

Capstone Portfolio

Yunlu Qian

English Language Learners

Peabody College, Vanderbilt University

CAPSTONE PORTFOLIO

Abstract

In this paper, I showed my teaching philosophy as a qualified adult EFL teacher by demonstrating my understanding of constructivism, culturally responsive pedagogy, communicative language teaching, and application of these theories in real teaching settings. Different artifacts I did at Vanderbilt University explained and supported four professional knowledge areas and related TESOL domains. The theories I learned and the teaching practicum I experienced have shaped me into a facilitator who always cares for students in task-oriented adult EFL class. At the end, I pointed out challenges I would face in the future and came up with possible solutions for my own language class.

CAPSTONE PORTFOLIO

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Teaching Philosophy | 1 |
| High-quality EFL Instructions | 1 |
| Theories of language Learning | 2 |
| Constructivism | 2 |
| Culturally Responsive Pedagogy | 3 |
| Communicative Language Teaching..... | 5 |
| Translanguaging Teaching | 7 |
| Artifact Analysis | 9 |
| Professional Knowledge Area: Learner | 9 |
| TESOL Domain 4: Identity and Context | 9 |
| Artifact A | 10 |
| TESOL Domain 6: Learning | 12 |
| Artifact B | 12 |
| Professional Knowledge Area: The Learning Context | 15 |
| TESOL Domain 2: Instructing..... | 15 |
| Artifact A | 16 |
| Professional Knowledge Area: Curriculum | 20 |
| TESOL Domain 1: Planning | 20 |
| Artifact A | 21 |
| TESOL Domain 7: Content | 23 |
| Artifact B | 23 |
| Professional Knowledge Area: Assessment | 26 |
| TESOL Domain 3: Assessing..... | 26 |
| Artifact A | 27 |
| Application to Practice: Implication and Future Consideration | 32 |
| TESOL Domain 8: Commitment and Professionalism | 32 |
| Me as an Adult EFL Teacher | 32 |
| Future Challenges | 34 |
| Possible Solutions | 35 |
| Conclusion | 36 |
| References | 38 |
| Appendix | 40 |
| Appendix A | 40 |
| Appendix B | 55 |
| Appendix C | 58 |
| Appendix D | 64 |
| Appendix E | 66 |
| Appendix F | 70 |

Teaching Philosophy

High-quality EFL Instructions

My target students in the future are Chinese adult EFL students who are very different from students in K12 system. In today's EFL education, much attention has been paid to K12 students, but educators do not care too much about adult learners whose learning styles and goals are closely related to their cultural background and life experience. Therefore, nowadays most of the adult EFL classes are boring since there are only explicit teaching strategies which hardly attract students' attention. Hence, I believe that efforts should be made to improve the quality of adult EFL lessons. From my point of view, one important symbol of a high-quality EFL class is that students are actively engaged in all the activities designed by the teacher. Thus, I would combine explicit and implicit teaching together. What is more, adult students usually have a fully-developed L1 system and rich life experience. Language teachers should bridge adult students' background knowledge with the new things they need to learn in class. Another feature of adult students is that they always have specific goals for learning English, for example, communicating with their children's teacher who only speaks English in class or traveling to an English-speaking country. Based on this feature, I believe communicative language teaching should be used in adult EFL class because students can learn the language by acquiring enough comprehensible input and at the same time practice the language they have already learned in authentic tasks. To support my ideas of a high-quality adult EFL class, theories of constructivism, culturally responsive pedagogy and communicative language teaching will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

Theories of language Learning

Constructivism

First of all, constructivism can help adult EFL students actively engage in class. In a constructivist classroom, teachers act as guides and the whole class should be student-centered (Windschitl, 1999). In traditional EFL classes, teachers lecture all the time and students are only asked to memorize the things that teacher mentions in class and do not have the chance to explore by themselves. Yet, in a constructivist class, students work independently or in groups to construct meaning by building on background knowledge, experience and reflect on those experiences while the teacher is acting as a facilitator (Windschitl, 1999). Teachers always propose a question and encourage students to figure out the answer by themselves. In a constructivist class, students share responsibilities and make their own decisions instead of listening to teachers' ideas all the time. However, it does not necessarily mean that teachers do nothing in class. When I was teaching passive voice sentences to my adult students, I did not conclude the features of passive voice for them, instead they were given several passive voice sentences and worked in groups to explore the rules by themselves. In that activity, I did not correct their mistakes immediately in the discussion but led students to think about those mistakes and ways to change them. As a constructivism teacher, I observed students' performance in discussion and gave them suggestions when they had some challenges. Teachers are not supposed to correct students' answers but to provide support and guide them to discover the answers by themselves.

In constructivist classes, students have to use their funds of knowledge and this helps teachers better organize classroom instruction they commonly encounter in schools (Moll et al., 1992). Students will automatically connect the knowledge they have to the problem they face. By

doing so, they conclude the result by themselves and experience the process of solving a problem which makes them fully engaged in class. The challenge is that EFL teachers must appropriately use students' funds of knowledge as a resource to help them acquire language skills. This requires teachers to understand the importance of students' funds of knowledge, for example, their first language and community life experience. After having a thorough understanding of students' funds of knowledge, teachers can design curriculum and choose learning materials depending on the students' background information and interests. For instance, when target students are all Chinese native speakers, then I could organize activities, for example, encouraging students to write an introduction of Chinese culture to English native speakers. This activity closely relates topics that students are familiar with to language skills that they need to acquire in class so that they will be more active and engaged in the whole process. Hence, correctly using funds of knowledge to design constructivist activities helps adult EFL students learn English more actively (Moll et al., 1992).

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy

Adult EFL students have diverse cultural backgrounds and rich life experience. In adult English classes, it is essential for teachers to understand the strength students bring to the learning context and how their family and community influence students' learning. EFL teachers agree that caring is one of the most important aspects that help educators work efficiently with students in real teaching. In my teaching philosophy, I want to emphasize culturally responsive pedagogy which is an approach in which teachers acknowledge the home, community and culture of each student and integrate those values and experiences into curricular content (Gay, 2010).

One significant feature of CRP is that educators should respect students' cultural backgrounds and treat every student equally while understanding their specific differences (Gay, 2010). The variation in adult EFL students' ages, and working and life experiences contributes to their unique cultural backgrounds. Based on this fact, educators should think about the specific needs of different adult students and design teaching activities related to their needs in work and life. For instance, family is a good topic that helps teachers know more about adult students. Typical reasons for adult English learning are that they want to help their kids in English learning or talk with their children's teacher who could only speak English. In my class, I can organize activities like creating oral and written family stories in English to encourage students to share about their family lives. Adult students are usually excited to share their family information with peers and teachers. They will be less stressed or worried about their language proficiency while talking about things they are really familiar with. In the meantime, I, as the educator, can learn more about students and have a solid knowledge foundation to teach students in a culturally responsive way.

Another feature of culturally responsive pedagogy is the focus on caring "for" instead of "about" personal well-being and academic success of ethnically diverse students (Gay, 2010). To further explain, Gay claims that caring about conveys concern for students' state of being and caring for is the engagement in doing something to positively affect students (2010). In other words, "caring for" means teachers try to do something for students instead of only showing concern. In real teaching situations, teachers should care for students' mental and physical needs to make sure their learning will not be affected. If a problem is discovered, teachers can talk with professional colleagues or even students themselves to discuss certain solutions. In my practicum, I always talked with my mentor to review or redesign lesson plans based on students'

real situations. For example, they didn't have enough time to study because they need to take care of the family or go to work. We invited our students to discuss the class plan and finally found a solution: teachers do not leave too much homework for them on working days. Caring for students' first language is another good example of this feature. In some English classes, teachers prefer using all English instructions without considering using students' first languages. However, not every student can understand English instructions and read fluently in English at the beginning. Hence, using students' first languages can be a good way to help them belong to the class and engage more actively. In one of my school observations, I noticed that some students were struggling readers and had difficulty in understanding books written all in English. In this case, teachers can provide bilingual books which contain the language that students are familiar with to help them understand the content of that book and develop interest in reading.

Communicative Language Teaching

As I mentioned, adult learners usually have very specific goals for learning English. Unlike young EFL learners, most of them do not need to pass certain standardized English language proficiency tests. One of their biggest goals is to communicate with others fluently in English whether in work or life. Hence communicative language teaching should be adapted into adult EFL teaching because it perfectly meets adult students' needs. Communicative language teaching has several characteristics: focusing on functions of language, developing communicative competence, communicating in unrehearsed context, and the teacher's role as a facilitator (Brown, 2001).

First of all, communicative language teaching focuses on the function of language that enables learners to accomplish certain communication purposes in real life, instead of paying too much attention to the form of language. Adult learners love grammar and vocabulary explanation

but their goal is to use English in daily conversations. To meet that goal, teachers should create more opportunities for them to practice communication skills instead of lecturing all the time. Group discussion and interaction with teachers are all good examples of communicative language learning. In my class, I always ask my students to discuss while doing exercises and push them to communicate with their peers. Second, communicative language teaching aims at developing students' communicative competence. There are five different communicative competences: discourse, sociocultural, linguistic, actional, and strategic (Celce-Murcia, Dornyei, & Thurrell, 1995). For discourse competence, students practice how to organize and express their ideas coherently and appropriately in different contexts. For sociocultural competence, they learn how to interpret the social contextual and cultural factors in English conversations or texts, for instance, age, gender and living conditions. For linguistic competence, students acquire the knowledge of syntax, morphology, lexicon and phonology through real communication. For actional competence, students use English to express their opinions, clarify themselves or ask questions in conversations. For strategic competence, students develop learning strategies for their future language learning.

The third feature of communicative language teaching is that students will practice communication in unrehearsed context because in real life there are no rehearsed conversations. If students are only required to memorize certain dialogues or sentences in their textbook, they are unable to express their ideas clearly and fluently in English. The fourth feature of communicative language teaching is similar to the feature of constructivist teaching in which teachers act as facilitators or guides. If a teacher is lecturing all the time in class, students will have no chance to practice communication skills. In my practicum, we have a weekly article sharing club in which students share the article they read with the whole group. The teacher only

listens to their presentation and gives them support when they need help. In this case, the teacher acts as a guide or facilitator in communicative language teaching class and gives students enough support and provides suggestions when they have questions or challenges.

Translanguaging Teaching

Speaking of constructivism, culturally responsive pedagogy and communicative language teaching, there is one teaching method which combines all the features of these three theories: translanguaging teaching. Here is an example of translanguaging teaching which happened in my own class. When I taught a poem to my adult students, I first led them to “think out loud” and explore the meaning of new words in the poem. After they were familiar with the poem, I asked them to translate one “juicy” sentence into their L1 by working in groups. After deciding on the final version, they need to share with the class their translation, difficulties they had, and solutions they came up with. In translanguaging teaching, teachers ask students to work in groups to translate one or two “juicy” sentences from the context into their first language. During the group work, teachers can join the groups to make sure students understand all the instructions and everything goes on smoothly. After finishing the translation in group, teachers encourage each group to share their translation version and learn from each other. At the end of this activity, students freely talk about the difficulty they face in doing the translanguaging activity in which they discover the grammar or vocabulary that they are still not clear about (Jimenez, 2018).

In this teaching method, students, the center of the class, are communicating with each other in group discussion and class-sharing activities (Brock,2001). Moreover, teachers make good use of students L1 and bridge what they already know with what they need to learn in class.

Goodwin and Jimenez (2015) claim that students who participate in translation activities improve

their strategic reading, translation, and engagement, which then improves their English reading comprehension. They propose that teachers can identify metalinguistic comments or questions that come up during translation activities and encourage students to use their own metalinguistic awareness in language learning.

In conclusion, my teaching philosophy shows that high-quality EFL instruction should be constructivist teaching which helps students fully engage in activities and bridges students' background knowledge with what they need to learn. At the same time, culturally responsive pedagogy can be a good strategy for teachers to use adult students' culture and life experience to design more attractive lessons. Last but not least, communicative language teaching ensures students have the ability to achieve their goals and use English outside of class.

Artifact Analysis

Professional Knowledge Area: Learner

In this part, I will talk about the professional knowledge area 1: the learner, who is the center of an EFL class. Learners are important because they can bring rich resources into our language class, and learning more about learners can definitely help EFL adult teachers better design the lesson. Adult learners are independent individuals who have diverse cultural backgrounds and life experiences. In adult EFL teaching, it is necessary for teachers to investigate the background information and learning process of different learners and use these resources to help them acquire the target language. There are two TESOL domains related to this professional knowledge area: TESOL domain 4 and 6. In the following paragraphs, each domain will be explained and supported by my artifacts.

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 how context contributes to identity formation and therefore influences learning. Teachers use this knowledge of identity and settings in planning, instructing, and assessing.

The first sentence of the domain explains what aspects a teacher should learn about their EFL learners. This is important because adult EFLs' language learning is greatly influenced by their family, cultural background, education history, and goals. Adult EFL students usually have very specific expectations for the learning process, and they are good at building bridges between what they already know and what they need to learn. Therefore, when EFL teachers try

to design the learning content and curriculum for adult students, they should consider students' different life experiences and purposes of learning. The second sentence mentions the importance of the setting in an EFL class. The appropriate setting influences adult EFLs' affective filters and makes them more engaged in class (Krashen,1981). We used to take it for granted that adult students have strong learning motivations, so that they can definitely get engaged in all kinds of activities in class. However, adult learners also need well-designed learning settings to engage. Adult EFL teachers should design age-appropriate settings for their students.

Artifact A

The artifact (see in Appendix A) I choose to analyze here is Part 1 of the analysis project I did in Assessment class which focuses on analyzing a 49-year-old Spanish-speaking student Erika's cultural and linguistic backgrounds and the educational context of the school. I met Erika at Belmont International English where she attended English classes twice a week. In Part 1 (A) of this artifact, I analyzed the students' family backgrounds, education history, goals and expectations based on her answers to an adult EFL biography. At the same time, I used the Sociocultural Checklist to assess her acculturation level, cognitive learning style, culture and language, experiential background and sociolinguistic development. In Part 1 (B), according to an interview with her teacher and the pictures I collected in school, I described the classroom and school instructional context.

This artifact supports the ideas shown in TESOL Domain 4. In Part 1(A), I analyzed the student's identity according to the information she provided in the questionnaire and the interview, including her family background, languages she could speak, her educational history in Mexico, her goals and her expectations for this English class. Domain 4 mentions that adult

EFL students' communities, heritages and goals shape learning and expectations of learning. In my analysis, it was clear that the student's expectation of the class was greatly influenced by her previous experience of living in three different countries. Adult EFLs usually come to class with very specific goals and expectations. My analysis showed that the biggest goal for Erika was to talk with her son's teachers fluently. In my future teaching, I will make good use of students' background knowledge and learning purposes instead of just gathering this information. For example, I will put students who share similar learning goals into the same group and design specific learning activities to help them achieve certain goals.

For context, in part 1(B), the educational and instructional contexts of both the classroom and the school were analyzed to show the extent to which the school supported culturally and linguistically diverse students. As shown in Domain 4, context contributes to identity formation and therefore influences the learning of adult EFL students. Analyzing a classroom or school's educational context helps teachers build an idea about the strengths and weaknesses of the learning context. In Artifact A, I pointed out that even though some of the classroom decorations showed the school's respect towards students' diverse backgrounds, support for languages other than English can hardly be found in school. A large number of students actually cannot express their ideas clearly in English. With the language support, teachers can collect more accurate information about their students and improve class planning, instruction, and assessment.

This artifact also closely relates to the culturally responsive pedagogy which was explained in my teaching philosophy. Gay (2010) claimed that culturally responsive pedagogy is an approach whereby teachers acknowledge the home, community, and culture of each student and integrate those values and experiences into curricular content and the school environment. This artifact paid much attention to the home, education, language, and sociocultural background

of one student. Teachers can make good use of this information and design classes which are not only related to students' experiences and values, but also shows their appreciation of students' diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds.

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.

Domain 6 talks about how teachers should use their knowledge of language and adult language learning to support adult EFL's language acquisition. It is important because understanding learners' second language acquisition helps teachers design tasks in an appropriate sequence to scaffold students' learning (Hamond & Gibbons, 2005). For example, in my future adult EFL class, I will design interpretive tasks at the beginning of the lesson because students need to understand the content and get enough comprehensible instruction. Then I will design interpersonal tasks for them to improve authentic communication skills. After these activities, it is time to do presentational tasks in which I can assess their learning results. Activities designed in logical sequence effectively help adult EFLs finish tasks at different levels successfully.

Artifact B

In Artifact B (see in Appendix B), I taught a lesson by using a translanguaging activity which was related to Domain 6. In that class, I taught a poem called *When You are Old* written by William Butler Yeats. First, I drew students' attention to the topic "when you are old" by asking them to draw a picture of themselves when they are old. After that, I introduced the poem and talked about the background information. Then, we discussed unknown words and phrases in

groups. After reading and thinking out loud, I asked them to find out the hardest stanza for them to understand and divided them into two groups to do the translanguaging activity. In the activity, students first translated the stanza by themselves and then talked with a partner to decide the final translation. After that discussion, students were invited to explain their translations and share with the class what difficulties they had in translating and how they overcame them. At the end of the class, I led students to think about their metacognitive awareness during the translanguaging process and how they could use this strategy in future learning

This artifact reflects how a teacher used her knowledge of language and adult language learning to support adult EFL's language acquisition which is mentioned in Domain 6. First, the learning outcome of each task became the building block for the next (Hamond & Gibbons, 2005). All the tasks were designed in an appropriate sequence which scaffolds students to understand the content step by step. Students first built their own connection with the poem by imagine what they would look like when they are old and then started to learn unfamiliar words and phrases through communications with the teacher and peers. After interpretive tasks, they began to do the interpersonal activity in which they need to talk about their translation and decide the final version with students who share the same first language background. Second, they presented the final translation and explained the difficulties they met in the translation process. This learning sequence makes sure that students can finish each task successfully.

Moreover, L1 is also important for adult learners while acquiring a new language. I used the translanguaging activity to help students understand the complex content. The translanguaging activity I adapted in this class shows the ideas I mentioned in my teaching philosophy. Translanguaging teaching shows the features of constructivism, culturally responsive pedagogy and communicative language teaching. Students who participate in translation activities improve

their strategic reading, translation, and engagement, which then improves their English reading comprehension (Goodwin & Jimenez, 2015). If I could do this activity again, I would change some of my instructions to better scaffold students' translanguaging learning. First, I will choose a shorter "juicy" sentence for students to translate because my students were nervous when they found the sentence was long. Second, I will leave more time for students' translation discussion part since I noticed some students did not have enough opportunities to share their ideas. This activity leads students to use their metalinguistic awareness in comprehension and is a good strategy for them to analyze complex texts in future language learning.

In conclusion, the professional knowledge area of learner shows TESOL Domains 4 and 6 which indicate the importance of identity, context and learning process. The two artifacts that I mentioned reflect the ideas and concepts in both TESOL Domains and my own teaching philosophy.

Professional Knowledge Area: The Learning Context

After discussing the importance of learners, I will talk about the learning context for adult EFLs. I would like to divide the learning context into two parts to analyze its importance: learning environment and teachers' instruction. A learning environment is the foundation that promotes students engaged in class. In a good learning environment, teachers care for students physically and mentally by providing comfortable studying places and meaningful classroom decorations. Students can feel a sense of inclusion and belonging within the class. Teachers' instructions also help create a positive learning context. To be specific, teachers should plan their instructions and design purposeful and attractive teaching activities to promote students' active engagement in class. This professional knowledge area is closely related to TESOL Domain 2.

TESOL Domain 2: Instructing

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

This domain explains the importance of creating positive learning contexts in two dimensions. First, it highlights that teachers should create a supportive environment to engage learners in purposeful learning. A supportive environment means students' physical and mental needs can be met and their diverse cultural and language backgrounds are respected in the class. For example, the decorations in classrooms take students' cultural backgrounds into consideration and students can easily find their first language in classroom or in teaching materials. Second, this domain clarifies that teachers' instructions should promote respectful classroom interaction in a good learning context. Language acquisition is most likely to occur when learners are using the language to communicate with each other in authentic and

unrehearsed conversations. Therefore, it is necessary for teachers to promote not only respectful but also high-quality interactions within the class. Instead of only focusing on promoting interactions between the teacher and students, teachers should design activities which allow high-quality peer interactions to happen (Foster & Ohta, 2005). Therefore, these two dimensions fully explain the importance of creating a positive learning context.

Artifact A

Artifact A (see in Appendix C) is the school investigation paper I wrote in Foundation class which supports the ideas in Domain 2. Before writing that paper, I observed four 8th grade English Learner (EL) classes at Croft Middle School. In that paper, I analyzed how Ms. Levy, the EL teacher, created learning contexts for her EL students and pointed out instructions that she can improve in the future. The environment of the classroom I observed reflects the ideas of how to create supportive learning contexts for EFL students. I also noticed that some of her instructions actually cannot promote high-quality interactions among students. The improvement suggestions I stated in that paper explained how to encourage students to have respectful and high-quality interactions by using purposeful instructions. In the following paragraphs, I will analyze the connection between my artifact and the TESOL Domain.

To begin with, the decorations of the class that I analyzed in the paper showed Ms. Levy's efforts to create a supportive atmosphere which makes students engaged in class. For instance, there were drawings explaining what good readers do: questioning, visualizing, inferencing, making connects, synthesizing and summarizing. This reading procedure became a daily routine for students and helped them be good readers in the future. At the same time, with the help of these reading steps, students developed their own problem-solving abilities while reading complex texts. When they met difficulties in reading, they turned to this decoration for

help and had a clear idea about what they need to do to solve the problem. Therefore, the decoration analysis written in my paper demonstrated how the teacher created supportive atmosphere to make students feel supported and engaged in class.

The teaching instructions I observed in Ms. Levy's class also engaged students in purposeful learning. There was a white board showing what students were going to learn in the whole week. When classes began, Ms. Levy pointed at the white board and asked students what they had learned yesterday and what they were going to do in this class. With the help of the weekly plan listed on the board, students clearly knew what they were supposed to do in class and followed teacher's instructions easily.

In addition, the visual aids provided in Ms. Levy's class showed the idea of creating a learning context in which students' cultural and language backgrounds are respected. To be concrete, Ms. Levy made good use of students' L1 in EL teaching. For instance, since students in her classes were all Spanish native speakers, she borrowed books written in both English and Spanish from the library every month. By allowing students to use their first languages in class, teachers can better design the class by collecting the "funds of knowledge" of their students (Moll et al., 1992). Thus, the learning environment in Ms. Levy's class promotes students' learning and helps teachers organize their instruction.

However, in the observation I actually did not notice too many strategies that the teacher used to promote respectful and high-quality interactions in the class. Therefore, I came up with two suggestions to push students having high quality interactions with their teachers and peers. First, students are more willing to interact with others when the topic is related to their life and the instructions are clear. Thus, I would recommend teachers provide step-by-step instruction for students when they need to interact with each other. Teachers can type the instructions out and

show them on slides. At the same time, for lower level students, it is necessary to give them some prompts of high-quality interaction. For instance, “What do you mean by...” or “I don’t agree with..., because...”. Meanwhile, when choosing discussion topics, teachers can use students’ funds of knowledge, for example, building the connection between the character in the article and themselves (Moll et al., 1992). Second, in an ideal EFL class, teachers should have differentiated teaching instructions for students at different levels. I noticed Ms. Levy used the same instruction for students from four different levels. Students with high language proficiency talked a lot in class, while lower level students barely opened their mouths. Hence, to help students have high-quality interactions, teachers should give harder tasks for high level students and provide more instructions and help for lower level students. I can also adapt these strategies in my adult EFL classes. I will choose topics that adult students are interested in to discuss, for instance, job hunting or teacher-parent conference. At the same time, I will provide help for low level students when they need to join the group discussion, for example, sentence stances will be provided for them to refer to when they have difficulties with expressions. The suggestions I gave in this artifact can also be used to promote respectful interactions in adult EFL classrooms.

This artifact also reflects the ideas of culturally responsive pedagogy in my teaching philosophy. One significant feature of CRP is that educators should respect students’ cultural backgrounds and treat every student equally while understanding differences (Gay, 2010). In this artifact, I specifically explained and analyzed how Ms. Levy respected her students’ cultural and language backgrounds by using their L1 in teaching. Another feature of culturally responsive pedagogy is that it focuses on caring for instead about personal well-being and academic success of ethnically diverse students (Gay, 2010). In my artifact, I mentioned how Ms. Levy used classroom decorations to develop students’ reading skills and problem-solving abilities. In this

case, the teacher cared for students' academic success by creating a supportive environment to help students meet their learning goals.

In conclusion, supportive learning contexts engage students in purposeful learning and promote respectful interactions in class. The examples from Ms. Levy's class strongly support the idea that a mature EFL teacher should create a supportive atmosphere to actively engage students in class. At the same time, my suggestions for future instructions show the importance of promoting respectful and high-quality interactions in EFL class.

Professional Knowledge Area: Curriculum

In addition to learning context, curriculum is another important element which promotes the learning process of adult EFLs. Curriculum design is important because EFL teachers need to plan ahead to make sure all the instructions and activities used in class help students achieve both content and language objectives. In macro analysis, a well-designed curriculum provides teachers the big picture of the course and offers specific objectives to achieve. In micro analysis, teachers have the chance to arrange the sequence of different tasks in a logical way and plan their instructions ahead. This professional knowledge area is closely related to TOSOL Domain 1 and 7 which will be explained in the following paragraphs.

TESOL Domain 1: Planning

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

This domain explains the importance of instruction planning in adult EFL teaching. I will divide the importance of instruction planning into three parts. First, instruction planning helps teachers to promote EFL students' learning. In an ideal EFL class, teachers will use different strategies to scaffold students' learning, for instance, using students' prior knowledge, logical sequence of tasks, and audio or video materials (Hammond & Gibbons, 2005). Second, instruction planning ensures that at the end of the class, learners can meet the goals set by teachers. Teachers will claim the content and language goals of the class at the beginning of the teaching plan. All instructions or activities designed in that plan are aimed at helping students achieve the final goal. Third, since the ideal teaching plan is different from the real teaching situation, teachers need to discuss the teaching plan with other colleagues and modify it in order

to ensure that the plan is feasible in the real class. At the same time, if anything unexpected happens in real teaching, teachers have to make decisions and change the plan immediately. Hence, I believe that instruction planning offers teachers the foundation of a successful teaching.

Artifact A

The artifact (see in Appendix D) I choose to support the importance of planning is the teaching plan I co-designed with my colleague in practicum. In that class, students explored the rules of possessive forms in their group discussion and wrote a story according to given settings by using as many possessive forms as they can within the group. At the end of the class, we assessed students' learning results by using exit tickets with questions related to possessive forms. The designing process of this lesson plan reflects the ideas stated in TESOL Domain 1.

To begin with, the scaffolding strategies used in that lesson plans show our effort to plan the instructions to promote students' learning and ensure their engagement in class. We designed activities related to students' background knowledge to involve them in actively exploring the rules of possessive forms. For instance, we led students to guess the belonging of different dogs and wrote down the possessive words they used in discussion. Then, students were asked to explore the rules of different possessive words and write down the rules of different categories in the charts we designed. In this lesson plan, we designed authentic conversations, visual aids, and a logical sequence of different tasks to promote students' learning and make sure the class can go on smoothly.

Second, the exit tickets we designed in the lesson plan help us know the learning results of different students and whether they have met the learning goals. In exit tickets, we set questions related to what students learned in class, for instance, they need to choose which possessive pronoun is correct to use in a sentence: his or he's. After collecting their answers, we

soon found questions that the majority of the students were still not clear about and spent extra time on explaining the rules and answering their questions. The planning of exit tickets helps students in that class achieve the learning goal and provides teachers information for future teaching.

Third, since this is a co-designed lesson plan, I discussed a lot with my colleague in the process and modified the plan many times to better scaffold my students in learning. Adult students will be more engaged in well-planned activities that are related to their daily life. Hence, after finishing the first draft of the lesson plan, we found that in the story-writing activity, the task was too broad to ask students to write a short story within ten minutes. Then, we provided more details for students in that task by given them settings and key words for each story. After analyzing my own teaching, I realized that actually we focused too much on engagement in that lesson plan and did not pay any attention on peer-scaffolding. If I can modify the lesson plan again, I would leave five minutes for students to comment on other groups' use of possessive forms in the story. In this process, students can demonstrate peer-scaffolding in which they can learn from each other's ideas. In this case, modifying teaching plans can promote students' engagement and achievement in class.

Besides reflecting the content in Domain 1, this artifact shows the ideas of constructivism mentioned in my teaching philosophy. The final goal of instruction planning is helping students engage and meet the learning goal in class which also shows features of a constructivist classroom. For instance, in that lesson plan, in order to get students fully engaged in class, instead of telling them the rule of possessive forms directly, we planned to encourage them to explore the rules by themselves. In this example, students are the center of that EFL class and teachers only act as the role of a guide who provides help when students need it while exploring

the new area (Windschitl, 1999). Based on this, I conclude that this artifact relates to my teaching philosophy.

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.

Domain 7 focuses on the role of content in EFL teaching. In adult EFL class, usually we do not have very professional subject objectives, for example, Science or Math. However, adult learners usually come to English class with very specific goals, for instance, communicating with their children's teachers. Hence, in adult EFL teaching, it is necessary for teachers to collect information about students' needs and design appropriate language objectives for them to achieve the content goal. Since adult learners' goals are usually related to their everyday life, out-of-school literacy can be a good resource for students to learn and use the language.

Artifact B

Artifact B (see in Appendix E) is the community literacy paper I finished in Foundation class. Before writing that paper, our class had a practicum of observing out-of-school literacies in different communities in Nashville. In that paper, I specifically focused on the literacy I observed in K&S World Market and designed several EFL class teaching activities based on the literacy I discovered, for example, role-play conversation and product description translation.

The activities suggested in this paper demonstrate the idea of helping students acquire the language they need to talk about the content they want to learn about. All the activities I designed in this paper shows the effort of helping my students acquire different language skills to meet the goal of grocery shopping in English. To achieve this goal, I designed different kinds of activities that improve students' communication skills in shopping situations. For example, I suggested that the teacher can organize a supermarket observation practicum and ask students to record the literacies or dialogues they noticed in that place. After the practicum, students and the teacher can work together analyzing the words or sentences shown in their records. Then, students will be encouraged to create a market by writing their own posters or product descriptions and do role-plays to practice the language skills. By doing these activities, students will learn the language while using it, and the language skills they acquire in the class allow them to finish grocery shopping successfully in English speaking countries. In my future language teaching, I will change some of these activities to meet the needs of my adult EFL students. My future target students are adults who are always busy with work. Therefore, they do not have enough time to explore their communities and find literacies there. To solve this problem, I will encourage my students to find out-of-school literacies online because internet language is everywhere in today's life. By adapting this change, I can still use the activity in adult literacy teaching and will not give extra burden to my adult students.

The connection between this artifact and the TESOL Domain 7 also demonstrates the idea of communicative language teaching shown in my teaching philosophy. In communicative language teaching, students practice communication in unrehearsed contexts because in real life there are no rehearsed conversations (Brown, 2001). The role-play activity I designed in that paper shows the idea of communicative language teaching. In this activity students can learn the

language by having authentic and unrehearsed conversations with their peers or teachers. By doing so, they can improve their discourse competence, sociocultural competence, linguistic competence, actional competence and strategic competence while having the authentic conversation. (Celce-Murcia, Dornyei, & Thurrell, 1995). I will apply this activity to my future adult EFL teaching as well because my adult students have rich life and literacy experience. For example, I will ask my students to do unrehearsed conversations happening in their working places by using the literacies they found in their companies.

In conclusion, curriculum provides the foundation of successful adult EFL classes. As future educators, we should have the professional knowledge to plan instructions in a logical way and encourage students to acquire language skills they need to communicate in the subject or content area.

Professional Knowledge Area: Assessment

Assessment is closely related to curriculum since the curriculum design will be changed based on the results of different assessments. To begin with, assessments play important roles in EFL placement. Normally, before taking official classes, EFL students will be asked to take some standardized and authentic assessments. The results of these assessments help teachers have a clear idea of students' English language proficiency and place them in different levels appropriately. Besides, the analysis of assessment results helps EFL teachers design their teaching plan based on students' language proficiency and cultural backgrounds. When students show some specific problems in assessments, the teachers change the teaching plan according to students' real learning situation. Moreover, the final informative assessments provide the information of students' learning progress in the whole semester. Comparing students' assessment results at the beginning and the end of the semester, teachers and parents can know students' learning progress. This professional knowledge area reflects the content of TESOL Domain 3 which will be analyzed in the following paragraphs

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.

I will analyze the importance of this domain in three dimensions: assessment and interpretation, teaching plan, and feedback. First of all, mature EFL teachers should have the ability to design and conduct their own authentic assessments to test students' language proficiency. At the same time, they need to interpret the results from self-designed and standardized assessments. For instance, the reliability and validity of these assessments should be taken into consideration since different assessments vary from each other (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2019). What is more, self-developed assessments and standardized assessments have their own advantages and disadvantages. EFL teachers should compare and contrast different assessments critically and make sure they can use the results effectively. Second, the analysis result can help teachers better design their teaching plan and change their instructions if necessary. This does not mean that they only focus on language proficiency, for example, speaking, listening, reading and writing. The sociocultural assessment result is another factor EFL teacher should consider while designing teaching plans for students from different cultural backgrounds. Last but not least, students, the center of the class, should be involved while determining what will be assessed. After the assessment, teachers should not only analyze the results by themselves, but also provide feedback to students since they need to know how to improve certain skills in future study.

Artifact A

The artifact (see in Appendix F) I choose is the oral assessment project in the Assessment course in which I analyzed the results of an oral assessment designed by myself and an oral standardized assessment of Erika who is a 49-year-old Mexican EFL student at Belmont International English school. In the paper, I first introduced the oral assessment designed by myself and how I evaluated her oral English proficiency based on the rubrics I chose. Then, I

analyzed the reliability and validity of the standardized assessment and provided the reasons for the Erika's final grade in the assessment. At the end of the paper, I compared and contrasted the two assessments and gave some suggestions on improving Erika's oral language proficiency and designing my future oral language assessments.

This artifact strongly supports the importance of assessing mentioned in Domain 3. My self-designed oral language assessment shows that teachers have the ability to design an authentic assessment and evaluate its result successfully. The oral assessment has three parts: self- introduction, information gap, and discussion. The assessment was designed based on the features of adult EFL learners and provided enough opportunities for them to show output and receive input. For example, the students talked a lot in the discussion part because the topic was about a movie which is related to students' life experience. At the same time, the SOLOM rubric was appropriately chosen to evaluate students' oral language proficiency. It is a rating scale that teachers can use to assess students' English oral language proficiency based on what they observe on a continual basis in a variety of situations. For instance, interpersonal conversation, class discussion and everyday talk. Hence, I believe that these facts in this artifact reflect the importance of an EFL teachers' ability to assess students' learning results in teaching (SOLOM).

After designing and conducting the assessments, interpreting the results is also an important procedure mentioned in Domain 3. The interpreting process of the standardized assessment in Artifact A also demonstrates the importance of it. While discussing the result of Erik's oral language proficiency shown in WMLS, I analyzed the reliability and validity of the standardized assessment. It turned out that the reason for Erika's low score in several parts is not because of her language proficiency, but the low validity of the assessment. For example, the content is quite out-of-date, and the construct validity is low as well. After comparing and

contrasting the self-developed assessment and WMLS, I concluded that Erika's oral language proficiency should be "intermediate fluent" and pointed out the drawback in both assessments. For instance, my protocol for the authentic assessment was not clear enough and the content of WMLS needed to be updated. The low validity of the standardized assessment triggered my thinking of how to avoid it in my future teaching. If my future adult students need to take placement assessments, I will recommend some standardized assessments with high validity based on the analysis data I collected. This procedure shows that an EFL teacher has to analyze critically the results of different assessments and find out students' real language proficiencies.

In addition to assessing and interpreting, in this artifact, I also provided plans for Erika's future teaching since the assessment result reflected the student's language proficiency and showed her advantages and disadvantages in language learning. For example, I noticed that Erika had low scores in pronunciation and grammar parts and these problems were greatly influenced by her L1 Spanish. Hence, I suggested that in Erika's future teaching, the teaching content should focus on pronunciation and grammar explanation. To be specific, teachers can design activities that help Erika have opportunities to practice English sounds which are hard for her to pronounce. Tongue twisters are great examples of pronunciation practice. For grammar explanation, teachers can ask Erika to discover her own grammar mistakes and think about ways to correct them. Moreover, I could design several activities, for instance, translanguaging activity, for Erika to tell the differences between English and Spanish. In translanguaging activity, she can compare and contrast her first language and English. Based on these facts, I can conclude that a mature EFL teacher should make good use of the information they collect from the assessment analysis. Teachers can design and change their teaching plans according to the students' real language proficiency and the problems shown in their learning process.

In this artifact, I did not involve my student in determining the assessment content and did not provide effective feedback to her immediately. If I conduct the authentic assessment again in the future, I will ask the student to have a one on one interview first because it is necessary to know more about the student's sociocultural background while designing an assessment. To be specific, I would take her L1, daily life activities and interest into consideration while designing the assessment items. Erika is interested in cooking, so I can design questions related to this field to make her engaged in the assessment. Before the assessment, I will show Erika the rubrics I choose and discuss with her about it. If Erika has any questions about the rubric, I will listen to her suggestions and revise the rubric with her. After the assessment, feedback will be provided to my student immediately. I will explain the reasons for her scores in different fields, talk about her problems shown in the assessment, and gave suggestions on her future language learning. With these changes, the student can be fully involved in the assessment process and have a clear idea about her language proficiency and future learning.

This artifact is also closely related to the constructivism theory mentioned in my teaching philosophy. In constructivist classrooms, students are the center of the class and teachers act as a guide (Windschitl, 1999). In my artifact, I used the professional knowledge to assess students' oral language proficiency and interpret the results of different assessments to better guide students' learning in the future. With the suggestions I raised for this oral assessment plan, my students can be constructively involved in the whole assessment process since they have the right to design what should be assessed and get immediate feedback from the teacher. After interpreting the results, I can start to design or change my teaching plans based on the problems shown in the students' assessment results. For example, if my student gets low scores in

grammar because she is confused about possessive forms which have been taught in the class, I will take extra time to explain the rules of possessive forms to her until she totally understands them. By getting students involved in the assessment process and interpreting her assessment results, I can better understand my student's language proficiency and learning process. All the effort I did in that project helped my student, the center of the class, to be fully engaged in the assessment and daily constructivist classes. Hence, I believe this artifact also reflects my ideas of the teaching philosophy.

In conclusion, assessment is an inevitable step in adult EFL teaching. The assessment procedures can be divided into assessing and interpreting, teaching planning, and giving feedback. In an ideal adult EFL class, the teacher should have the professional knowledge to conduct each procedure and used the information to create a constructivist class.

Application to Practice: Implication and Future Consideration

After talking about my teaching philosophy and analyzing my artifacts related to four professional knowledge areas, I start to think about the implication I learned from all the works I did here. My thoughts about my implications and future considerations have three parts: who I am as a teacher, challenges in the future, and possible solutions.

TESOL Domain 8: Commitment and Professionalism

Teachers continue to grow in their understanding of the relationship of second language teaching and learning to the community of English language teaching professionals, the broader teaching community, and communities at large, and use these understandings to inform and change themselves and these communities.

In TESOL domain 8, the growth and contribution of EFL teachers have been highlighted because a qualified EFL teacher is eligible to dig in their understanding of second language teaching and help members in their communities create better learning environment for EFL students. In another word, as a future adult EFL teacher, I need to carefully think about who I am now as a teacher after absorbing all the theories I learned at Peabody. At the same time, I also pay attention to the challenges which I will have in my own class. In other to help my future teaching community solve these problems, I come up with several suggestions.

Me as an Adult EFL Teacher

Based on my teaching philosophy and the analysis of artifacts, I can describe myself a facilitator who always cares for students in task-oriented classroom. First of all, I use the word “facilitator” instead of “teacher” to describe myself because I followed the ideas of constructivism in which students should be the center of the class, and I provide support for them

to explore the new world. For example, when I taught the class about possessive grammar rules to my adult EFL students, instead of telling them the rules directly, I encouraged them to come up with phrases which showed belongings and then led them to conclude the rules of possessive forms by themselves. In this case, I offered opportunities for my students to think, explore and present in class. Therefore, facilitator is the main word I will use to describe myself.

Task-oriented is the second description I choose to show who I am in teaching. This word reflects the features of communicative language teaching explained in my teaching philosophy. Students start to learn the language when they open their mouth and use it to finish authentic tasks (Littlewood, 2011). In my adult EFL class teaching, I take both adult students' practical learning goals and the features of communicative language teaching into consideration and design tasks in which students need to have authentic and unrehearsed conversations. For example, I can design role-play tasks for adult students to solve authentic tasks happen in their daily life, like grocery shopping or parent-teacher conference. These tasks are also age-appropriate for my adult students because many games are too childish for adult learners. Hence, as a task-oriented facilitator, I could design meaningful tasks for my adult students to get engaged and learn English through communication.

The third phrase for me as an adult EFL teacher is "caring for" which demonstrates the essence of culturally responsive pedagogy. As I mentioned in my teaching philosophy, adult EFL learners lack the attention from EFL teachers and they are absolutely different from students in K12 system. Therefore, as an adult EFL teacher I always care for my students by considering their rich language, cultural and education background information while designing lesson plans help them meet their own practical needs. This can be greatly shown in my changing understanding of assessments. Before I systematically learned how to do assessment from

Peabody, I took it for granted that assessment was only a way of showing students' learning results. After learning more about assessments, I realized actually a mature EFL teacher should interpret instead of only gather information from assessments. For me, the assessments about cultural, language and education backgrounds provide much useful information to set goals and design meaningful activities for my adult EFL students. All in all, as a facilitator in a task oriented EFL class, I will always care for my students' background information and unique goals in the future.

Future Challenges

While applying the theories of second language learning into real classes, I noticed two biggest challenges between ideal theories and real classroom settings. First, even though I tried different strategies to promote high quality and respectful interaction within class, some students with lower level English proficiency still have few chances to express their ideas in limited class time. Second, in adult EFL class, usually there are no specific requirements or standards for teaching materials. This leads to one problem that the teaching materials for adult EFLs are always out-of-date and designed in an illogical way. How can I choose appropriate teaching materials for adult EFL learners? In the following paragraphs, I will explain these two challenges in details.

The first challenge is how to make sure every student has enough time to express their ideas in class interactions. I noticed this problem in my own classroom because students with low English language proficiency always agreed with students whose language level is higher than theirs. As a result, some students dominate the interaction by keeping telling their ideas, while some students barely have the chance to open their mouth. If this situation continues, students with low proficiency can hardly improve their communication competences in

discussion activities and they may even lose confidence of learning English. It is inevitable that there are students with different language proficiency levels in adult EFL class. What kind of strategies we can take to make sure every student has fair opportunities to show their ideas in class interactions?

The second challenge is how to choose appropriate teaching materials for adult EFL students. This challenge was shown in my practicum class. It was really hard to find teaching materials that are attractive for students with different ages and cultural backgrounds. There are no perfect books in the world and the adult English textbooks can never meet the needs of all students. Moreover, adult teaching materials are always focused on grammar rules which make the class become grammar oriented. I do not mean that grammar is not important. However, if the adult EFL class is only focusing on grammar teaching, students may only care about the form instead of the meaning of language. After discovering these problems, I am wondering how I can choose or design teaching materials that can make students of all ages involved and give them chance to really use the language.

Possible Solutions

After discussing these two challenges with my professors and peers, I came up with some possible solutions for my future adult EFL teaching. These solutions may still have flaws, but I will improve them step by step in my real teaching.

To make sure students with different proficiency levels have the same chance to express their ideas in class discussion, I will use strategies to ask students to count how many sentences they said in discussion. I do not mean ask them to count the numbers by writing or speaking it out loud. I will give a group different colors of candy when they are going to have a discussion. Once after talking, a student needs to put a candy of his color in the middle of the table. When

they notice there are too many red candies on the table, then the student who gets red candies may need to give more chances to other people. If there are only one or two green candies, students with green candies will be encouraged to tell more about his ideas. At the same time, I will provide sentence stances for students in front of the class, for example “Do you mean...”, “Can you please explain... again?”, “I agree with you because...”. With these strategies, I hope my future students can have enough chances to express their ideas in class discussion.

As for teaching materials selection, I will involve my students in choosing materials they need to learn. Adult students are different from K12 students because they have the ability to tell their goals and things they want to learn. Meanwhile, adult students have rich literacy experience in daily life and the English language is changing every day. Therefore, I will encourage my students to discover out-of-school literacies by themselves and bring them into class. In the future, I decide to discuss with my colleagues every month about how to make good use of out-of-school literacies my students find and use this resource as teaching materials for my EFL students. Another way of using out-of-school literacies is encouraging students to introduce the literacy they find to their peers. In the process of introducing, students can improve their performance skills and use metalinguistic awareness to use language to explain language.

Conclusion

In this capstone, I show my teaching philosophy as a future adult EFL teacher by demonstrating my understanding of constructivism, culturally responsive pedagogy, communicative language teaching, and applications of these theories in real teaching setting. Four professional knowledge areas and related TESOL domains are explained and supported by different artifacts I did at Peabody. The theory learning and teaching practicum I experienced have changed me into a facilitator who always care for students in task oriented adult EFL class.

At the end, I point out challenges I will face in future and come up with possible solutions for my own language classes. With all the classes and teaching I experienced within these two years, now I have the knowledge and ability to be a mature adult EFL teacher.

References

- Barrera, R. B., & Jiménez, R. T. (2001). Bilingual teachers speak about the literacy instruction of bilingual Latino students. In B. M. Taylor & P. D. Pearson (Eds.), *Teaching Reading: Effective Schools and Accomplished Teachers* (pp. 335-357). Mahwah, NJ: Earlbaum.
- Brock, C. (2001). Serving English language learners: Placing learners learning on center stage. *Language Arts, 78*(5), 467-475
- Brown, H., & Abeywickrama, P. (2019.). *Language assessment: principles and classroom practices* (Third edition.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dornyei, Z., & Thurrell,s. (1995). Communicative competence: pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6*(2), 5-35.
- Chamot, A., & O'Malley, J.M. (1996). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A model for linguistically diverse classrooms. *The Elementary School Journal, 96*(3), 259-273.
- Foster, P., & Ohta, A. (2005). Negotiation for meaning and peer assistance in second language classrooms. *Applied Linguistics, 26*(3), 402-430.
- Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching - Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Goodwin, A. P., & Jiménez, R. (2016). TRANSLATE: New strategic approaches for English learners. *Reading Teacher, 69*(6), 621-625.
- Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P. (2005). Putting scaffolding to work: The contribution of

scaffolding in articulating ESL education. *Prospect*, 20, 6-30

Jiménez, R. T. & Rose, B. C. (2010). Knowing how to know: Building meaningful relationships through instruction that meets the needs of students learning English. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(5), 403-412.

Johns, A., & Price-Machado, D. (2001). English for specific purposes: Tailoring courses to student needs – and to the outside world. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. (pp. 43-54). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*.

Pergamon Press Inc.

Littlewood, W. (2011). *Communicative language teaching: An expanding concept for a changing world*. In Hinkel, E. (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, Volume II. (pp. 541-557). Routledge: New York, New York.

Moll, L., Gonzalez, N., Neff, D., & Amanti, C. (1992). Funds of Knowledge for Teaching: Using a Qualitative Approach to Connect Homes and Classrooms. *Theory into Practice*. 31(2), pp. 132-141.

SOLOM. (n.d.). Retrieved from

<http://www.cal.org/twi/EvalToolkit/appendix/solom.pdf>

Windschitl, M. (1999). The challenges of sustaining a constructivist classroom culture. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 80(10), 751-55.

Appendix

Appendix A

Part A

Introduction:

The student I chose for this analysis is a 49-year-old Mexican lady Erika at Belmont International English. She is in class of level six, which is the highest level provided there and she attends classes every Tuesday and Thursday. She was born and raised in Mexico and had lived in France for six years because her husband works for a French company. Her family moved to Nashville nine months ago because her husband changed a new program. Erika's first language is Spanish. Since she had lived in France for six years, she could speak very fluent French. Now she is taking Belmont International English classes to improve her oral English language proficiency. I am interested in her multicultural and trilingual experience and decided to analyze her cultural and linguistic background. The following is the specific analysis.

Adult ESL Student Biography:

Since my student is an adult who can express her ideas clearly both in speaking and writing, I used the cultural and linguistic survey our group designed in class to assess her background. She was required to write down her answers of those questions and then we had a 30-minute interview talking about these answers in details (See Appendix A). The biography is divided into four parts: family & language background, education history, goals & expectations and working experience.

When I asked Erika about her family background, she was very excited and proud to talk about her husband and three children. Erika's husband works for a French company, so they moved to France and lived there for almost six years. Nine months ago, her husband changed a new program and they moved to Nashville and would stay here for five years. Since her family moved to France for almost six years, her two older kids finished their college education in Europe. Now her 23-year-old son lives in Budapest and 21-year-old daughter lives in Spain. Erika and her husband live with their 11-year-old boy in Nashville. Hence Erika has to use different languages in different situations. For example, at home she speaks Spanish (L1). While chatting with her French friends, she could change into French mode easily (L2). In her son's elementary school, she has to talk with the teacher in English (L3) which is a little bit hard for her to understand. Erika's trilingual experience allows her to adapt to a new environment quickly and use her prior knowledge in Spanish and French to help herself learning English.

It took Erika a while to think about the question "what is your schooling experience outside the US" because she finished her college education almost thirty years old. She earned bachelor's degrees in business administration and Culinary arts in Mexico. In university, she studied English every week, but she usually quit the class because English was not very important 30 years ago. Six years after graduation, she realized the importance of English and took English classes 6 hours a week. The only English test she had took was the English course final test in her university. She said "Standardized English tests were not mandatory when I was in school. When we moved to Europe, I noticed that my children need to take many standardized tests before they got enrolled." Since Erika has received higher education in her home country, she has her own learning strategy and is very clear about her goals.

Erika listed very specific goals of learning English. As a mom, she has the responsibility to take care the whole family especially her children. Although school has Spanish interpreter who could help her communicate with her son's teacher, she still wants to learn English and effectively communicate with the teacher because she believes it is weird to have a stranger there while talking something about her son. Another goal is that she needs to communicate with her older son and daughter's girlfriends or boyfriends. Erika mentioned that her son had many girlfriends whose native language was not Spanish or French, for instance, Swedish. Hence, she has to use English to communicate with them and this is one of the biggest reasons she wants to improve her English language proficiency. Also, she mentioned in our interview that she would go to post office after our interview to mail cloths and medical supplies to her daughter who is learning diving in Thailand. She was actually very nervous because that was her first time to mail things in US and she was afraid that she didn't understand the mailing procedure, but she had to deal with these things because her daughter needs her help. To sum up, listening and speaking skills are her top priorities because she needs to take care the whole family by communicating with others.

One of Erika's goals is to work or become a volunteer in US because she felt lonely and boring at daytime. This triggered our conversation about her working experience. In Mexico she used to have her own small business, but she sold it when the family moved to France. She doesn't have any working experience outside of Mexico because she is not confident in her French/ English proficiency. However, she actually wants to do something in US, especially about culinary arts which is her major. According to her answers and descriptions in the survey and interview, her family actually has very good social economic status in Mexico and France. Now she starts to live in a new country, she is trying hard to maintain the previous social economic status and the

first step is to improve her language proficiency. Erika is in good social economic status so that she could afford private English tutors who teaches communicative language to her every Wednesday.

To summarize her biography, Erika is an international citizen who has trilingual skills. Her family which is in good social economic statuses is very diverse and flexible in adapting to new environments. She is most focused on listening and speaking skills because she needs to take care of every family member and find a job (no need to worry about salary) in US. What is more, she is motivated in English learning and has both emotion and financial support from her family while learning the language.

Sociocultural Checklist:

I also completed Collier's (2002) Sociocultural checklist to assess Erika's acculturation level, cognitive learning style, culture and language, experiential background and sociolinguistic development (see in Appendix B). I observed her performance in class and had a 20-minute interview with her about certain sociocultural questions (see in Appendix C). For acculturation level got a score of 50%. Her scores for culture and language are 67%. She scored 33% in experiential background, cognitive learning and sociolinguistic development. Following is the details of the checklist.

For acculturation level, Erika was checked for "does not interact much with majority culture peers or majority cultural group", "displays heightened stress or anxiety in cross-cultural interactions" "oral expression contains considerable code switching". In our interview, I asked her that do you have any American friends, and do you often talk with them? She replied that she would talk to her American friends in the swimming pool every morning. Yet according to her description,

they would only have basic greetings every day and do not have too much conversation. Then I have to say she does not interact much with majority culture peers or majority culture group. She also mentioned that she was stressed while talking with other people whose native language is not English because she was afraid that when she couldn't express her ideas clearly and they may get angry. Another interesting I observed in the interview is that when she was talking about something that she didn't know how to express in English, she would say certain word in French instead of in Spanish.

For cognitive learning style, she was checked "Retains learning strategies that are no longer appropriate" and "Displays difficulty with task analysis" The first problem was noticed in her interview because she said that she wants more written homework and she believed that homework is the best way for her to learn English. However, in class she was supposed to do more oral exercises to practice her English. The other fact was observed in class when teacher was teaching "passive voice". At that time, she was confused about the task given by teacher and didn't ask him for clearance.

For culture and language, this is the part that her teacher should mainly focus on because she was scored for "Comes from non-English speaking home", "Comes from non-English speaking geographic area", "Family emphasis support of family or community/group over individual effort" and. "Comes from a culture or ethnic group different from mainstream America". Erika comes from Mexico where Spanish is the widely used and her family Speaks Spanish at home even though they had lived in France for six years. In our interview, Erika mentioned that now young people in her hometown Mexico City are learning English and English is used there. However, she left her hometown many years ago and at that time English was still not widely used in Mexico City, so I have to say that she comes from non-English speaking geographic area.

When I asked her what her family believes is more important, family support or individual effort? She replied without hesitation “Of course family support, I contact my children everyday” Another evidence was that she was so happy to mail things from US to Thailand for her daughter, even though she was nervous about talking with the staff in post office. Hence, I believe her family emphasis support of family over individual effort. What is interesting is that Erika realized she comes from a culture different from mainstream America and has her own opinion about this “I know Americans do not like Mexicans because of political issues and I understand it.”

For experiential background, she was checked “High family mobility” because her family has lived in three countries and now five family members live in three different countries. When she talked about how long she would stay in Nashville, she said “I don’t know. Maybe five years.” She has no idea how long they would stay in Nashville because it all depends on the job location of her husband. She was also checked “Little exposure to subject or content or not familiar with material” and “Different terms/concepts for subject areas or materials and content.” She complained that when teacher was talking about the US political issues in class, she could not understand it because has no idea what those policies are.

For sociolinguistic development, she was checked “limited academic language in English” and “Asks a peer for assistance in understanding”. I notice that when the class was learning some grammar rules, Erika could not understand those academic terms of certain grammar rules and would ask her friends who could speak Spanish help her. She said in the interview “I don’t want to always sit next to people who can speak Spanish because I want to practice my English. But I would ask my Mexican friends for help if I don’t understand the thing in English.

As Collier says, if you have checked more than 40% of the items in any of the five areas, it indicates that the student needs intervention in this area (2002). Erika needs intervention in acculturation level and culture & language.

Part B

Introduction:

The class I observed is Dr. Frank Jones' level 6 English class in Belmont International English which is an international English school for adult students who wants to improve their English proficiency. All the classrooms are provided by Belmont United Methodist Church for free. To better analyze the class and school context, Zibei and I had an interview with Frank (See in Appendix D) and took some pictures of the class and school (See in Appendix E). In the interview, we asked questions about school history, students background information, students' learning goals, assessments used in school or class, teaching activities and other support provided. The following is specific analysis of the education context of Frank's class and Belmont International English by showing the details of our interview and observations.

Classroom:

I used Gottlieb's (2016) A Rating Scale of a Linguistically and Culturally Responsive School (See Appendix F). Frank's class has a score of four for "multilingualism and multiculturalism permeate the air, from signage to murals to conversations in the halls", "Students' language and cultures are valued every minute of every day". In Frank's class, we have students from 18 different countries. During my observation, I noticed that students will talk in different kinds of languages in the halls, for instance, Japanese, Spanish, Portuguese and

Korean. What's more, Frank could speak English, Spanish and French so that he would talk with students in French and Spanish. I also noticed that there is a flyer written in English and a Chinese knot decoration on the classroom's wall which shows multicultural and multilingualism atmosphere of this class. One teaching activity I observed in class was Frank inviting a Mexican student to teach everyone else in the class about the meaning of Mexican flag because that month was the National Hispanic Heritage month (See Appendix E). The student used both English and Spanish to explain the original of the flag. This is a very strong evidence of valuing students' languages and cultures.

The score for "High expectations is set for all students; the language learners can reach their goals in one or more languages" is two. In our interview, we asked Frank "Who are our students and what are their goals of learning English?". Frank explained that majority of his 30 students are female, and they came to America because their spouses need to work or study here. The top three goals for them is to communicate fluently with others in English, to find a job and to apply for higher education. Yet, only very few people have the second and third goals so that the class is only focused on communicative language teaching. At the same time, students may drop out once they find a job or have other important things to do in their life because the class is free and not mandatory. Hence, Frank does not have high expectations for all students and the classes are flexible without any standards. However, in class Frank does expect students to read and understand a novel written in English. Yet there is no certain requirement and assessment for reading skills and ability. Hence, I conclude that students in this class do not have high. Expectations from teachers and they probably cannot reach their goal in one or more language.

Frank's class got another two for "Curriculum, instruction, and assessment invite multiple perspectives and reflect the identities of the students" Before we came to observe the

whole class, Frank emailed us that he would not use any formal assessments in his class. I also asked him a question about it “There are six classes here from level 1 to level 6. If you do not use any formal assessment, then how could you place students into different levels?” Frank replied that after registration students would be required to write several sentences and have a short conversation with the teacher. Then teachers all of six levels will discuss together which level the students should be placed. They do not have specific rubrics for language proficiency assessment. The decision will be made based on teachers’ discussion and how many people one level can contain. All the teachers will design their teaching plan independently and there is not requirement for curriculum design and teaching plan. The class is mostly focused on explaining the English language rules and American political or culture issues. A normal routine is that Frank explains some grammar or vocabulary to students and they will discuss in groups to do some related grammar or vocabulary exercises. The instructional style of Frank is explicit teaching with lots of exercise only in English. The students are from so many countries that he could not contain their culture and first languages in class. Then I believe the curriculum, instruction and assessment does not reflect the identities of the students.

Frank’s class got a score of three for “the linguistics and culture resources of the community and family members are an extension of the school”. In Frank’s Thursday class, he would invite volunteers from community who are retired professional English native speakers to facilitate the class’ article sharing club. Every volunteer would be in charge of a group of five or six students and answer their questions or correct their mistakes made in the conversation. Besides language help, they also tell some American culture to students and explain some culture differences. Frank make good use of resources he and the school have to help students learn things out of class. Yet it is hard for student’s family members to join the teaching because there

are 30 students in class and class space is limited. Moreover, the class meets every Tuesday and Thursday morning and students' spouses need to work at that time. Hence Frank's class does not use too many culture resources of family members but makes good use of linguistics and culture resources of the community.

Last but not the least, I gave Frank's class scores of four in "Every adult in the school advocates on behalf of students, and social attention is paid to languages and cultures" and "linguistic and cultural responsiveness is part of the school's and district's mission and vision". Frank and his colleagues are all volunteers and they don't receive any payments through teaching here. They really care for the students cultural and linguistic background and even use their own money to buy equipment for language teaching, for example, speakers or books. The aim of the class is to help students improve their English language ability. On the Frank's class website, he wrote "Around four thousand students from many countries have been helped to improve their proficiency in English and their understanding of American culture. We welcome new students. We work hard, but we have fun, too." According to these evidences, I believe every faculty of Belmont International English pays attention to students' linguistic and cultural development.

School

I used Herrera's rubric of Level of performance to assess school content and to what extent does the school support culturally and linguistically diverse students (Appendix G). This school is a little bit special because it is not literally a "school". In my interview with Frank, I asked him the history of Belmont International English. He introduced that the Belmont English class was part of the metro Nashville public school system and later was in charge of Nashville

State Community College. Few years later, it was taken over by Tennessee College of Applied Technology which required the school to check all the students' citizenship. The Belmont International English actually do not care the immigration status of their students, so they quit, and all the teachers do not get any salary now. I will discuss the result of my assessment in five aspects: culture, language, academic, families and community.

For culture performance, I would say Belmont International English school meets the basic needs of students. First of all, Belmont International English does not have written principle for teachers and students. Yet the school and teachers do respect and value students' diverse culture background. When students register online, they are required to complete a form of background information (See Appendix H). For instance, they need to answer questions like "what is your home country" and "what is your occupation in your country". Teachers really care for the students and they could memorize the culture background information about almost every student at the very beginning of the semester. School and. Teachers understand that different students may experience different stages of acculturation and they provide all the resources they have to help students adapt to life in US. At the same time, it is impossible for teachers to understand the culture of students from 18 countries. They realize there are some cultural misconceptions in class and are happy to have students explain culture differences. Then I would say the school meets the basic cultural needs of students.

The school also meets students' basic needs of language. As an international English school, students' L1 is absolutely accepted in school and school provides a platform for students to meet new friends who have the same culture and language background with them. I observed that some students became very good friends after attending class. However, there are too many languages used in school, they cannot provide L1 help for everyone. I noticed some signs in

Church are written in Spanish, but I don't think students from Japan or Korea can understand. As I mentioned before, now teachers at Belmont International Church are not paid. Majority of them are retired volunteer teachers. They are not that knowledgeable about those language acquisition theories, but they do understand the importance of communicative language teaching and try very hard to contain more communicate activities in their lessons. As experienced teachers, they do understand that CLD student's first language can influence their behavior. According to these evidences I believe that the school meet s students' basic needs of language.

For academic needs, Belmont International school still needs improvement. Again, this school is not a real "school" and it does not need to follow any standards or achieve certain academic goals. Majority of the students there actually do not want to improve their academic English. Hence school actually does not provide particular strategies to students. In advanced levels, teacher would spend some time on reading skills and teach students some reading strategies, for instance, summary, comparison and think-aloud. However, these materials or strategies could hardly students' academic needs. Even though according to the rubric this school needs improvement in meeting students' academic needs, they don't necessarily have to focus on students' academic achievements.

The level of performance for families is "meet basic needs". In the form students need to fill in when registering contains information about their spouse. On the first day of class, students will be invited to share with the whole class information about them and their family as well. In assignments, students are encouraged to write things about their family with language skills learned within class. However, the school will not contact their families unless in emergency situations. This is understandable since these students are all adults and there are only six

volunteer teachers who need to take care of 107 students. Hence, I would say Belmont International English meets the basic needs of family

Last but not the least, the school meets criteria for community part. In church lobby, there are many flyers proving job information and events which could help students improving English in community. For example, there is information about free conversation class taught by Vanderbilt University. Teacher always encourages students and their family to attend certain community events. At the same time, professional volunteers from community come to school every Thursdays to provide opportunities for students to have authentic English conversations with native speakers. Since some students' family are illegal immigrants, I observed that there were magazines and flyers inform students and their family about their rights resisting ICE. One flyer is written in three different languages with a hotline that student can contact for help. Thus, I conclude that Belmont International School meets the criteria for community part.

In conclusion, both Belmont International English and Frank's class value and respect students' culture and language background. Community support can be found everywhere in school and all the volunteer teachers do care for students. However, the school and class do not provide enough academic and family support because of the goals of the adult students and the big size of the class.

Emphasize:

Zibei and I had an interview together with Frank who is the teacher of level 6 class. In our interview, we asked him questions about school history, students background information, students' learning goals, class information, assessments used, teaching activities and other support provided.

For school history, we asked him “why this class is taught in a church” and “How do students usually know about it”. Frank then explained the history of the Belmont International English as I mentioned in the school analysis part. For student’s background information, we asked him that how do they collect student’s information, where are they from and what about their educational history in their home country. For students learning goals, questions like “what is majority students’ goal of learning English?” “Do they have a goal of finding a job here” were asked. For class information, I asked him “how many levels of classes do they have”, “what are the standards of different levels”. Since he said they don’t use formal assessment for placement, we asked him how do they decide the placement of different students. After that we discussed something about the teaching activities with questions like “what do you think is important in teaching?” and “Will you use students L1 as teaching resource in class”. In the last part of our interview, Frank talked about other support he or the school provided for students.

To conclude the themes developed from our discussion, both Belmont International English and Frank’s class value and respect students’ culture and language background. Community support can be found everywhere in school and all the volunteer teachers do care for students. However, the school and class do not provide enough academic and family support because of the goals of the adult students and the big size of the class. In class, teacher would focus on grammar and vocabulary teaching. Communicative practices happen when students work in group to finish certain grammar or vocabulary exercises.

References:

Herrera, S., Murry, K., & Cabral, R. (n.d.). *Assessment accommodations for classroom teachers of culturally and linguistically diverse students* / Socorro G. Herrera, Kevin G. Murry, Robin Morales Cabral. Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.

Belmont International English, (n.d.). Retrieved from

<http://www.frankjones.org/>

Gottlieb, M. (2016). *Assessing English language learners: Bridges to educational equity: Connecting academic language proficiency to student achievement*. Corwin Press.

Appendix B

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| Teacher: Yunlu Qian | Date: Oct. 17, 2019 | Grade/Class/Subject: Belmont International English (Adult) |
| Unit/Theme: <i>When You are Old</i> | | SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS: 1. Handouts of the poem 2. Audio of the poem |
| Content Objective(s): 1. SWBAT claim the main idea of the poem <i>When You are Old</i> 2. SWBAT state why translanguaging is helpful in English reading and show their metalinguistic awareness | | Language Objective(s): 1. SWBAT understand unfamiliar words in the poem. 2. SWBAT translate part of the poem into their L1 3. SWBAT explain their translanguaging process to peers in English |
| SIOP FEATURES | | |
| PREPARATION √ Adaptation of content √ Links to background <input type="checkbox"/> Links to past learning √ Strategies incorporated | SCAFFOLDING √ Modeling <input type="checkbox"/> Guided practice √ Independent practice √ Comprehensible input | GROUP OPTIONS <input type="checkbox"/> Whole class <input type="checkbox"/> Small groups √ Partners √ Independent |
| INTEGRATION OF PROCESSES √ Reading <input type="checkbox"/> Writing √ Speaking √ Listening | APPLICATION √ Hands-on √ Meaningful √ Linked to objectives √ Promotes engagement | ASSESSMENT √ Individual √ Group <input type="checkbox"/> Written √ Oral |
| Mini-LESSON (4-6 students: half Chinese native speakers and half Japanese Speakers) | | |
| SEQUENCE: | | |
| Warm up: 5 minutes | | |
| 1. Teacher asks students to draw a quick image of themselves when they are old. | | |
| 2. Students explain to the group about their image. | | |
| 3. Teacher tells students the title of the poem and asks them to guess what the poem is about. (students shout out directly) | | |
| Read and think-aloud: 10 minutes | | |

4. Teacher introduces the background information of the poet and poem. Then play the one-minute audio of the poem.
5. Students read the poem sentence by sentence and discuss in the whole group about the words they do not know. (teacher can ask “can anyone tell me what “XX” means?”)
6. While reading the poem, teacher leads students to think-aloud the image the poem describes.

Translanguaging activity: 15 minutes

7. Teacher asks students to explain their understandings of the poem and the hardest part to understand. After that, students need to translate the confusing part into their L1.
8. Students first translate by themselves and second work with peers who speak the same language with them to come up with a final translation version.
9. Students share their translation with the group and explain to others why they translate it into certain words to make peers who do not speak that language understand. Teacher can ask “what problem did you have during the translation and how did you overcome it”
10. Teacher asks students to share their understanding of the poem after the translanguaging activity.

Wrap up: 5 minutes

11. Teacher asks students to reflect the translanguaging activity (Do you like it? Is it helpful for you to understand the poem? How will you use it in future reading?)

REFLECTIONS:

- This is a mini lesson which will only have 4-6 students
- In order to conduct the translanguaging activity, I would only choose Chinese and Japanese native speakers.
- During translation, students can use technology to search the meaning of certain words but can't search the translation of the poem directly.

When You Are Old
BY WILLIAM BUTLER YEATS

When you are old and grey and full of sleep,
And nodding by the fire, take down this book,
And slowly read, and dream of the soft look
Your eyes had once, and of their shadows deep;

How many loved your moments of glad grace,
And loved your beauty with love false or true,
But one man loved the **pilgrim** soul in you,
And loved the sorrows of your changing face;

And **bending down** beside the glowing **bars**,
 Murmur, a little sadly, how Love fled
And paced upon the mountains overhead
And hid his face **amid** a crowd of stars.

Pilgrim: a person who journeys to a holy place for religious reasons.

Bend down: lean down; incline the body downward

Murmur: say something in a low, soft, or indistinct voice.

Bar: a long rod or rigid piece of wood

Amid: surrounded by; in the middle of

Appendix C

In this practicum, I observed four English Learner (EL) classes at the 8th grade of Croft Middle School. The communities of Nashville are rich with diversity and Croft Middle school, as a metro public school, has 140 students in its EL program (“Croft Design Center Middle School”). Basically, all the EL students at Croft Middle school take English tests and then are divided into six levels. Level one means the student is an English beginner and level six means the student’s English ability achieves the native level. And EL students are pulled out only in English classes. In other words, they attend math, science, or biology classes with their native classmates but have to go to EL classroom for English classes. As a metro Nashville public school, Croft middle school not only offers help to EL students, but also assists their family with language support. For example, at the school’s front desk, I noticed that those handouts were written in English, Spanish and Arabic. Also, the school website provides both English and Spanish student-parent handbook.

In the classes I observed, teacher taught the same content in different classes. The first class was attended by level one EL students and the second one was attended by level two EL students. And the third and fourth classes had students from level three and four. When I stepped into the classroom, I was impressed by different kinds of decorations on wall to help students study English. For instance, there were drawings explaining what good readers do: questioning, visualizing, inferencing, making connects, synthesizing and summarizing. Besides, pictures of alphabets, short vowels, and long vowels were posted on wall for EL students to memorize the content. Ms. Levy, who was the eighth grade EL teacher, told us she would change the decoration every month to make her students feel motivated and supported. The literacies I found in classroom were not only in English but also in Spanish since almost all the EL students here

were Spanish native speakers. Paintings with Spanish descriptions could be found everywhere, and teacher borrowed Spanish books or Spanish-English books from the city library for EL students. I asked Ms. Levy why she borrowed so many Spanish books for EL students who should be supposed to read more English books. She said that some of her students who just came to the US were struggling readers and it was hard and boring for them to read English books. So she borrowed books written in their first language to make sure that at least they were reading no matter in what kind of language. By allowing students to use their first language in class, teachers can have concrete ideas about the “funds of knowledge” of their students from which they could better organize classroom instruction these children commonly encounter in schools (Moll et al., 1992). Before the class began, I found there was a white board on which specifically listing what students were going to learn in the whole week. And when classes began, Ms. Levy pointed at the white board and asked students what they had learned yesterday and what they were going to do in this class. With the help of the week plan listed on board, students clearly knew what they were supposed to do in class and easily followed teacher’s instructions.

Each class was 55 minutes long and we, as international students from Vanderbilt University, were invited by Ms. Levy to give students a presentation about our home country. After the presentation, they were guided by teacher to read an article and then raise questions for each paragraph. During this whole process, I came up several questions on how these EL students were served at school. The specific questions are stated as follows.

First, I noticed students were more actively engaged in our presentation than those reading activities. When we were introducing our home countries, they asked a lot of interesting

questions about the literacy they saw in our PowerPoint. A boy asked, “Does Pepsi taste different in China?” because he saw a word “Pepsi” in one picture. However, when they were required to raise questions for the reading materials, students were not interested in the topic and teacher had to encourage them again and again to think about the words or sentences in that article.

Educators would want to identify some useful activities through which students can pursue and achieve their language and literacy objectives. These activities should be closely tied to the spaces and forms of literate life in which students engage (Skerrett, 2015). The participant's out-of-school information literacy practices were not strongly recognized or valued in the classroom (McTavish, 2009). Since outside-school literacy practices can greatly motivate EL students to learn the target language, why schools do not take out-school literacy as a teaching material in class? As a future educator, I recommend schools to collect out-of-school literacy by using students' funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992). For example, EL teachers can encourage student to collect information about his hobby and make an English poster about it by using all the information he collected. After finish doing the poster, student can give a presentation about his hobby to his peers and teachers. By doing this kind of activity, students are more engaged in learning activities and became more motivated in language learning.

Second, in class, Ms. Levy asked level one student to explain the meaning of the new vocabulary in the article. Since level one EL students' language ability was so limited, they cannot use their own language to express the idea in their mind. Hence, the majority of the students just read the English definition of those words on PowerPoint, so it was very hard for teachers to test whether they really understood those words, or they were just reading the definition without any understanding. Can teachers come up with a new way to make sure that

EL students truly understand the content they are learning in class? Goodwin and Jimenez suggest that students who participate in translate activities improve the comprehension of English language (2016). Can translanguaging be used as an effective way to test whether EL students really understand the content? The understandings about language often go unexamined when the focus is on completing the translation. Instructors should also ask students to identify strategies used to comprehend and translate the selected text, reminding students of previously taught strategies and new ones (Goodwin & Jimenez, 2016). Based on this theory, it is recommended that teachers can divide students into small groups and work together to translate the new vocabulary or phrases or paragraph into their first language. During this process, they may face some difficulties and finally find a way to overcome it. After the group work, teachers can invite each group to explain what the hardest part in their translation is and how do they overcome it. By doing so, students unconsciously learn all the new things in the content and realize the differences between their first language and the target language.

Third, I found even though students from different class had different levels of language proficiency, they were learning the same content with the same instructions and tasks. It turned out that level one students could hardly understand what they should do, and it took them the whole class to finish one simple task. Yet, for level four students, those tasks in the reading activity were very easy and understandable. They only used ten minutes to finish all the tasks and did not know what to do in the rest of the time. Calderon, Slavin, and Sanchez assert that the quality of instruction is what matters most in educating English learners (2011). It is clear that the instructions for students with different levels of language proficiency should be changed based on different students' need. I understand that according to the Common Core Standard,

students at the same grade should use the same learning material because they are only at that grade once. Nevertheless, even with the same reading material, different level students should be given different instructions and learning tasks. As larger numbers of English learners reach America's schools, K-12 general education teachers are discovering the need to learn how to teach these students (Calderon, Slavin & Sanchez, 2011). For example, students at level one has more difficulty in understanding those vocabulary and sentences in the material so their task should be more about understanding the content. Yet, students at level four can understand the content by themselves so teachers can encourage them to analysis the writing structure of the given material and write an essay by using that structure.

All in all, the Croft Middle school provides different help within school or class to help both EL students and their family. However, these helps are not enough so there are still some questions about how EL students can be well served at school. To solve those problems, research-based recommendations are provided to improve the learning environment of EL students.

References

Croft Design Center Middle school (n.d.) Retrieved November 12, 2018 from

<https://schools.mnps.org/croft-design-center-middle-prep/>

Calderon, M., Slavin, R., & Sanchez, M. (2011). Effective instruction for English learners.

Future of Children, 21(1), pp.103-127.

Goodwin, A. P., & Jiménez, R. (2016). TRANSLATE: New strategic approaches for English

learners. *Reading Teacher*, 69(6), pp. 621-625.

McTavish, M. (2009). "I get my facts from the internet": A case study of the teaching and

learning of information literacy in in-school and out-of-school contexts. *Journal of Early*

Childhood Literacy, 9(1), pp. 3-28.

Moll, C. L., Gonzalez, N., Neff, D., & Amanti, C. (1992). Funds of Knowledge for Teaching:

Using a Qualitative Approach to Connect Homes and Classrooms. *Theory into Practice*.

31(2), pp. 132-141.

Skerrett, A. (2015). *Teaching transnational youth—literacy and education in a changing*

world. New York: NY, Teachers College Press.

Appendix D

Lesson Plan

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Teacher: Yunlu Qian & Zibei Zhai | Date: 11/14/2019 | Grade/Class/Subject: Belmont International English (Adult) |
| Theme/Unit : Possessives | Materials: Handouts of possessives Slides | |
| Content Objective(s): 1. SWBAT acquire the rules of possessive nouns. 2. SWBAT use the correct form of possessive pronouns. | Language Objective(s): 1. SWBAT write stories by using possessives. 2. SWBAT discuss the given questions by using possessives. | |
| <p>LESSON SEQUENCE:</p> <p>Warm up (5 min)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Claim the content and language objectives 2. Teacher asks students “How many of you have pets at home?” and “Do you think you look like your Pets?”. Students shout out their answers. (the whole class) 3. Teacher shows students the activity “you look like your dog”. Students are given mixed pictures of dogs and their owners. They need to figure out which dog belongs to which owner by giving reasons. (discuss in the table and share the reason with the whole class) 4. Teacher writes down the possessive nouns, adjectives and pronouns they used. <p>Fill in the charts (10 min)</p> <p>Teacher asks students what does “possession” mean and then draws students’ attention to the possessive nouns they mentioned in warm up activity. Teacher introduces the term “possessive nouns” and asks students to use their own names to create possessive nouns.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teacher gives out the charts about possessive nouns and shows students how we add apostrophe in the singular form of possessive nouns. Students fill in the column of singular form of possessive nouns with examples they come up in class. 2. After learning how to write the singular form of possessive nouns, teacher encourages students to think about the plural form. Students can shout out their answers and | | |

teacher guide them to find the correct answer. Then, students finished examples of plural forms.

3. Teacher draws students' attention to the possessive pronouns and adjectives they mentioned in the warm up activity and asks students work in groups to fill in the chart about possessive pronouns and adjectives. (shoulder partners or group of three)

Story making (10 mins)

1. Divide a big group into two small groups and give each table two different topics;
2. Tell them the rule first: try to use more possessives and meantime, make a natural story. The group using most possessives will receive a gift.
3. After finishing writing, two small groups in a table exchange their story. Students need to circle the possessives and underline their favorite possessive-using sentence in the story they read. Teacher randomly picks groups to share the general idea of the story and their favorite sentence. (students need to give ample reasons)
4. The group with the same topic will be required to share the reading they get.

Assessment (2 mins)

1. He is so nervous that we can tell it's not _____ (he) car.
2. After making a payment, the house will be _____ (I) forever.
3. _____ (she) oral English is better than _____ (you).

Appendix E

In this paper, the presence and background information of the Asian community in Nashville are going to be introduced. More discussions on how to combine community literacies with school instruction will be shown based on the information collected in the immigrant community observation in Nashville.

Nashville has a proud history of welcoming immigrants and has long recognized the benefits of making it easier for all residents to participate, contribute, and access key services and opportunities (“Nashville Together”). The Asian community, as the minority group, plays an important role in expanding the Nashville’s diversity. According to the data, in 2018 the Asian population in Nashville is 22,680 and about 2.5% of the whole population (“Nashville, Tennessee Population 2018”). Yet in 2000, there were only 12,992 Asian people in this city (“Nashville Population and Demographics”). In the recent 18 years, the population of the Asian Community has almost been doubled. In Nashville, the average Asian household size is two (“Current Asian Population in Nashville 2017”, 2018). According to the small household size, we can see that the majority of the Asian immigrants in Nashville are still newcomers. Although compared with big coastal cities, Nashville has fairly small Asian population. There are still some markets such as K&S World Market that meet the everyday needs of Asian immigrants. The K&S World Market is an international grocery store where you can find some typical Asian products. As a public place often visited by the Asian community in Nashville, the market has different literacies which could become a great resource for teachers who have students from a certain community in their classroom.

In our practicum, I noticed that the name of the market is written in English and different Asian languages at the gate of the market (see Figure 1). Also some Asian decorations are posted at prominent locations (see Figure 2). Both English and its original language can be seen on the

majority of the products' packaging (see Figure 3). Moreover, some of the products sold in the market also have descriptions in more than one language (see Figure 4). Some product descriptions are only written in one Asian language which may make customers who are not the native speaker of that language confused (see Figure 5).

With all the literacies collected from the market, several teaching methodologies can be taken in ELL classes, especially for Asian students. The following is the specific explanation. To begin, by visiting places with different cultures, teachers can have more concrete ideas about the "funds of knowledge" of their students from which they could better organize classroom instruction these children commonly encounter in schools (Moll et al., 1992). Knowing more about students' cultural background and their everyday life is also an important part of culturally responsive caring which is a powerful ideological and praxis pillar of culturally responsive pedagogy for students (Gay, 2010). It is challenging for ELL teachers to visit all their students' home in order to know more about their funds of knowledge. Literacies collected in community help teachers to connect the abstract teaching contents with what Asian ELL students are familiar with. For example, teachers could ask every student to bring a daily product with description only written in their first language, then let them show work in pairs to introduce the function of the product to their partners. Later, teachers can encourage students to write an English description for their partners' products based on the introduction from their peers. This kind of activity successfully connects the knowledge that students had with what they need to learn. Moreover, choosing teaching materials from daily life stimulates students' learning interest which can last in the future. In addition, minority students who have different cultural backgrounds can gradually build their social identity by sharing the culture in their country with others.

Moreover, English also functions as a lingua franca, the language used by native speakers of different languages in a particular area to communicate with each other (De Jong, 2011, p.41). Today's second language class focuses more on language itself instead of teaching students how to use it practically. Teachers should also pay more attention to the practical use of English in daily life because people learn language with specific purposes. In real class, teachers can organize a practicum in places where second language learners use the target language to communicate, for example, K&S World Market. After practicum, teachers can give a brief summary on that practicum and guide students to discuss the literacies or dialogues they observed in the market. After that, several words or expressions used in that place should be explained by teachers. Then students are going to create an in-class international market with all the information they have observed and learned. They can design their own posters and write appropriate product descriptions referring to the examples they see in the real market. Role-play is also a great activity in which students act as customers, cashiers and salespersons to do shopping all in English. Teachers can participate in activities to make sure that students are clear about all the instructions and evaluate their language ability. Organizing these kinds of in-class activities focuses more on the practical function of language which can be seldom learned only from books. More importantly, situational learning cultivates students' observation and imitation abilities which can be beneficial in their future studies.

In conclusion, having a small population in Nashville, the Asian community, as non-English language speakers, still lacks enough practical language instructions based on their own culture. Teachers whose students are Asian ELLs can combine Asian community culture and literacies with daily teaching to help them better adapt to not only the specific class but also life in US.

References

Current Asian Population in Nashville 2017. (2018) Retrieved October 6, 2018 from

<https://suburbanstats.org/race/tennessee/nashville/how-many-asian-people-live-in-nashville-tennessee>

De Jong, J. E., (2011). *Foundation for multilingualism in education: From principles to practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon.

Gay, G., (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching - Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Moll, C. L., Gonzalez, N., Neff, D., & Amanti, C. (1992). Funds of Knowledge for Teaching: Using a Qualitative Approach to Connect Homes and Classrooms. *Theory into Practice*. 31(2), pp. 132-141.

Nashville Population and Demographics.(n.d.) Retrieved October 6, 2018 from

<http://nashville.areaconnect.com/statistics.htm>

Nashville, Tennessee Population 2018. (n.d.) Retrieved October 6, 2018 from

<http://worldpopulationreview.com/us-cities/nashville-population/>

Nashville Together. (n.d.) Retrieved October 6, 2018 from

<https://www.tnimmigrant.org/nashville-together/>

Appendix F

My oral language assessment

Assessment procedure:

Since Zibei and I are in the same practicum class, we co-designed an oral language assessment for our students: Erika (the student that I assessed) and Makiko. Our oral language assessment was divided into three parts: self-introduction, information gap and discussion. In the first activity, students were asked to introduce themselves and we provided some hints for them to talk about, for example, name, home country, family, hobbies and other things. In the second part, students need to finish an information gap activity. They received information about two movies and each of them only has the complete information of one movie. Hence, they need to ask each other questions to finish the information gap. In the third activity, students are required to discuss which movie they want to watch together, which theater they will choose, and which time is convenient for them by giving certain reasons and details.

Rubrics and Results:

The rubric we choose is Student Oral Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM). The SOLOM is a rating scale that teachers can use to assess students' English oral language proficiency based on what they observe on a continual basis in a variety of situations, for instance, interpersonal conversation, class discussion and everyday talk. There are five parts for teachers to rate: comprehension, vocabulary, fluency, grammar and pronunciation. Teachers need to match students' English language proficiency to descriptions on a five-point scale for each part. The total score for the SOLOM is 25 points. Normally, approximately 19 or 20 points can be considered proficient. Based on Erika's performance in that oral assessment, I gave her four

points for comprehension, four points for fluency, four points for vocabulary, three points for Pronunciation and three points for grammar and 19 in total. Hence, according to my scores, Erika's SOLOM English proficiency level is intermediate fluency. Specific evidence and analysis will be explained in the following paragraphs.

Evidence:

Erika got four points for comprehension because she could understand instructions given by us and introduction from others. When Makiko told something interesting about her husband, Erika got the point and laughed immediately. Hence, I believe she could understand nearly everything at normal speed. However, in the information gap activity, she was confused about the expression of time "twelve to ten". After hearing the expression, she got confused and asked Makiko to repeat it, but still could not understand. According to these facts, I think Erika can understand nearly everything at normal speed, although occasional repetition maybe necessary.

I gave her four points for fluency as well, since she could speak English fluently during the whole assessment. Moreover, her speed was appropriate for audience to understand. Yet, there were moments when she stopped and searched for certain words. For example, she was not sure about the word candidates and volunteer so that she stopped and looked at me for confirmation. Moreover, when she said the phrase "six hundred person", she repeated "six hundred" several times to make sure we could understand it. Then, I could come to the conclusion that her everyday conversation and discussion are fluent but with occasional lapses while she searches for the correct manner of expression.

For vocabulary, Erika achieved another four points. She used some really hard words in her talk, for example, Budapest, marketing, proficiency, candidate and biography. Majority of

these words were used appropriately in sentences. However, she was code-switching when she didn't know how to express something in English. She said several Spanish and French words in the introduction part, and I could not understand them. To sum up, Erika has very board vocabulary, but she occasionally uses inappropriate words or terms in her conversation.

Erika had three points for pronunciation because her English pronunciation was influenced by her L1 Spanish and L2 French. Some typical mistakes were that she would pronounce all the "t" sounds into "d" sounds and all the "r" sounds into "l" sounds. The most confusing part is that she pronounced "Nashville" as "nagville" and I can't understand that word in the beginning. Hence, listeners need to be concentrated to understand Erika's pronunciation and sometimes they will have some misunderstandings caused by her pronunciation problems.

The last part is grammar where Erika got three points. There were frequent grammar errors in her sentences, for instance, "I love swim", "we can continuing", "how long time the movie" and "Brittany change her". It is clear that her grammar sequence was influenced by Spanish. At the meantime, some of her answers were not even complete sentences: "And me no". This kind of sentence made her expressions hard for listeners to understand. Based on these facts, I claimed that Erika had frequent errors in grammar and word order and the meanings of her sentences were occasionally obscured.

All in all, based on Erika's performance in the oral language assessment designed by us, she got 19 points according to the SOLOM which means she was at "intermediate fluent" level.

Reflection upon the Assessment Process

What Happened

The first part (self-introduction) of the assessment went smoothly with the demonstration given by Prof. Pray and the hints provided by us. Though Erika said she was very nervous at that time, when it came to family, she had a lot of information to share with us and gradually became less stressed. I thought they would only be talking by themselves in the introduction part. Yet, it turned out that they had a really interesting conversation by asking each other different questions based on the information they received.

In the second part (information gap), after listening to the instruction, they replied that they had already understood it and we asked them to start the conversation directly. However, we soon noticed that they misunderstood the activity instruction and were confused about the task given by them. Hence, Zibei and I stopped them immediately and gave a demonstration by asking each other the information provided on their charts. After this model, Erika and Makiko fully understood the instruction and continued the information gap activity.

In the third part (discussion), Erika and Makiko had an authentic conversation deciding which movie they want to watch together. We were afraid that they might only give the conclusion without providing too many details, so we told them that they need to tell each other the reason why they want to watch the movie or choose the theatre. Surprisingly, in their conversation, they provided specific details of each choice and negotiate about the location and time. What is more, they even talked about how to go to the theater which was not required by us.

How Might I Change my Protocol and Rubrics

For protocol, I noticed that our instruction for information gap activity was not very clear which led to the misunderstanding of them. I might add some modeling (Zibei and I did the

demonstration) and ask them some questions after they replied that they had already understood the instruction, for example, “Tell me what you are supposed to do in this activity?”. At the same time, I could also provide some hints for information gap activity by showing them one or two demo questions: “could you please tell me what the theme of the movie is”.

For scoring, I might add affective filter into the rubric. The reason why I want to take affective filter into consideration is that Erika claimed that she was nervous at that time and this to some degree influenced her performance at that time. Hence, I will add some observation checklist at the beginning of the rubric: level of anxiety, physical condition and other things I observed. By adding these into consideration, my oral assessment could become more reliable.

Another thing that I want to add to rubric is discourse competence because Erika showed her discourse competence in these three activities but SOLOM cannot be used assess it. Hence, I would like to add the discourse competence rubric to it. Based on CASAS speaking content standards, I would set “Identify the context, audience, and purpose of speaking (consider listener’s perspective, cultural influences, social norms etc). Take into account purpose, perspective, and cultural influence of the listener while speaking.” as the highest level of discourse competence.

In conclusion, based on Erika’s performance in my oral assessment, I might add more modeling procedures and observation checklist to improve the reliability of my assessment. Moreover, to improve the validity of the oral assessment, I might add discourse competence into my rubric to better assess Erika’s oral English proficiency.

Standardized Test Result

Since Erika has never taken any standardized tests before, I tested her oral language proficiency by doing the first two tests of the Woodcock Munoz Language Survey: picture vocabulary and verbal analogies. In the picture vocabulary part, I pointed at a certain picture and asked questions like “what is this”. In the verbal analogies part, I gave her an example like “a bird is to fly”, then asked her “like a fish is to...”. Erika’s raw score for picture vocabulary is 23 which indicates that her age equivalent is 5.3 years old and her grade equivalent is K1. Her raw score for verbal analogies is 11 which shows that her age equivalent is 7.11 years old and her grade equivalent is K2.7. According to the manual, for these two tests her average W score is 476.5 and the W difference is -23.5 which means her oral English language proficiency is limited (Woodcock & Muñoz-Sandoval, 2001).

Reliability of WMLS

According to the data provided by the Woodcock Munoz Comprehension Manual, among students aging from 40-49 years old, the reliability coefficient for Test1 picture vocabulary is 0.90 and the reliability coefficient for Test 2 verbal analogies is 0.86(Woodcock & Muñoz-Sandoval, 2001). The test reliabilities were calculated by the split-half procedure, using odd and even raw scores and were corrected for length by the Spearman-Brown formula. To explain the data, reliability coefficient of 1.0 means it is a 100% perfect reliable assessment. When the coefficient is close to 1.0, it represents high reliability. Since Erika is 49 years old, I could conclude that based on the data, Test 1 and 2 of WMLS are reliable for test-takers who are at Erika’s age. Moreover, test 1 is more reliable than test 2. However, data cannot represent everything, there are still some drawbacks of its reliability. I will give more specific analysis on the student, the scoring, the test administration and the test itself in following paragraphs.

For student-related reliability, the WMLS does take test takers' physical and mental situations into consideration to make sure the test reflects their real English language proficiency. For physical situation, the examiners need to provide information about the subject like "does the subject have glasses and were they used during testing" and "does the subject have a hearing aid and was it used during testing". Besides, they could add information about other things related to students' physical situation based on observation. For mental situation, the examiners need to take notes about the test-takers' affective filter. For instance, level of conversational proficiency, cooperation and activity, attention and concentration, self-confidence, care in responding and response to difficult tasks. Besides, examiner can give reasons to believe that the testing session may not represent a fair sample of the subject's ability and what kinds of modification are made. All in all, the student-related reliability of WMLS is pretty high because it ensures that the test shows a fair sample of the test takers.

For rater reliability, in most situations, there is only one examiner who will give the final score, so we need to think about the intra-rater reliability. The reliable parts of WMLS rating process is that it provides training and scoring criteria for examiners. The item scoring explanation requires the examiner to record subject's response that cannot be definitely scored as correct or incorrect and score it later. However, this is also the drawback of its rater reliability because in this situation the rater has to make subjective decision which does not have a criterion. This subjective decision hurts the reliability of WMLS.

For the administration, one of the reliable facts is that examiner can find a quiet place to take the assessment since it is very flexible. At the same time, since it is a one on one test, examiner can provide any help that the test taker needs. Moreover, the instruction for each test is clear and understandable. Nevertheless, some pictures shown in test 1 picture vocabulary are not

clear for test takers to recognize, for instance, the picture of the word “printer” does not look like a printer and is very ambiguous because nowadays it is hard to see this kind of machine (See in Appendix). Another example is the picture of “tourniquet” which actually looks like a wrist band (See in Appendix). Hence, poor picture quality is the unreliable factor for administration.

For test reliability, since I only used the oral assessment (test 1 and 2) it only took us about ten minutes finish so that the subject will not be too tired. Meanwhile, there are instructions of basal and ceiling of each test to avoid having too many test items which may lead to time waste. There are no written items in the test and all the test materials are clearly printed. Hence, I would say the WMLS has a high-test reliability.

Validity of WMLS

The inferences made from a valid assessment results should be appropriate, meaningful and useful in terms of the purpose of the assessment (Gronlund, 1998). Since I only used the oral English proficiency assessment of the WMLS, so I will mainly focus on the validity of the test 1 picture vocabulary and test 2 Verbal analogies. The manual states that examiner should use these two parts to assess students oral English (Woodcock & Muñoz-Sandoval, 2001). To analyze the validity of it, I would divide it into content, criterion and construct validity. The specific analysis is explained in the following paragraphs.

Content validity is the extent to which the content of a test represents the domain of content that it is designed to measure. As it shown in the manual, the purpose of test 1 and 2 are used to assess test taker’s oral language proficiency. To be concrete, picture vocabulary is aimed at measuring the subject’s ability to name familiar and unfamiliar pictured objects. The manual claims that although the test contains a few receptive items at the beginning, it is primarily an

expressive semantic task Woodcock & Muñoz-Sandoval, 2001). However, I don't agree with the statement that it is an expressive task because the test takers could only answer a single word for each question, and they are not literally expressing their ideas. Moreover, test bias exists in this part, for example, no every student knows the word sphinx or toga (See in Appendix) because some of the students may have never seen these words even in their first language and they don't have the culture background. This part of the test manly focuses on students' cognitive ability instead of oral English proficiency. The manual says that the test 2 verbal analogies is used to measure students' ability to comprehend and verbally complete a logical and relationship. Basically, the test taker needs to interpret the logical relation from the given sample and then answer the question. However, sometimes, the words from given examples are hard for test takers to understand. In this case, the test taker cannot give the correct answer not because he or she has limited oral English proficiency but because he or she didn't understand the example and cannot interpret the relationship. In this case, the test is not assessing student comprehension and verbal ability, but their vocabulary. Hence, I would say the content validity for Test 1 and 2 is not very high based on my analysis.

The criterion validity of an assessment can be divided into concurrent validity and predictive validity. The manual book does not mention the data of predictive validity for WMLS, so I mainly analyze the concurrent validity of it. Since Erika is an adult, I would look at the data shown about university study which is about adult test-takers. According to the data of the manual book, two construct measures are WAIS, which is used to assess intelligence and cognitive ability, and OWLS, which is aimed at assessing student's language abilities: listening comprehension, oral expression and oral comprehension Woodcock & Muñoz-Sandoval, 2001). As shown in the book, the correlation between the oral language cluster of WMLS and WAIS

III's Verbal IQ scores, Performance IQ scores and Verbal Comprehension Index are 0.79, 0.60 and 0.71. The correlation between WMLS cluster of oral language and OWLS's Listening comprehension, oral expression and oral comprehension are 0.59, 0.43 and 0.56. Based on the data, we could see that the WMLS oral language cluster is actually more related to an intelligence test than a language assessment. The WMLS oral language tests are assessing students' cognitive ability and intelligence instead of really focusing on students' English language proficiency. Hence, I would say the construct validity of WMLS oral language cluster is low.

Construct validity is also a kind of evidence to support a test's validity. According to the manual book, for students' age from 40-59, the intercorrelations among oral language and broad English ability are higher than those for young test takers especially in Verbal Analogies (Woodcock & Muñoz-Sandoval, 2001). I believe this is because that the language test requires a broad content knowledge and good logic thinking ability to achieve high scores. Test 1 and 2 of WMLS are designed to assess students' oral English language proficiency. However, I don't think the test really assesses students' oral language proficiency, for instance, discourse competence. Hence, it actually has very low construct validity.

To conclude, WMLS has an overall high reliability, even though with some drawbacks. However, according to the content, concurrent and construct validity analysis, the test does not have a high validity for adult test-takers, especially in oral English language assessment. This could also explain why Erika received a such a low score in WMLS Test 1 and Test 2.

Compare and Contrast

The results from my oral language assessment and the WMLS are totally different: Erika was scored as “intermediate fluent” in my oral language assessment and was scored as “limited” in WMLS. Several reasons can contribute to the differences.

First of all, the WMLS is focused on cognitive academic language ability and my oral assessment is about authentic conversation. Since Erika is already 49 years old and she does not have any education history in English speaking countries, her academic language is not proficient and cannot meet the academic needs. However, she has been living in US for nine months and talks with people every day in English. Hence her oral English proficiency in daily conversation is high and she could conduct an authentic conversation without difficulty.

Second, the WMLS has a low validity for assessing test-taker’s oral English proficiency. In those two tests, students only need to answer a single word for each question, and they are not supposed to produce a long conversation. It is impossible to assess one’s oral English proficiency accurately only based on single words said by them. Moreover, in order to achieve a high score in WMLS verbal analogies, the test taker needs to have a strong logical thinking ability which I don’t think should be taken into consideration while assessing one’s oral English proficiency. In my oral assessment, Erika was asked to speak for almost 15 minutes, so that I have collected a lot of data of her oral English performance. I would say that the oral assessment designed by me and Zibei is more valid than the WMLS oral assessments.

Third thing is that the tasks given in my assessment are related to Erika’s daily life and the information provided in the activity is authentic and up to date. Hence, she is familiar with the topic and has a lot of things to talk about. Yet, the items in WMLS are designed years ago and nowadays people are not familiar with some of them. In this kind of situation, this test can hardly assess test-takers’ real English proficiency.

My oral assessment and the WMLS have the same problem in assessing Erika's oral English proficiency. Both of them do not really assess Erika's discourse competence and pragmatics which are important oral English abilities. Hence, I would say the two tests both need to improve the assessment of a students' discourse competence or pragmatics by adding more rubrics or protocol.

In conclusion, I believe that Erika's oral English proficiency should be "intermediate fluent". The different result from WMLS is caused by the test's different assessment focuses, low validity and outdated test terms. At the same time, both of the assessment designed by me and the WMLS have the same drawback of lacking discourse commence assessing process and should be improved by adding more rubrics or change the protocol.

References:

Brown, H., & Abeywickrama, P. (2019.). *Language assessment: principles and classroom practices* (Third edition.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

CASAS Adult Speaking Content Standards. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://brightspace.vanderbilt.edu/content/enforced/161341-2019F.1.EDUC.6550.02/csfiles/home_dir/speaking-content-standards.pdf?_&d2lSessionVal=WG2rTKaxNZalWQHbNuaFRjrog&ou=161341

Gronlund, N. E. (1998). *Assessment of student achievement* (6th edition). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon

SOLOM. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.cal.org/twi/EvalToolkit/appendix/solom.pdf>

Woodcock, R. W., & Muñoz-Sandoval, A. F. (2001). *Comprehensive Manual. Woodcock-Muñoz Language Survey Normative Update, English Form*. Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.