated understanding. As a consequence, her content knowledge did not support the expansion of her semantic maps. While in her oral introduction of her traveling experience, her breadth of word knowledge under certain concepts helped her performance in lexical density, defined as the number of lexical or content words divided by the total number of words.

It is important to note that Alicia’s limitation of L2 lexical semantic knowledge does not equal to her lack of knowledge in her first knowledge, Mandarin Chinese. During our interview, there was a time when she tried to state that the glass that constructed Tokyo Tower was “transparent”, she failed to activate the equivalents of the adjective in English immediately. Thus, in order to proceed with her narration, she brought out its Chinese expression to exchange meanings. In other cases, some nonexistent and misspelled words were, in fact, the reflection of her still progressing L2 semantics system, which did not interfere with her holistic content knowledge. Some examples are as follows: When she was explaining the Werewolf game in the expository task, she meant to introduce the character “foreteller”; Instead, she mispronounced as “foretutor”, which seemed to be influenced by the phrase “fortune teller”. A similar situation could be found in the sentence “it’s a class about the fundamention of the American education system”, where the word “fundamention” was nonexistent but was probably a derivation mixed by “fundamental” and “foundation” in her unique system of word knowledge. This phenomenon is also related to the questions of “In what patterns does the word occur?” about grammatical functions under the category of use, in Nation’s (2013) framework as mentioned before.
To sum up, Alicia had a fair amount of knowledge in terms of words concept and referents, but how broad and deep her word knowledge depends on what content areas she encountered and her L2 lexical maps are still in the process of expanding and developing as she proceeds her graduate studying.

**Pragmatics analysis**

I started pragmatics part with some daily topics which I assumed would help her transit to the next phase more smoothly. When asked about her current communications with American colleagues, she imitated their expressive emotions with noticeably changing tone and volume. Her utterances in response to my questions were mostly situationally appropriate considering our close relationship regarding the social context. To continue, by examining her communicative skills from the scope of the Grice’s Conversational Maxims (Language Files, 2016), I found that she had a good mastery of the Maxim of Quality and Relation, but she had difficulty with that of Quantity and Manner.

We moved on to the major part of the interview by performing the role-play based on seven different scenarios where socio-pragmatic factors, i.e., social distance, power and degree of imposition (Brown & Levinson, 1987) and pragma-linguistic factors were at play with varying degrees. Her language appeared to reveal certain features that can be generalized as patterns, while some stay distinct from others. The topics moved from declining a professor’s Ph.D. offer, to rejecting the requests made by a classmate and a stranger respectively. In all cases her first instinct was apologizing politely, followed by reasonable and understandable excuses to avoid the possible conflicts. In the professor’s case, she addressed both family and individual concern as to why she had to give up the opportunity; As for the notes borrowing scene, she violated the
Maxim of Quality by purposely lying about the fact that she had lent the notes to someone else while she actually had not. This demonstrates her inclination to minimize the negative consequences that could affect the interlocutor, speaking to the part of her communicative strategies. According to the utterances she produced, I noticed that, though she possessed a basic socio-pragmatic awareness, the relatively rigid utterance patterns made it difficult to see how different elements in that spectrum play out. In other words, her lack of pragma-linguistic competence was getting in the way. There is limited language variability as she frequently applied “I would like to, but I’m afraid…” pattern to decline, or used conventionalized forms “I/You can…” to make suggestions, when other options that vary in degree of directness indicating politeness such as “It would be helpful if you …” or more directly “I recommend you …/ I suggest that you …” (Martinez-Flor, 2005) can help further measure contextual appropriateness incurred by the aforementioned three social variables.

To further evaluate her communicative skills, I collected her samples of emails on the written mode and designed controlled writing activities for her, which serve as powerful add-on evidence for the findings in the oral samples. Different from the actual in-person communication where interlocutors have to respond on scene, the discourse conducted through emails allows more time to ponder over wording but requires no less effort than in a spontaneous situation. In each recent email that Alicia sent me, the person she wrote to is of varied social distance, power (e.g., school orientation leader, professor, office officials, landlord) and imposition (e.g., request assignment sign-up and apply for on-campus jobs). Overall speaking, she followed the Maxim of quality and relevance, but the problem resides in, again, the Maxim of quantity and manner. She has exhibited a pronounced tendency to explain things that are often more informative than is
required (Maxim of quantity) before bringing out the real issue. As a result of redundancy, she also had difficulty being brief in expressing the core message. For instance, in the case where I asked her to write an email to a luxury hotel manager regarding her stay to suggest some hotel service improvements (Example 6 from 6Rs Approach, pp.54), she first spent a whole paragraph complimenting the satisfactory part, then complained about her unpleasant experience, before finally suggesting to him to provide better training for his staff. However, the email could have been more purpose-oriented, minimizing or at least shortening the length of compliment and complaint. Also, she was being wordy by stating, “I do hope my suggestion can make sense for the hotel and it can become better and better!” when an ending line like, “I hope my suggestions can help improve your services” will do.

Additionally, in terms of pragma-linguistic awareness, the linguistic forms she produced when making requests and suggestions do not explicitly demonstrate her competence in reacting to dynamic contexts. I noticed that she usually started the email with “I hope this email/message finds you well” regardless of assorted social relations, which is acceptable but not necessarily the most appropriate. In one email she used this greeting to her professor whom she met every week. I would argue that it is best to skip the informal conversation and cut straight to the intent of email, considering a professional discourse. Other preferred patterns like “I’m reaching out to ask…” “Could you please…” (indirect but she used with a close friend) or “How’s it going?” (casual and informal while she used with a hotel manager) all indicate that she has yet to achieve a stage where English as the second language is mastered as a tool to communicate effectively and efficiently.
Part III. Assessment of Learner’s Stage of English Acquisition

Based on Alicia’s initial self-evaluation, she considered herself an intermediate English language learner with 13 years test-oriented training experience. Yet, after a close and detailed examination built upon focus on discrete elements of the language, I would score her overall proficiency at in transition to Level 4, or High Intermediate Fluency (See Image 1, Phillips Galloway, 2017) while it has not yet fully landed at that stage.

According to the categorization and description of each level in the Language Acquisition Chart, some of the characteristics that have been detected and analyzed in her oral samples would match the items in Level 3, Low Intermediate or Social Language Stage. Take the pragmatic part of the interview for example: though basically, she could handle different social contexts using situationally appropriate language to express her intentions without highly contextualized support, she produced a noticeably amount of short phrases and simple sentences combined with basic grammatical mistakes such as subject-verb agreement. Some pronunciation errors also appeared from time to time, but those could be understood given rich context.

Having that being said, some aspects of her spoken language performance did come close to the requirements that Level 4 has set. In tasks of the narrative, persuasive and expository type where she was expected to produce more consistent utterances, she displayed her ability in engaging in connected discourse, relying on lexical devices more than grammatical ones. She showed a certain level of comprehension that was able to help her stay on track of the topic. Albeit in the current stage she usually has difficulty further explaining facts or evaluating arguments, her process of developing more academic language is unfolding as she continues her graduate program.
When drawing on the Student Oral Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM) chart (See Image 3) to break down her language ability into separate sessions, it is interesting to note that those independent scores are mostly aligned with her overall score evaluated upon the chart mentioned above. Specifically, regarding Comprehension, Alicia’s level reached at 4, which means she understood nearly everything at normal speed with occasional repetition from the interlocutor. Nevertheless, in one of the narrative tasks where she talked about her experience of being in a native speaker dominant class, Alicia admitted that she had a hard time comprehending the professor’s normal speed language, due to the highly intense content input where lots of technical terms and subject related vocabulary were packed. Therefore, her comprehension ability was to some extent subject to the language context. As for fluency, Alicia performed at a score of 3, because there were frequent pauses and rephrases in her speech when she was searching for the idea or the correct manner of expression. Also, her vocabulary score would land at the same number in that her active vocabulary was limited, leading to lots of repetitions of one word, instead of using other equivalents such as synonyms to convey the same concept. Yet, I would score both Alicia’s pronunciation and grammar at level 4: her pronunciation was intelligible for most of the time despite her accent influenced by her first language. Besides, her grammar mistakes in many occasions were just slips of the tongue that did not obscure meaning, though some related explicitly to word form or order did involve her morphological and syntactical awareness that require explicit instructions to improve over time.

Part IV. Specific Instructional Plan

Since Alicia had never lived or studied in an English-speaking country before this August, she is facing numerous challenges both in her academic and in different daily social settings. In order
to help her better transition to a more demanding language learning environment, the instruction plan should be constructed and conducted in a meaningful and context-based structure.

**Phonology**

To further develop Alicia’s phonological skills, I suggest the following instructions according to her strengths and weakness: Firstly, combine both segmentals and suprasegmentals features of pronunciation in the instruction and focus more on the latter when her overall language proficiency becomes more advanced (Nair et al., 2006). Language drills that involve the use of minimal pairs can help her make distinctions between sounds in L1 and L2 and thus reinforce her mastery of the target language. Later, when she reaches a relatively higher level of phonological awareness, activities should lean towards aiming at improving her communicative ability by strengthening prosodic features (stress, rhythm, intonation, etc.) (Lambacher, 1999). For example, drawing her attention to “the difference between the rhythm of the syllable-timed Chinese language and the stress-timed English language” (See Image 4) is a beneficial contrastive approach. The teacher can use chain pictures or curved lines to highlight linking differences (Chen et al., p. 14). Secondly, since phonological skills are interrelated with morphology and etymology (Bowers et al., 2017), other aspects of language knowledge should be incorporated to accomplish a more advanced language stage. Alicia exhibited a lack of complexity in her speech vocabulary, which has not only affected her fluency but got in her way of showing adequate comprehension of the content. Thus, teaching meanings and the relevant history of affixes would help build on her understandings of word combinations in the long run. The purpose of this strategy goes beyond the phonological level to the improvement of her metalinguistic skill over time.

**Grammar**
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In order to improve Alicia’s overall grammar skills, I suggest all her language practice instructions centralize in meaning-based forms. Explicit morphological interventions such as teaching affix and root meanings would help her expand the knowledge of word families. The rationale behind, suggested by Goodwin, Lipsky, & Ahn (2015), is that by guiding students to become “word detectives,” they can consciously relate the word’s meaning to morphemes and be able to generate new ones (pp. 465). Through decoding words and reconstructing meanings, she can have a stronger vocabulary base which would benefit her productive language activities. As for syntactical instructions, I recommend her to involve in more speaking practice on narrative or informative speech topics like some highly discussed issues in Education, the area she will be mainly investing in. In those scaffolded practices, cohesion is particularly addressed. Regular close analysis of spoken and written model texts can draw her attention to cohesion in both grammatical and lexical lenses. Following that type of exposure, “brief active processing activities can involve students in generating examples” (Crsson & Lesaux, 2013). By imitating the model and practicing on a regular basis, syntactical knowledge can be further internalized and strengthened in her daily practice.

Semantics

In order to develop and deepen Alicia’s word knowledge, I suggest that she capitalize on Graves’ (2016) word learning instruction. Firstly, Alicia would benefit from rich and varied language experiences where words appear in a wide variety of situations and genres. New words are learned through multiple meaningful interactions. Thus, promoting incidental word learning through her independent work outside the classroom is of great importance to building richer and deeper semantic webs in her word knowledge. Secondly, explicit words instruction should be adopted. After receiving clear and simple explanations, Alicia should be
given more information to add to her previous understanding. The teacher could further deepen her word knowledge by guiding her to connect, paraphrase word meanings, or providing a wide range of synonyms for increasing her awareness of new words. After class, she could keep journals with interesting and usual words that she encountered. By doing this, she will be actively transferring word knowledge from receptive to the productive sphere and be practicing independent vocabulary learning. The rationale behind, as pointed out by Lavoie, Mark, and Jenniss (2014), is that meaningful and task-based vocabulary activities require deeper processing, so that it is more likely that “the lexical unit will be acquired and retrieved” (p. 212).

**Pragmatics**

Based on our first session of interview and the written samples (mainly emails for pragmatic part) I collected, I found that she has attained a certain level of communicative skills based on the past nurturing in her home country, but has not acquired an advanced ability to handle social contexts with differing situational variables that require appropriate linguistic choices. Thus, I would recommend her to engage in more controlled and free communicative production activities, such as oral and written tasks in giving requests and suggestions that imply different levels of directness in communication (Martinez-Flor, Uso-Juan, 2006). By way of deliberately practicing, she can be more aware of the strategies applicable in real life situations in the U.S. Besides, I noticed she is still in her initial process of cultural adaptation, and that has been reflected in the forms of her language production. In order to improve Alicia’s code-switching skill, I believe that she will benefit from the “comparison and contrast” strategy that Wheeler (2008) favored: using detailed analysis to notice different language patterns in two languages. Under this framework, she should be more conscious of language differences, cultivates her cognitive flexibility over time, and thus developing her pragmatic skills overall.
Part V. Critical Reflection

Having been learning English for many years myself, I have never had the opportunity to examine the English language or any other language in such a close and detailed approach. This case study has helped me gain insight into not only what my interviewee knows about and how she uses English as her second language, but more importantly, it helped me dive deeper into the rationale, the reasons why those language phenomena would occur in ones existing linguistic system. In other words, it has opened up a door for me to consciously build on my metalinguistic awareness, the ability to talk about and analyze language.

I also became more aware of the interrelated relationship between ones L1 and L2, how they are interacting and affecting a second language learner’s learning trajectory in multiple, nuanced ways, under different sociocultural backgrounds. By applying various theoretical foundations to the assessment of Alicia’s linguistic performances in different areas, those theories have become more concrete and easier to retain in my knowledge. Additionally, I also realized the complexity of language which requires a massive amount of researching and synthesizing. This recognition is essential for me to develop a rigorous and scientific attitude toward language-related discussion appeared in different works of literature.

As for the pedagogy implications derived from this learning, I realized that in order to meet the language needs that ELLs have, explicit and strategic instructions tailored to different aspects of the language learning should be designed with specific purposes. Thus, in my future work with English learners, I will be particularly attaching importance to carrying out instructional activities with clear goals set up and at the same time fostering a space where my students feel
CAPSTONE EFL PORTFOLIO

their investment in the second language is rewarded with the progress they are effortfully making.

Appendix

Image 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOLOM Teacher Observation</th>
<th>Student Oral Language Observation Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student's Name:</td>
<td>Grade:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Observed:</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Comprehension</strong></td>
<td>Cannot be said to understand</td>
<td>Has great difficulty following</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>even simple conversation.</td>
<td>what is said. Can comprehend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>only social conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>spoken slowly and with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>frequent repetitions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually hesitant; often forced</td>
<td>Speech in everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>into silence by language</td>
<td>conversation and classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>limitations.</td>
<td>discussion frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disrupted by the student's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>search for the correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>manner of expression.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **B. Fluency**           | Speech so halting and         | Speech in everyday conversation|
|                          | fragmentary as to make        | and classroom discussion        |
|                          | conversation virtually         | generally fluent, with           |
|                          | impossible.                   | occasional lapses while the     |
|                          |                              | student searches for the correct|
|                          |                              | manner of expression.           |

| **C. Vocabulary**        | Vocabulary limitations so     | Student frequently uses wrong|
|                          | extreme as to make            | words; conversation              |
|                          | conversation virtually         | somewhat limited because of     |
|                          | impossible.                   | inadequate vocabulary.          |

| **D. Pronunciation**     | Pronunciation problems so     | Always intelligible, although   |
|                          | severe as to make speech      | the listener is conscious of a   |
|                          | virtually unintelligible.      | definite accent and occasional   |
|                          |                              | inappropriate intonation         |
|                          |                              | patterns.                        |

| **E. Grammar**           | Errors in grammar and word    | Occasionally makes grammatical   |
|                          | order so severe as to make    | and/or word order errors that    |
|                          | speech virtually unintelligible.| occasionally obscure meaning.    |
|                          |                              | Make frequent errors of         |
|                          |                              | grammar and word order that     |
|                          |                              | occasionally obscure meaning.    |
|                          |                              | Occasionally makes grammatical   |
|                          |                              | and/or word order errors that do |
|                          |                              | not obscure meaning.            |
|                          |                              | Grammar and word order errors   |
|                          |                              | approximate that of a native    |
|                          |                              | speaker.                        |
Table 16.1 Nation's (2013) framework of the dimensions involved in knowing a word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
<th>FORM</th>
<th>MEANING</th>
<th>FORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spoken [R]</td>
<td>What does the word sound like?</td>
<td>[P] How is the word pronounced?</td>
<td>Witten [R]</td>
<td>What does the word look like?</td>
<td>[P] How is the word written and spelled?</td>
<td>Word parts [R]</td>
<td>What parts are recognizable in this word?</td>
<td>[P] What word parts are needed to express the meaning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Form and meaning [R]</td>
<td>What meaning does this word form signal?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concept and referents [R]</td>
<td>What is included in the concept?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associations [R]</td>
<td>What other words does this make us think of?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collocations [R]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Constraints on use [R]</td>
<td>Where, when, and how often would we expect to meet this word?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: [R] = receptive; [P] = productive.
English: Stress-timed Rhythm

Chinese: Syllable-timed Rhythm

Pronunciation is important.
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Artifact C: Digital Storytelling Project
(This project is for the class EDUC 6340: Reading and Learning with Print and New Media. The following contents include a handout given by the professor, the professor’s example of her identity video, and my video, alongside with the link and the script.)

Part 1 Handout: Where I’m From

When you meet someone new, one of the first questions you usually ask is, Where are you from? The answer to that question is usually the name of the country, state, city, or town where we live. But usually it is more complicated than that.

When you’re thinking about where you’re from, you think of the specific things. You think of significant items, like a teddy bear given to you by your favorite aunt, or the old couch with the pizza stain. You think of common sayings from the people around you, like how your crazy uncle always calls you Scooter, or how your grandma always says “ciao for now” when you leave her house. You also think of the people and places that have made you who you are, like your first pet hamster that taught you to keep the cage door closed, or your favorite court where you play pickup games.

Brainstorming:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Common Sayings</th>
<th>People/Places</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Think about items in your home (bedroom, kitchen)</td>
<td>Think about phrases you heard growing up</td>
<td>Think about family members, relatives, or friends that link you to your past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think about items in your yard</td>
<td>Think about family jokes and nick names</td>
<td>Think about places that link you to your past (places that relate to different times of the year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other items?</td>
<td>Other items?</td>
<td>Other items?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 2 Teacher’s example:

Link: https://animoto.com/play/Xtqnjzk1cLX7Q3xwJAe0pg

Part 3 My Final Video Production:

Link: https://animoto.com/play/s1BEbSg5Uu5AD6Z1ZUXU1TA
Where I’m From (Script)
Gia Huang

I am from a five foot brown Teddy bear
From stacks of faded teenage letters
Inserted with dried maple leaves
Murmurs of all seasons

I am from mother’s handknit sweaters, winter scarves
From her “time to speed up” as December approaches
I am from the long-gone fish tank
Next to the stained couch
That used to be crawled all over

I am from a rainbow tossing ball
With scattered golden hair
From my dog’s lazy belly and muddy paws
And from his glowing coat in summer lakes

I am from worn-out Nike shoes
And size 6 roller skates
From a rusty blue bike somewhere in the garage
I am from Saturday hikes and breeze in the woods
Sprinting all the way down from top of the hill

I am form soup noodles and steamed rice
From grandmother’s meat balls
And a bubbling pot on Lunar New Year’s Eve
And pan-fried pork dumplings
From “hurry up when served hot”

Cobbled roads and stone buildings
Carrying stories hundreds of years
I am from a Great Wall
Weaved in a city’s love and pain
From the outstretched spines of ups and downs
I come from these memories
Rooted on the other side of the Pacific Ocean

Wherever I go
I hear Yangtze river wind through my veins
Artifact D: Whole Class Instruction Analysis

(This artifact is completed for EDUC 6540: Methods and Materials for Educating English Language Learner. This written assignment was conducted after a whole class instruction. I reflect on my lesson on teaching Point of View at the macro and micro-levels respectively.)

Part one: Video Analysis Paper for Methods and Materials for Educating ELLs

Macro-analysis

High-quality language teaching takes a disciplined and strategic process of planning, applying, and evaluating multidimensional aspects of lesson instruction. In this part of the video reflection, I will introduce and analyze the macro-level features of a complete 5th grade English Language Arts lesson, aiming to refine pedagogical practices.

As part of context information of this lesson: there were approximately 20 EL students of a variety of cultural and linguistic backgrounds, sitting at five tables, as shown in the video. Their English language proficiencies mostly range from level 2-5 gauged by WIDA standards. The lesson centers on a short story called The Party by Pam Munoz Ryan, which presents a first-person narrative of a girl's inner struggle towards a party. Her treatment leads to the theme of teenagers dealing with their insecurities and finding a sense of inclusion at school. The students had only read the story once by the time I came in to lead Second Read, and they had not had many discussions on the details yet. As predetermined in text-based planning, Point of View was the focus of the next lesson. In align with Common Core Standards (Point of View in Literature), the learning objective that I planned to achieve was that "student can describe how a narrator's
point of view influences how events are developed by writing a response using evidence and explanation (Literacy. RL. 5.6).

Throughout the lesson planning, I intended to incorporate deliberate scaffolding strategies into instructional implementation to achieve learning objectives. Adopting the three-stage framework to planning "backward design" (Wiggins & McTighe, 1998): learning experiences and instruction will need to gather evidence of student's understanding of how Pam's (the narrator) perspective changes as events unfold. Observable evidence includes their oral and written production in response to how she perceives things differently at each key plot element. The primary steps consist of identifying the narrator along with characteristics of the first-person point of view, tracing Pam's changing perspective individually and collaboratively, and producing a written response as the final task.

In real practice, some of the preplanned scaffolds ended up more successful than the others. In the video, after students read out loud the big objective (high level of participation), I explicitly demonstrated the break-down of sequential steps and underlined different parts of the sentence, having most of them facing the screen and appearing to be paying attention. They could easily point out who was telling the story to answer my prompt question, “who’s the narrator of The Party?”, after which I continued by asking, “which word in the question that I just asked sounds like ‘narrative’?” I then wrote down “narrator” and “narrative” on the board to illustrate the suffix, imbedding another key word “perspective” as well. In this part, students seem to listen attentively but they were not given much opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of the features of 1st person P.O.V, since I blatantly gave out what could have been heard from them.
Later, I conducted turn and talk activity (“how does Pam think of herself, other people, and the party?”) so that students could practice finding text evidence and use it to negotiate meaning with their partner. Within the 2-minute discussion, students were actively conversing with their peers, especially in the beginning, despite that their answers did not reveal the complexity of the character’s inner feelings when I called on individuals to share out. Drawing on the view that comprehension is seen as a purposeful sense-making process instead of an outcome or “a stable, relatively uniform procedure” (Aukerman, 2008, pp.52), this step has met the intended goal. As we proceeded to have the group discussion to work on different key elements based on the diagram worksheet, students’ level of engagement declined in the video, as I noticed that around half of the groups dived right into the content, while the other half looked disoriented and didn’t know what to do in that moment. When I directed them to transition to the final culminating task—paragraph writing, using the previous discussion as a precursor, I was observing their timely writing production, but found that a lot of them were still struggling with writing a complete sentence.

Based on Hammond & Gibbons' (2005) Scaffolding in Action chart, particularly at the macro 'designed-in' level, I also inserted the following elements. Firstly, since the students had not reviewed Point of View this year, decisions about task sequencing took into account the progression of difficulty level, moving from more controlled, decontextualized exercises—pronouns matching and sentence rewriting as a warm-up activity (Bellwork), to a poem reading (fluency session) with key points highlighted as a step of transition. Later discussion questions pushed them to find text evidence and use it in their reasoning process. Though the text is complex for the majority of students in that it contains advanced vocabulary and syntactic
structures, for instance, in describing sensory details, the students turned out to be better situated in approximating the goal. Secondly, the lesson offered opportunities to leverage students' conceptual resources that enable them to connect new ideas to their prior learning (SIOP Feature 8). Before we moved on to *The Party*, we read the poem *I'll Never be a Slave Again* (introduced earlier and not intended to teach explicitly) written by W. Dexter Smith Jr.. When I posed the question that "what connections can you possibly make between the two texts?", a student responded that Pam was treated like a slave because Bridget (the party host) chose other friends over her to the party. Even though he did not manage to use more precise language to articulate abstract thematic connection, he helped other students bridge contexts, igniting higher-order thinking at a deeper level. This is evidenced by the whole class performing the “agree” gesture in the moment. Another conspicuous component among all the scaffolding features is the application of semiotic systems in teaching point of view. The modified plot diagram (see Appendix 1) served to structure their understanding of how Pam's emotions influence the description of events, as they put information in each box. In the video, in the meanwhile I was modeling the first two plots on the board, students’ pencils were scratching. They obtained a clearer sense of what was expected as they worked on their own. They mainly relied on the graphic to trace, organize, or add their thoughts in paragraph writing phase and some of them held onto that diagram too tight that even didn’t pull out their journal. One detail that also caught my attention is that on the board, I didn’t have the exact same sheet with all the questions fleshed out as students’ did at hand, some of them had difficulty accessing the expectation, which I clarified promptly by pointing out what and where they should write. In addition to it, I also reminded students to use annotation systems as they read. For instance, I instructed them to mark star signs next to key sentences; color-coding has been a ritual to dissect elements of the story.
As I frequently cued them "where in the text do you know that?", they are getting more used to annotating the text. Ideally, the students would benefit from noticing not only features of the content, but scaling up to metalevels of language as well in the long term.

Compared with Hammond & Gibbons' (2005) framework, Echevarria et al. (2017) proposed another model called Gradual Increase of Student Independence (GISI), which gives me a slightly different angle to reflect on how this particular lesson sequence played out in reality. I noticed the discourse pattern of teacher initiation, student response, and teacher evaluation (IRE; Mehan, 1979) lasted until they began group work. The Second Read began with explicit teaching and demonstration: the word "narrator" was written on the board with its suffix "or" boxed and matched with its definition. After I passed out the plot diagram sheets, we practiced Total Physical Response (TPR) together, placing our arms horizontally and upward to represent different stages of plot mountain. In modeling the question in the exposition box, "how does Pam feel about the party in the beginning?", I used Turn the Question strategy, writing down "Pam feels____ in the beginning" and expecting the students to come up with adjectives and descriptions. They managed to fill in the blank with appropriate words like "disappointed" and "jealous" immediately. For the Rising Action, the students first talked to their shoulder partner before teacher/student interaction. Instead of doing a full-sentence demonstration, this time I chose to only write down key words to decrease my role and increase their independence. During my observation of their group work process, I found that despite of conspicuous amount of misspelled words, a lot of the students attempted to write in complete sentences and showed their inclination of using text evidence, while some apparently needed extra individual assistance.
Follow along the above procedural scaffolding: there arose the question on differentiated instruction that deserves further refinement. Despite the recognition that the process to students' eventual independent output is not linear and that re-teaching in reality is very often necessary especially with those of low ELP levels, this recorded lesson did not reflect the students' different background factors, such as their oral language and literacy in English and in their home language, resulting in the lack of accommodation to instruction and assessment. As a direct causal effect, the students appeared less engaged during the group discussion as expected, partly because individuals did not get sufficient support to catch up with others. This makes collaboration harder to operate. In considering the use of strategies and tools to implement differentiation, it is necessary to construct language-based expectations that correspond with the individual's current ELP level. WIDA information booklet gives an example of how the teacher Mr. Nelson adjusts instruction and expectations based on the skills and knowledge the student has acquired and the strengths he or she tends to bring in to the class. He makes tools like graphic organizers, parental involvement, and flexible grouping accessible to his students (WIDA Focus on Differentiation, 2012). One noticeable weakness of my lesson is the lack of specification of language objectives. To improve on this part, the language-based expectation for all students can be "write a paragraph to describe how the narrator's point of view changes in the story using descriptive language such as sensory details, and complex sentence structures". For students at the lowest ELP, aiming for “producing descriptive words or phrases in the worksheet" can be a modification. For those at a relatively higher level, theirs can be "writing simple sentences using language and vocabulary that explains the focus question clearly". I could have considered asking them to use emojis to show the character's emotions, providing sentence
stems, and pulling small groups for extra assistance while others are writing on their own. WIDA can-do descriptors would have been a valuable reference in gauging students' performance.

In developing the lesson for future use, another layer of consideration—critical literacy, is worth entertaining in leading classroom discourse. To expand on the lesson on point of view, the teacher and the students can explore the difference it would make if the story was narrated from other points of view. What information can get lost through filters of personal emotions? How does the same scenario can be rewritten from another point of view that may disclose other sides of the story? Should the narrator's point of view be cautioned against due to certain biases and mindset? Those complex questions, conducted through dialogic teaching, will facilitate students' thinking through different lens of perspectives. Reznitskaya (2012) in her research analyzed the application of the Dialogic Inquiry Tool (DIT) in elementary language arts classrooms and demonstrated its potential to inform teacher practice, where teachers are "substantively weak", but "procedurally strong" (pp.451). In comparison to dialogic instruction, most of the teacher/student dialogue that appeared in the video does not hold much flexibility in allowing students to question assumptions or implications of the content other than to identify the text evidence or to summarize. There is no denying that due to the students' current ELP, the precision of their critical expression is, to some extent, subjected. However, as Bacon (2017) called for an increase of "alignment between language learning and critical engagement toward mutual reinforcement and critical praxis", language teachers should guide students to critique and rewrite stories under the range of languages and modalities (pp.431&446). Therefore, this lesson will be more instructionally meaningful if it includes more open-ended dialogue in later stage of a whole unit lesson.
In conclusion, through a macro-level scope, I have looked at features of scaffolding primarily under two different conceptual frameworks. I structured the class in a way that all steps of instructional practices lead to the ultimate learning objective. Students were engaging with body movements (TPR) and visuals such as the plot diagram to contextualize their learning. In terms of areas of improvement, I overlooked the importance of differentiating language-based objectives. To dig deeper, I suggest this lesson bring in more dialogic teaching to practice students’ perspective taking abilities and other aspects of critical thinking, which in the long run, contributes to a supportive and constructive learning environment.

**Micro-analysis**

In this part of the video reflection, I’m going to switch gears to the micro-level examination of the lesson on Point of View, analyzing moment-to-moment interactions among different sides, with the intent to gauge the actual outcomes of planned scaffolds for achieving lesson objectives.

First of all, to better set students up, I intentionally incorporated some build-up activities with a certain degree of modification to their daily routine—Bellwork and Fluency, before we delved into analyzing character traits and plots development. I began the lesson by introducing two controlled, form-focused exercises. Prior to communicative activities, the provision of guided, teacher-initiated part under FonF occurs on the grounds of emphasizing the necessary forms students need to grasp (Loewen, 2011)—pronouns as grammatical markers of Point of View. As the students had not been exposed to the concept of point of view this year, it took a longer time
than expected for them to finish those tasks. Shortly after the screen projected the exercises, a student raised his hand, looking puzzled and said, "I don't get the question [on the board]." I then explained to the whole class the specific procedure they needed to follow, including drawing the chart, matching pronouns with the corresponding point of view, and rewriting the sentence projected on the screen. After I called on an individual named Shin to report out his work, at 20:34 (see Appendix 2 for complete 5 minutes transcript). I illustrated the shift of perspective by reminding them, "Notice how Shin changed the pronoun…from "my" to "your", so now it's told from 2nd person point of view". In response to my quick comprehension check, only approximately half of them nodded or whispered yes. I then moved on to Fluency session, where I led a poem called *I'll Never Be a Slave Again*, with the intent to solicit views on connection with *The Party*, both of which discussed freedom of self-expression and social influences should not ultimately have enough power to sway our decision making. We read the poem two times together as I intended to draw their attention to two aspects of the material. At 21:27 in the video, I initiated the question, "what point of view is this poem told from?" before our first read. There didn't seem to display a very high level of student engagement (around 50 to 60 percent of them were reading aloud) since a fair amount of students appeared to be struggling with articulating the words. When a student tentatively took a guess of the point of view being used (at 23:57, Rayan says, "3rd person point of view?", which is wrong), promptly, other students were excitedly raising their hands, trying to offer different opinions. "I've hoped, through years of toil and care…", as Aditya successfully traced the text evidence to back up 1st person point of view. Having noticed their lack of enthusiasm, I spontaneously reiterated my expectation, "I want you to read louder, louder than the first time," which turned out to be effective since there was an increased level of voice volume, though it doesn't equal to their mastery of comprehension. I
then extended the dialogue and invited them to make connections with the story we were going to have further discussion on. "To not be a slave is free," responded by Hawdin after the prompt question of "what's the opposite of being a slave?". Building upon this general understanding, Wakanda managed to help the whole class relating to our focus content. This is evidenced by his response, that "in the story The Party, at first they are kind of treated her like a slave because they chose almost the whole school instead for her and another girl." This shows a good example of a student's attempt at recounting the plots and rendering the relationships between characters in preparation for further analysis, which was the anticipated goal by the end of this stage of classroom activities.

Before I passed out the plot diagram as the primary worksheet, there was a turn and talk session for students to converse with their shoulder partners. The question was, "based on Pam's point of view, how does she think of herself and other people?" I structured this as pair-work so that students can look at the text collaboratively, exchange some plot details with their peers, and potentially identify information gaps after communicating their initial thoughts. From the video, most of the students were participating in the task, some of them referring back to the text in the meantime to coordinate meaning-making. However, when it was time to share out, they did not appear to be aware of the narrator's changing, nuanced emotions as the story unfolds, only focusing on Pam's negative feelings. "She feels upset," as Rayan commented, "…that I wasn't worthy." Hawdin added another detail but from the same stage of the plot, which does not demonstrate the narrator's change of perspective. Therefore, I posed the question explicitly to the whole class, "do Pam's feelings change throughout the story, or they stay the same?". Some of
them immediately shouted out, "they changed!", at which point I passed out the plot diagram as the visual support to further scaffold our comprehension activity.

By looking at the interactions that evolved around the plot diagram, there were some efforts made on positing directive questions aligned with the strategy of Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DR-TA, as cited in Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2017), while in the meanwhile the dialogue pattern similar to the IRE was conspicuous as well. As I led students to identify different key plot elements, I primarily did two things: first, I initiated questions, such as "what was happening to Pam in the beginning?" (at 37:23), "what happened next," to push the storyline forward. Second, I constantly asked the students to locate text evidence to demonstrate their reasoning process. For instance, after they gave out answers like "she has no friends," "maybe she had a chance to go," I responded, "where do you see that in the text?" "how do you know that? Can you point it out for us?" (37:30). In my planning stage, I assumed this part would proceed more smoothly than it actually did since students had read the story at least once.

Nevertheless, as shown in the video, they had difficulty determining crucial plot moments in the first multiple attempts. In figuring out what the rising action of the story was, I had to recast their answers and redirect their train of thoughts on the spot. When Moises came up with a detail that describes Pam's inner struggle, I responded, "That's her reaction after she found out she's not invited, right? But think about what happened [that] changed her emotion?" (at 39:10). When Rayan again brought up another line, "each time someone mentioned the party, I smiled weakly and nodded," which did not bring us to the intended direction either, I didn't immediately correct him but lingered for his sense-making process. I probed by asking, "what does that tell you?". This extra step resulted in him saying "that she's happy whenever someone mentions the party?".
Apparently, he missed the meaning indicated by the adverb "weakly." Knowing how he arrived at his thinking, which as Aukerman (2008) points out in promoting comprehension-as-sense-making, that "how textual evidence and their understandings about the world (in this case is "word") give them reason to decide what they think the text means" (pp. 57) matters. To pull our conversation back on track, I then invited more participants by asking, "do we have different ideas?", followed by Bawi locating a detail that finally moved us forward. In the story where Pam's friend Meredith shows her confidence and doesn't care about the invitation, Pam is thereby positively influenced by her composure. For the sake of pacing, I then guided their attention to where the biggest twist occurs, that three girls can't make it to the party. Another student, therefore, gave a reasonable prediction, that "maybe [Pam] had a chance to go?" (at 42:00).

Overall, we spent a longer time than planned on straightening out the general storyline, since, in actual practice, the communications were not linear and thus demanded extra time for intentional teacher talk and peer scaffolding. This is necessary in that to foster comprehension-as-sense-making, language teachers very often have to let go of the need to rush students into arriving at the "correct" understanding and leveraging their textual hypothesizing instead (Aukerman, 2008).

If further evaluating the interactions captured in the video in align with Aukerman's comprehension-as-sense-making view, there exist many opportunities where I could have attended to students' contributions more strategically, eliciting and bridging more interactive student-talk. Aiming at the intended answers, I noticed myself enforce too much control over our discussion. This is evidenced by my tendency to phrasing close-ended questions. In introducing the features of the first-person point of view, I stated the fact that "we know about other
characters' feelings only through the narrator's perspective, right?", which only received students' echoing behaviors like nodding without language production. An alternative can be to ask "how do we know about other characters' feelings…" so as to give students time to foster their understanding. Other examples such as "does that change the direction of the story?", "did Pam give her answer? Yes or no?", or "Wakanda just pointed out…agree or disagree?", all of which failed to generate a meaningful, more detailed student sense-making process. Instead of asking one-word answer questions, I could have replaced them with those start with what, why, and how. As Reznitskaya (2012) in rethinking language use during literature discussions proposed a "collaborative deliberation of complex questions" as a productive dynamic to foster dialogic teaching (pp.446). Her suggestions lend support to questions like "How does that scene change the direction of the story?", "What can you infer from Pam's final action?", "why do you agree with his comment on…", or "who can elaborate on what he just said?". They would have invited in more thoughts and students' language production. Additionally, as much as students were engaged in using text evidence to support their description of characters emotions at different stages, they were not given sufficient space to further elaborate on how they arrived at their description from what they had found, nor had they been asked to enunciate the connections accessible to them already. It is not hard to spot in the video where I shut down the one-on-one interaction and carried on with aspects of content meanings left unresolved. For example, with the student who overlooked the word "weakly" in a sentence that indicates Pam's emotions, I could have asked "who has a different understanding of this sentence?", by which means other students may have pointed him to rectify his prior knowledge of this specific detail.
As highlighted in Caplan and Farling's (2017) article, the concept of joint construction underlies the teaching and learning circle (TLC). However, in real practice, there is never a clear-cut path to this ideal, constructive dynamic. Classroom discourse involves numerous factors brought at play, influencing the trajectory of teaching at any moment. According to all the video evidence mentioned above, students' contributions demonstrate that they were thinking in connection with content, though language goals were not explicitly shown but embedded in the meaning-making process. My (as teacher's) part of utterances mainly functioned as to initiate and facilitate conversation, but it could have put less constraint on student talk and promoted their understanding more thoroughly. Moment-to-moment, spontaneous interactions are the smallest molecules of a whole lesson while they also have the capacity to determine its ultimate outcomes. Thereby, future refinement ought to address this dimension of instruction, so as to foster an effective, vibrant dynamic between teaching and learning.

**Final reflection**

Reflecting upon my classroom practica experiences so far, I have identified two major learning goals for improving instruction for EL students grounded in the SIOP self-evaluation framework. What I have observed and practiced prompts me to refine my dialogic teaching skill by fostering a questioning-driven learning environment, as well as adopting the concept of multimodality in transforming EL students’ learning experiences.

First and foremost, I believe that successful language teaching takes place when the teacher skillfully maneuvers classroom dialogue and consistently promotes quality interaction. This requires the teacher to goes farther in responding and building upon students’ sense-making
(TESOL Standards 1b, 3a, b, c). As much as I recognize the value of dialogic teaching, in real practice, I found myself sometimes stumble over words as my thoughts on responding to students’ answers failed to catch on the speed of speech. As a consequence, I ended up taking a shortcut by throwing closed-ended questions. The ability to handle spontaneity in teaching, which takes the form of teacher recasting, redirecting, furthering students’ ideas is a fundamental skill that supports the implementation of teaching techniques and learning activities. I have closely analyzed moment-to-moment interaction in my sample lesson and highlighted questions and other types of utterances that could have been conducted differently. The reason why binary questions tend to come out accrued from the Comprehension-as-Outcome View discussed by Aukerman (2008). This mindset results in my emphasis on getting students to the “right” understanding, instead of on how and why they think in certain ways.

Therefore, having noticed my intuitive tendency to dominate classroom dialogue, I reckon that one direct approach to teaching toward Comprehension-as-Sense-Making is to “adopt a respectful, curious stance toward students’ textual hypothesizing and their social purposes” (Aukerman, 2008, pp. 57). The six acts that characterize shared evaluation pedagogy (SHEP, Aukerman, 2006) reconceptualized the teacher’s role in classroom dialogue: abdicating the exclusive authority and practicing student-centered instruction. At its core, it is a problem-based learning environment that I am striving to nurture in my future teaching. Not only do I as the teacher need to model questioning continually, but students need to practice identifying and refining their questions. A strategy that starts with a potentially controversial statement, followed by students producing and prioritizing their questions, and ends with their reflection (Daniel,
2019) is of great practical use to construct a systemic classroom discourse and culture that characterizes constructivism.

When relating to my Philosophy of Teaching: This learning goal corresponds with my core belief in language teaching, that meaning-making language practices are central to students’ development of language proficiency as well as self-efficacy. EL students’ ability in questioning shows what meaning-making process embodies, which includes bringing clarity to the issue or expanding the scope of discussion. I have realized through this practicum experience that to enact critical literacies, teachers need to truly ground questioning in daily classroom dialogue. It could easily be left as wishful thinking considering curriculum restriction on how much time teachers should allocate in each unit of the textbook. I have seen my mentor under the pressure of chasing after the schedule while some students are not mastering the content. I acknowledge that it is enormously difficult to slow down and battle against the common expectation of having students arrive at a standard understanding of the text. Nevertheless, every pedagogical decision comes with pros and cons and time for questioning shall not be compromised.

Another major aspect of instructional refinement goal resides in Practice and Application in the SIOP framework (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2000; 2004; 2008). How to leverage various modes of language resources to improve students’ literacy skills and further expand their linguistic and cultural horizons is another rising focus on my teaching. As part of their daily routine, students are asked to pull out their journals while their pencils barely scratched during the ten-minute quick write. By contrast, I noticed them engage more than usual as I was playing a video about immigration to complement the content of “The Statue of Liberty” with visuals and sounds. If
students get to compose their writing with multidimensional resources accessible as Pacheco & Smith (2015) suggested in their multimodal code meshing article, will there be an increase in quality language production? When pictures, sounds, and even students’ first languages in align with the learning objective elicit students’ different layers of sensation and language repertoire, can we witness less frustration and more enjoyment in their writing composition? I lean toward giving positive answers to those questions because what I have observed from students’ writing performance suggests that there should be other tools and materials to make their writing process more enjoyable and productive. I have gained insight from Pacheco & Smith’s (2015) “My Hero” multimodal project that writing composition is ultimately about self-expression instead of perfection. Students’ wide range of experiential learning lends support to their creative construction and therefore strengthens their authenticity. There is no denying that EL students of WIDA level 1 or 2 need extra scaffolding such as providing sentence stems, but that doesn’t mean their whole writing production should be reduced to rigid and mechanical drills. Investigating students’ cultural and linguistic backgrounds to understand what resources I can leverage would help me diversify the manipulatives so that students can have different points of entry into a text or a topic.

As I have stressed the importance of carrying out instruction that embodies multimodality in my philosophy of teaching earlier, I tried to enact this concept in my practicum by bringing in videos, sounds (music to sing along), and other visuals that can potentially facilitate learning goals. Though students displayed a higher level of engagement under the assistance of assorted modes of linguistic resources, I have not quite attained quantitative language production directly out of those attempts to including multimodal instruction. Therefore, I envision the next step
would be to interweave multidimensional resources deeper into the observable goals of a lesson and maximize their affordances in communicative tasks. Noteworthy is the fact that I need to guarantee students’ sufficient exposure to high-quality language materials for them to read and write purposefully, before setting up the expectation for output activities.

With respect to the ongoing challenges about educating multilingual students, my teaching practice awaits to be advanced upon a more thorough understanding of meeting students where they are. This challenge goes beyond acknowledging all students are somewhere on their learning and development trajectories. It necessitates pedagogical actions accommodating their complex needs individually, differentiating tasks strategically, and monitoring their growth consistently. The fact that previously identified learning goals and emerging questions are to some extent interrelated also implies that one area of improvement holds the potential to inform other aspects of classroom teaching.
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Artifact D Part two: Lesson Plan (Revised)

5th Grade, ELA, 9:10—10:20 A.M.

Standard: Common Core Standards (Point of View in Literature)

Learning objective: Students can describe how a narrator’s point of view influences how events are described by writing a response using evidence and explanation (Literacy. RL. 5.6).

Text Dependent Question (focus question): How does Pam’s point of view influence the description of events in the story?

4 major steps to achieving the goal:

1. Emphasize first-person Point of View: noticing the features
2. Students can identify each plot element; figure out the whole storyline
3. ***Students are using the plot diagram to trace how the narrator’s perspective changes at each plot element.
4. Based on all the buildup, they can write down a paragraph of summary: how the point of view influences events, as the final culminating task

Teaching Sequence:

- Bellwork (8-10 mins)

  Task 1: match the pronouns with different types of point of view
Task 2: rewrite a sample sentence from another point of view

- **Fluency (5 mins)**

  Read 2 times together

  After 1st time: address punctuation; ask point of view “I”—first person POV

  Before 2nd time: this time let’s think about the content. “what does it mean to not be a slave?”

  After 2nd time: making connections to the text The Party—There are different ways of being a slave. If you are so tied to something, you lose your freedom/independence in your thoughts & actions (beyond physical constraints).

  Show some visuals on the screen to enforce the impression.

- **Second read of the text (35 mins)**

  – Understanding Point of View (5mins)

**Identifying the narrator**

Prompt: who’s the narrator of the story? What word in the question I just asked sounds like “narrative”? —the same time point to the word wall (highlight perspective and narrative)

“A narrator is a person who tells a narrative.” (board demonstration: OR in NARRATOR---box PERSON in definition)

**Features of first person P.O.V**

ONLY HER thoughts and feelings are shared with us. (quickly mention the critical literacy aspect—biases, mindset of this one character)

**Turn and Talk**

Based on Pam’s point of view, how does she think of herself & other people in the story? (When they point out one stage of her emotion, pause and ask the following question)
**Pass around the modified worksheet**

**Transition: Do Pam’s feelings towards herself and other people change?**

- Tracing Pam’s changing perspective (20mins)

Provide students with Worksheets: Modified Plot Diagram with focus question:

At each plot element, How does she feel about the party/herself/Bridget/?How has her feelings changed?

Identifying each key element first: call on individuals (interactional)

“what was happening to Pam in the beginning of the story?” “what does she want? The reality?

—that creates conflict (fill in the box)” “then what happens that changed Bridget’s invitation?”

“What does she do after that? The turning part of the story? What happens immediately after the climax? What happens at the VERY end of the story?

***How does Pam’s perspective change throughout the whole story?***

Whole class: Model Exposition part (complete sentence);

Talk to shoulder partner: rising action

As a group: the rest part of the story.

(Talk about it and write about it. Remind them to use text evidence to support their reasoning)

Exposition: How does she feel about the party?

Rising action: How does she feel about Bridget, Becky, and herself?

Climax: How have her feelings towards the party and herself changed now?

Falling action: How does she feel about the party now? what difference can you see?
(Exposition: Pam really wants to be invited to the party, because getting an invitation means “elevation in the school pecking order”, that she can be considered popular. Other evidence showing she really wants to be invited: she can’t focus on the conversations she was having with other people; she can’t concentrate in class, feeling not worthy, insecure, desperate, not good enough, belittled; in contrast to Meredith’s confidence; self-conscious, aware: doubting her appearance-feet? face? Hair? Coat? Too tall? Smile and hug more?

**Write on the board: Pam feels _______ in the beginning.**

Rising action: She hates Bridget for making her miserable. /She isn’t sure/puzzled by what Becky tells her. /She starts to question the point of going to her party. “I’m still me whether I go or not”. “There is still a chance.”—suspense

Climax: Bridget sends her invitation. Pam is in dilemma. She wants to go but can’t get over the fact she was just an “afterthought”.

Falling action: The invitation doesn’t even have her name on it. She is further reminded she can be easily replaced by someone else. )

**Before discussion, remind them that the graphic organizer will help them to write a decent paragraph.**

**After group discussion, directly transition to paragraph writing. Offer extra help to the students who are struggling.**

**Final statement: You might see yourself or someone you know in the story. Having insecurities is part of being kids. Try to not care too much about what other people think about you.**
Based on the discussion, write “how does Pam’s perspective change throughout the story?”.

(Set expectation: your pencil should be scratching all the time!)

For students that need extra scaffolding: sentence stems—In the beginning,…then…after that,… in the end,…

**Extended discussion** (time permits):

Think aloud:

What if the story was told from Becky or Bridget’s point of view? What would change when we change our perspective?
Adapted Plot Diagram

1. Exposition
   How does Pam feel about the party in the beginning?

2. Rising Action
   How does Pam feel about herself?
   about Bridget?
   about the invitation?

3. Climax
   How have Pam's feelings towards the party and herself changed?

4. Falling Action:
   How does she view the party now?

5. Resolution:
   What answer do you think Pam gives Bridget in the end? Why?

6. Conflict
   What is the major problem in the story?

How Pam’s Perspective Changes
5 Minutes Transcript

(the actual lesson starts from 12:40)

20:34

(After Shin reads out his sentence for rewrite activity)

T: Notice how Shin changed the pronoun…from "my" to "your", so now it's told from 2nd person point of view.

21:27

T: So we are going to read the poem 2 times together. What point of view is this poem told from? We are gonna read together.

(around 50 percent participation; some of them don’t read aloud)

24:37

T: Think about what kind of connections can you make, potentially the story we’ve been reading this week, The Party. I want you to read louder, louder than the first time. Does that make sense? Yes or no?

Sts: Yes.

(over 80 percent participation this time)

T: ok. So think about what does it mean to not be a slave? What’s the opposite of being a slave?

Hawdin: To not be a slave is free.

T: …is freedom. So the second stanza, the second line, “for freedom, peace, and right”. Right?

You all see that? There are different ways to be a slave…what kind of impression do you have about [Pam]?

Wakanda: Um, in the story The Party, at first they are kind of treated her like a slave because they chose almost the whole school instead for her and another girl.
T: Agree or disagree?
Sts use hand gestures to show agreement.

T: That’s a very good point.

(Transition to Second Read, skipped a slide of pictures showing the idea of being a slave)

30:43

T: if this story is told from first person point of view, then we know about other characters feelings and emotions only through Pam’s perspective, right?

(some of them are nodding, most of them no response)

31:43

T: Based on Pam’s point of view, let’s think about how does she think of herself? How does she think of other people?

(Turn and talk activity)

Rayan: she feels upset.

T: how do you know that in the text? (S4 locates text evidence, other students are following)

Rayan: …that I wasn’t worthy.

T: Highlight that in your text.

Hawdin: (point out another text evidence, which is on the same page as the previous one)

T: I have a question for you: Do Pam’s feelings change throughout the story or they stay the same?

Sts: No they changed…it changed. (some of them shout out)

T: It changed. Now we are going to use plot diagram…look at how her feelings change throughout the story. We have worksheets to work on today. (pass out worksheet)
37:23

T: Tell me what was happening to Pam in the very beginning?

Moises: she has no friends.

T: How do you know that? Where’s that in the text. Can you point it out for us?

(after he points out) that’s the beginning of the story. She got off the bus, and found her friends talking about something, about the party. What happened next? What’s the rising action?

Moises: She tries to get, like invited to the party?

T: ok, she wants to get...where do you see that in the text?

Moises: Page 17,… (not the expected text place)

T: That’s her reaction after she found out she’s not invited right? But think about what happened changed her emotion? Where can we find…?

Rayan: page 18, line 40, “each time someone mentioned the party, I smiled weakly and nodded.”

T: OK what does that tell you?

Rayan: that she’s happy whenever someone mentions the party?

T: We have different ideas?

Bawi: So on page 18, line 47, “Meredith said, ‘I wish she’d invited me so I could tell her no. She’s such a brat. And all that phony hugging. What’s that all about anyway?’” where did Meredith get her confidence? I wondered.

T: so this part is Pam’s interaction with Meredith…after she found out she was not invited to the party, she had multiple interactions with different friends. But let’s look at what happens on page 19, the first line, (T reads). Put a star sign next to it. Does that change the direction of the story?

Wakanda: Yes.

T: Why?
Wakanda: I think that, three girls can’t go, maybe she had a change to go?

T: Yes, where do you see that in the text? Where it says that she might has a chance?

. 

T: what’s the climax? (S8: it turns around) find that in the text. (read the text myself) now what comes next?

S5: At first, she didn’t want it and then Bridget came, …and then she will go.

T: She will go? you think she will go? (S5 nodded). After Bridget offered the invitation, starting from line 94, “my mind was a jumble”. She was actually debating herself….what’s the end of the story? (Gives hint, “I hesitated… and then I smiled?” ) Did she say? Yes or no did she say?

Sts: yes..no… she smiled…

T: let’s hold it in our head first.

46:10

T: we just identified key elements…how does her feelings change at each plot element?

(explicitly talking about Exposition)

T: We are going to turn the question. Pam feels ____ in the beginning.

S8: After she found out she was not invited, she was disappointed.

T: Disappointed. That’s a very good word to put in here. What else?

S7: She felt jealous…

T: That’s another word! How about desperate? Do we all know this word? (completes the sentence on the board)
(talking to shoulder partner about rising action: how does Pam feel about the party? Other people?)

T: How does Pam feel about herself?
S5: Sad.

T: Sad. Where do you see that in the text?
S5: (go back to the beginning of the story)
T: I like it that you pointed out, but we are looking at rising action now, maybe we can move forward a little bit. Yes, (call on S5)
S5: It’s about the, rising action, …three girls had to go to the band, she still has a chance…(basically retell the scene)
T: ok you just described the rising action. But how does she feel about it?
S9: unworthy?
T: That’s a good word. Maybe we could say “insecure”? how about that? (put key word on the board). How does she feel about Bridget?
S: Maybe she thinks that she’s showing off?
T: showing off? Yeah. (pointed to page & line number, “I hated Bridget.”)
S6: Because she wasn’t invited…
T: yeah, that’s right. She’s angry. About the invitation, I think S7 just pointed out, because three girls can’t go, that means Pam still has a chance. Agree or disagree? (write down another key word for a different question).
Artifact E: IPA Evaluation
(This artifact was for EDUC 6560-01: Teaching English as Foreign Language. The following evaluation plan was based on the model of Integrated Performance Assessment and the topic was self-selected.)

- **Theme**: Time Travel
- **Context for Learning: Students’ Background information**

This unit is designed for a classroom of high school first year (9th graders) EFL learners (about 20-30 people) in China. Most of them are of intermediate English proficiency level, while some perform at an early intermediate level. From the very beginning of their English language education, they have been exposed to test-oriented curricula where grammar, i.e. the form of the language is highly stressed while their communicative skills that focus on the meaning of language acquisition has long been overlooked. Students are not used to practicing spontaneous speaking activities in class; instead, they are very familiar with language exercises and drills provided in their textbook, but are new to the concept of IPA.

- **Learning Objectives:**

After the unit,

1) Students will get a general understanding of how "time travel" works and be able to conduct a conversation around different arguments on this topic.
2) Students will be able to talk about hypothetical scenarios referring to either the past or the future, using correct grammatical structures they have learned in class.

3) Students will develop their logical thinking and reasoning skills through various types of tasks in reading, listening, speaking and writing, integrating second language ability with specific content knowledge.

Target Vocabulary/Concepts & Grammar:

Key vocabulary terms such as "dimension", "gravity", "manipulate", etc.

Key theory/concepts: spacetime; Einstein’s theory of general/special relativity; Grandfather’s paradoxes; closed timelike curve (CTC), etc.

Key grammar structure: ways to talk about hypothetical situations, such as "I would have...if I could..." or "what if/Suppose we could...".

- Anchor text:

**Time Travel Simulation Resolves “Grandfather Paradox”**

On June 28, 2009, the world-famous physicist Stephen Hawking threw a party at the University of Cambridge, complete with balloons, hors d'oeuvres and iced champagne. Everyone was invited but no one showed up. Hawking had expected as much, because he only sent out invitations after his party had concluded. It was, he
said, "a welcome reception for future time travelers," a tongue-in-cheek experiment to reinforce his 1992 conjecture that travel into the past is effectively impossible.

But Hawking may be on the wrong side of history. Recent experiments offer tentative support for time travel's feasibility—at least from a mathematical perspective. The study cuts to the core of our understanding of the universe, and the resolution of the possibility of time travel, far from being a topic worthy only of science fiction, would have profound implications for fundamental physics as well as for practical applications such as quantum cryptography and computing.

The source of time travel speculation lies in the fact that our best physical theories seem to contain no prohibitions on traveling backward through time. The feat should be possible based on Einstein's theory of general relativity, which describes gravity as the warping of spacetime by energy and matter. An extremely powerful gravitational field, such as that produced by a spinning black hole, could in principle profoundly warp the fabric of existence so that spacetime bends back on itself. This would create a "closed timelike curve," or CTC, a loop that could be traversed to travel back in time.

In 1991, physicist David Deutsch put out a theory to fix paradoxes caused by CTCs. Instead of a human taking a CTC back in time to kill her ancestor, imagine
that a particle goes back in time to flip a switch on the particle-generating machine that created it. If the particle flips the switch, the machine shoots a particle — the particle — back into the CTC. However, if the switch isn't flipped, the machine shoots out nothing.

In this scenario it is not certain the particle will be shot out. It's just a probability. Deutsch's big idea was that particles are steady and constant at the quantum level. He insists that any particle entering one end of a CTC must come out the other end exactly the same. Therefore, a particle shot out by the machine with a probability of one half would enter the CTC and come out the other end to flip the switch with a probability of one half.

By doing so it would give itself at birth a probability of one half of going back to flip the switch. If the particle were a person, she would be born with a one-half probability of killing her grandfather. In turn, that would give her grandfather a one-half probability of escaping death at her hands. That's good enough in terms of probability to escape the paradox. This strange solution agrees with the laws of quantum physics.
- **Interpretive task** (10-15 mins)

Interpretive Comprehension Worksheet

I. **Key Concept Retrieval Practice.** Based on what you have learned in this unit so far, recall the following terms/concepts by giving either a one sentence description or listing key elements.

   - spacetime
   - Einstein’s General Relativity
   - Four dimensions in space
   - “Grandfather Paradoxes”

II. **Key Word Recognition.** Find in the article the word/phrase in the target language that best expresses the meaning of each of the following English words/phrases.

   - Synonym of appetizers: _____
   - Synonym of bent/twisted: _____
   - Synonym of achievement: _____
   - To cross through: _____
   - A shape like a curve/circle made by a line curving back towards itself
   - Done or said as a joke, not seriously
   - Prep. Phrase; means having ideas that are perceived as not progressive or enlightened
   - A phrase means diving into the most important part
   - List all the words that expresses an opinion based on incomplete evidence

III. **Main Idea Recognition.** Try to summarize the text by giving a subtitle to each paragraph.

IV. **Textual Evidence.** Find the supporting evidence/information for the following questions.
What was the real intention of Stephen Hawing to throw a party with no one showing up?

How did a “closed timelike curve” happen? Use your own words to briefly explain.

According to the text, what was the MAIN argument that Deutsch made to break the paradoxes? Use your own words to briefly explain.

V. Organizational Features. How is this text organized? Choose all that apply and provide the clues in the text using the target language.

A. Chronological
B. Cause/effect
C. Description
D. Problem and solution
E. Storytelling

Justification from text: ____________________________

VI. Author’s perspective. Select the perspective or point of view you think the author adopted and justify your answer with information from the text using the target language.

A. Scientific B. humanistic C. factual D. historical

Justification from text: ____________________________
# Interprettive Mode Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Exceeds Expectations</th>
<th>Meets Expectations</th>
<th>Does Not Meet Expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplished Comprehension</td>
<td>Strong Comprehension</td>
<td>Minimal Comprehension</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## LITERAL COMPREHENSION

### Key concept Retrieval
- Retrieves and interprets all key concepts appropriately with the help of the given text.
- Gives appropriate definitions for majority of key concepts within context of the text.
- Identifies half of key concepts appropriately within the context of the text; key words are used if not complete sentences.
- Identifies a few key concepts appropriately within the context of the text.

### Word Recognition
- Identifies all key words appropriately within context of the text.
- Identifies majority of key words appropriately within context of the text.
- Identifies half of key words appropriately within context of the text.
- Identifies a few key words appropriately within the context of the text.

### Main idea detection (titles/subtitles)
- Identifies the complete main idea(s) of the text.
- Identifies the key parts of the main idea(s) of the text but misses some elements.
- Identifies some part of the main idea(s) of the text.
- May identify some ideas from the text but they do not represent the main idea(s).

### Supporting detail detection
- Identifies all supporting details in the text and accurately provides information from the text to explain these details.
- Identifies the majority of supporting details in the text and may provide limited information from the text to explain some of these details.
- Identifies some supporting details in the text and may provide limited information from the text to explain these details. Or identifies the majority of supporting details but is unable to provide information from the text to explain these details.
- Identifies a few supporting details in the text but may be unable to provide information from the text to explain these details.

## INTERPRETIVE COMPREHENSION

### Organizational features
- Identifies the organizational feature(s) of the text and provides an appropriate rationale.
- Identifies the organizational feature(s) of the text; rationale misses some key points.
- Identifies part of the organizational feature(s) of the text; rationale may miss some key points. Or identifies the organizational feature(s) but rationale is not provided.
- Attempts to identify the organizational feature(s) of the text but is not successful.

### Author’s perspective
- Identifies the author’s perspective and provides a detailed justification.
- Identifies the author’s perspective and provides a justification.
- Identifies the author’s perspective but justification is either inappropriate or incomplete.
- Unable to identify the author’s perspective.

Evidence of Strengths:  
Examples of Where You Could Improve:
• **Interpersonal task:** Peer adventures across time (10mins)

Instructions:

Teacher’s Activity: Before the speaking task, teacher primes students with some popular sci-fi movies or books about time travel, using visual projections to help learners activate their relevant experiences and knowledge about the topic in discussion. Also, teacher in the meanwhile draws on the theories discussed in the previous text, guiding students to make connections during their following conversation.

Student’s Activity: Read over the prompt. Spend two minutes to write out a brainstorm with everything they know about time travel, including books or movies they plan to share with their partners. Think about if there are any clues in those stories that are connected to the theories or arguments they’ve processed in the text so far. Refer back to the notes and readings if necessary.

Prompt: You are going to have a 10 minutes conversation time with the person next to you. There should be 2 parts in your conversation: first, exchange your ideas about EITHER one theory (or one argument/key point) you have read in the text that impresses you the most OR one that you are still unclear about. You’re expected to respond based on what your partner says:
you can give comment or answer his/her questions if possible. For the second part, switch your focus to the books or movies that you’ve seen on the topic of time travel. Share and discuss if there is connection between those stories and the theories we’ve looked at.

I will assess how well you:

- **Talk** in English, try to communicate, and stay on topic,
- **Accurately** use new structures and vocabulary from the unit,
- Listen carefully to others’ comments and build off them,
- Are **Kind** to your partner by contributing to conversation without taking over and by inviting your partner to participate in the conversation.

- **Real-time evaluation Rubric:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TARGET LANGUAGE</th>
<th>ACCURACY</th>
<th>LISTENING SKILLS</th>
<th>KINDNESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of English the entire time to maintain the conversation</td>
<td>Use of learned vocabulary and grammar with no patterns of error</td>
<td>Active Listening, nodding, answering partners’ questions appropriately and asking follow up questions</td>
<td>Courtesy, Turn taking, Giving partner opportunities to participate, prompting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 1:</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student 2:</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
<td>4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Presentational task:** Write a short argumentative essay (25-30mins)

Instructions:
Send out enough assessment sheets with prepared writing prompt. Before students begin to write, give them some time to review the text, the comprehension worksheet as well as other notes in the previous sessions/activities related to the topic. Remind them to organize their thoughts in this process.

Writing prompt:

The mysterious puzzle about time’s boundaries has generated contentious debates over centuries. Some physicists such as Albert Einstein, had his theories to support the possibility of time travel while others claimed the hypothesis is invalid. Do you think human beings can travel across time? Discuss both sides’ arguments with facts and evidence and then give your own opinion. The essay should be between 200-250 words.

**Plan for corrective feedback:**

Overall strategy: Using various kinds of error feedback for improvement
Step 1: peer review session. Hand out peer assessment sheets, which will guide students to give feedback to one or two of their peers’ writing in terms of grammatical accuracy, vocabulary variability, and organizational clarity. They will score each part from 1-4. Note that the criteria should not be too specific at this point that students find time-consuming thus not effective. This step is to help them get initial feedback and facilitate self-correcting.

Step 2: Teacher’s feedback. After students made the corresponding revision to their writing, the teacher collects them all and uses both direct and indirect correction to offer feedback. For the grammar part, since small/untypical errors are expected to be corrected by students and their peers by the time they hand in the second version, teacher mainly focuses on noticeably patterns of errors instead of superficial ones. Underline phrases and sentences that are incomprehensible or inconsistent with other parts of the writing and then give short, conclusive feedback (could be bullet points) in the end for further improvement. This step should be meaning-focused.

Step 3: Individual meeting (if needed). Students can schedule an individual time slot with the teacher to communicate their concerns and thoughts and get more personalized individual help with their essay.