The Potential of High-Leverage Teaching Practices for Pre-Service Language Teacher Development Within Community-Based Children's Language Programs

By Charla Lorenzen, Ph.D.

INTRODUCTION

This action research study examined the experiences of a heritage speaker of Spanish who was training to become a Spanish teacher within a Spanish Education program that was in the process of transforming the traditional, front-loaded and theoretical methods course into a practice-based approach to teacher education (Troyan, Davin, & Donato, 2013). The goal of this transformation was to unite theory and practice in a relevant but realistic way. The pre-service teacher engaged in lesson planning, curriculum and material design, supervised teaching, and guided reflection within an innovative modern language teacher education program employing high-leverage teaching practices (HLTPs) as a framework for professional preparation (Hlas & Hlas, 2012).

This qualitative study occurred within an established community-based learning (CBL) program in which Spanish Education majors teach Spanish to local children as part of their Language Teaching Methods course. The program, called the Children's Spanish Program, serves as a context for situated practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) for pre-service teachers and fills a local need for Spanish classes for children younger than 7th grade, the stage at which the local public schools begin offering Spanish classes in their curriculum. The researcher in this study was the Language Teaching Methods instructor, the coordinator of the Spanish Education major, and the supervisor for the Children's Spanish Program.

Together, the Spanish Education majors, the children in the program, and the program supervisor engage in what is meant to be a meaningful service-learning experience in which all participants both teach and learn from one another in their own community (Carracelas-Juncal, 2013; Hellebrandt & Jorge, 2013; Root, 1997). The children learn Spanish from the supervisor and her college students, who in turn learn about effective teaching. The Children's Spanish Program provides the context for making their teaching practice studyable (Ghousseini & Sleep, 2011).

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A Practice-Based Language Education Curriculum

Traditionally, methods courses in a teacher education program have been *front-loaded* with theory about effective teaching, emphasizing what a teacher thinks or knows and deferring actual application and practice until later (Freeman, 1993; Grossman & McDonald, 2008). In this traditional model, the curriculum is based on "an extensive accumulation of practices" that are discussed theoretically (Hlas & Hlas 2012, p. S91). Alternatively, a large body of research in teacher education has indicated the need for a "practice-based curriculum" (Troyan et al., 2013), which enables pre-service teachers to learn about, practice, and enact a limited number of essential core teaching practices that effectively support student learning, with an emphasis on assessing what the teacher actually does in the classroom (Ball & Cohen, 1999; Ball et al., 2009; Davin & Troyan, 2015; Grossman & McDonald, 2008; Hlas & Hlas, 2012; Kearney, 2015; Lampert 2010; Troyan et al., 2013).

As Hlas & Hlas (2012) have noted, "Rather than attempting to prepare novice teachers with the totality of professional knowledge and skill, this approach to teacher education acknowledges that to

Learning Languages ~ 15

develop skilled beginning teachers, less may indeed be more" (p. S78). This alternative approach unites the methods course and teaching practice, effectively addressing a weakness of the traditional model, in which inconsistencies and even contradictions can exist between the pre-service teachers' learning in the university classroom and what is required of them at the field site (Troyan et al., 2013). A practice-based curriculum founded on high-leverage teaching practices, such as the one designed by Davin & Troyan (2015), provides a resolution for this common problem and could transform pre-service teacher development.

While the primary advantage of a practice-based curriculum is the ability to focus on essential core teaching practices, the principle challenge is choosing which practices on which to focus. Many researchers (Davin & Donato, 2011; Davin & Troyan, 2015; Hlas & Hlas, 2012; Kearney, 2015; LTP, n.d.; Troyan et al., 2013; TeachingWorks, n.d.) have worked to define *High Leverage Teaching Practices* (HLTPs) referred to by Troyan et al. (2013) as *High Leverage Practices* (HLPs), and to create a manageable list of HLTP for World Language Education (WLE).

High Leverage Teaching Practices in World Language Teacher Education

The results of Phase I of the Research Priorities Initiative of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) indicated a need for more research on effective foreign language teacher preparation (Glisan, 2010), including the topic of high-leverage teaching practices (Hlas & Hlas, 2012). The primary influences prior to the ACTFL report had primarily been two major projects, associated with the University of Michigan, The University of California–Los Angeles, and the University of Washington.

The TeachingWorks project, formerly known as TEI (Teacher Education Initiative), was formed in the University of Michigan School of Education, under the direction of Ball. The researchers in this project (TeachingWorks, n.d.), state that "A 'high-leverage practice' is an action or task central to teaching. Carried out skillfully, these practices increase the likelihood that teaching will be effective for students' learning. They are useful across a broad range of subject areas, grade levels, and teaching contexts, and are helpful in using and managing differences among pupils" (TeachingWorks, n.d., para. 1). Moreover, the TeachingWorks researchers state that all HLPs effectively advance student learning in the short-term and long-term; effectively use and manage student differences and confront inequities; are useful across contexts and content areas; are assessable; function as building blocks for learning to teach; can be broken down and taught to novice teachers; are justifiable and convincing as useful for becoming skilled practitioners in the short-term and long-term; and are unlikely to be learned well solely through experience (as cited in Hlas & Hlas, 2012).

A second project, known as LTP (Learning in, from, and for Teaching Practice, n.d.), is a research collaboration focusing on mathematics education and ambitious teaching. The lead researchers are Franke, Kazemi, and Lampert, and their work is based on Grossman, who emphasizes providing pre-service teachers with opportunities to make approximations of practice within their professional coursework. They also advocate that educators "limit the territory" (LTP, n.d., para. 5) of what is taught and practiced in the methods class, in order to "support beginning teachers' learning of contingent interactive practice" (para. 5). They state:

Current education reforms revolve around the formation of ambitious learning goals for students, implying the need

for a kind of teaching that is currently rare among American public school teachers. Teaching that enables different kinds of students—across ethnic, racial, class, and gender categories—to perform competently in complex domains requires not only skills, knowledge, and dispositions, but also the capacity to judge when, where, and how to use skills and knowledge in direct interaction with learners. (para. 1)

The extensive work on high-leverage teaching practices published by these authors and others has recently been applied specifically to the field of Foreign Language Education (FLE). Hlas & Hlas (2012) reviewed the research contributions of mathematics educators to date on the topic of HLTPs and argued that researchers in FLE need to first identify the specific HLTPs and associated *micropractices* "unique to our own goals" (Hlas & Hlas, 2012, p. S-91), and to then teach them to our world language methods students. They identified four possible HLTPs from the field of mathematics education that have connections with foreign language education: *anticipating student errors and misconceptions during planning, making connections between multiple representations, leading a classroom discussion, and teaching through problem solving.* In addition, they identified one or more *micropractices* or techniques for each HLTP. They defined micropractices as "...specific aspects of the teaching practice that need to be learned to enact the practice effectively" (Hlas & Hlas, 2012, p. S78). They further subdivided some of the micropractices into what they called *subpractices* (Hlas & Hlas, 2012, p. S78).

Hlas & Hlas (2012) concluded that: "HLTP work well because beginning teachers need time to analyze and rehearse HLTP with students in designed settings (e.g., critique lessons, laboratory classes) before taking the practice into actual classrooms for solo enactment (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Medina, 2008)" (p. S91). Troyan et al. (2013) built upon Hlas & Hlas' ()2012 theoretical work by implementing and examining a practice-based approach to foreign language teacher preparation. They focused on the following HLPs: *using the target language comprehensibly during instruction (CI), questioning for building and assessing student understanding, and teaching grammar using an inductive approach followed by co-constructed explanations of form-meaning relationships.*

Troyan and colleagues (2013, p.159) sought to clarify existing terminology, including *high-leverage practices* (HLPs) or *high-leverage teaching practices* (HLTPs), *micropractices*, etc. They chose to focus on what the LTP project (n.d.) calls *high-leverage practices* (HLPs) and *instructional activities* (IAs), stating: "The IAs serve as containers that carry principles, practices, and knowledge into practice and support both student learning and teacher learning" (LTP, n.d., para. 5). Troyan et al. (2013) emphasized what other researchers (Ball and Forzani, 2009; Lampert, 2010) had already stated, which is that the variation in the terms used reflects the differing grain size of these practices and highlights the need for researchers to agree upon a common language to describe research on a a high-leverage teaching practices approach to teacher education.

Troyan et al. (2013) stated that each HLP can be used across various IAs, but that for this study they situated each HLP within a specific IA, since they realized after the first iteration of the course that: "Assuming that our pre-service teachers were able to select a context and enact the practice simultaneously was misguided, and perhaps even developmentally inappropriate for the beginning teacher, at least during the introductory phases of learning an HLP. It became clear to us that pre-service teachers needed assistance when deciding upon an IA in which to refine their skill with particular HLPs" (p. 167).

In their second iteration of their methods class, these authors situated each HLP in a specific IA: the HLP *Using the target language comprehensibly during instruction (CI)* was expressed in the IA *Introducing new vocabulary words situated in a meaningful and interesting context*; the HLP *Questioning for building and assessing student understanding* was expressed in the IA *Guiding a text-based discussion using the interactive model and consisting of pre-, during-, and post-reading activities*; and the HLP *Teaching grammar using an inductive approach followed by co-constructed explanations of form-meaning relationships* was expressed in the IA *Telling a story (e.g. folktale, legend) that highlights a particular grammatical structure in a cultural context, followed by a co-constructed explanation of form-meaning mappings between teacher and students* (Troyan et al., 2013, p. 168).

Troyan et al. (2013) concluded:

> Our experience described above echoes the assertion of Grossman et al. (2009) that many HLPs may take years to master, and therefore HLPs need to be grounded in IAs that support their enactment (Lampert & Graziani, 2009). As the LTP (2001) group states, pre-service teachers "are required to make judgments about how to respond to students using the knowledge, principles, and practices that make up the 'curriculum' that supports learning to do the work [of] teaching. The IAs are structured to limit the territory in which novices need to make these kinds of judgments so that the mathematical knowledge and the practices they need to use to do them are able to be specified. ('Instructional Activities [IAs],' para. 1, p. 167)

In other words, *limiting the territory* helps define both the content knowledge and the pedagogical knowledge necessary to perform the HLP. Based on their overall experience implementing a practice-based teacher education program founded on HLPs situated within IAs, Troyan et al. (2013) recommended: fostering collaboration among supervisors and instructors; clearly defining the IAs; being selective about the HLPs to include in the methods course for deconstruction, analysis, rehearsal, and coaching; expecting student resistance to the rehearsal stage; and working within the program resources. While all of these conclusions will be helpful to others engaged in redesigning a world language teaching methods course, the conclusion most relevant to the current study was the following (p. 168):

> In our experience, the quality of pre-service teachers' lessons improved considerably when provided with an IA, which led to more meaningful and contextualized execution of the HLP. By requiring the HLP to be carried out in a cognitively challenging IA for learners, such as introducing new vocabulary words situated in a meaningful and interesting context, pre-service teachers were not burdened with the added task of selecting contexts of use. This structure allowed the pre-service teachers to initially practice the HLP in an instructional territory that was well defined. Containing the practice in this way provided the pre-service teachers with situations in which they were required to make judgments in the management of contingent interactions with students. Over time, as their control over the practice developed, pre-service teachers were able to decide for themselves which HLPs play critical roles in different IAs.

Davin & Troyan (2015) extended the work of Troyan et al. (2013) by examining two of the three HLPs from their 2013 study in more depth. They changed the HLP *Using the target language comprehensibly during instruction* (CI); to *Increasing interaction and target language comprehensibility*, or I-TLC, in order to emphasize the essential role of interaction instead of just mere input (Gass, Mackey, & Pica, 1998;

Long & Porter, 1985; Pica,1994; Storch, 2002; Swain, 1995), and they changed *Questioning for building and assessing student understanding to Questioning to build and assess student understanding*, or just *questioning*. They did not investigate the HLP *Teaching grammar using an inductive approach followed by co-constructed explanations of form-meaning relationships*. Davin & Troyan (2015) chose these two HLPs because they both "recognize the centrality of language as a mediational tool in social theories of learning (Vygotsky, 1986) and were designed to increase teacher candidates' classroom interactional competence, defined as 'teachers' and learners' ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning" (Walsh , 2006, p. 130). Each of the HLPs was instead divided into 3 categories and these categories were each divided into 12 descriptors, or component aspects of practice that compose the HLP (Davin & Troyan, 2015, p.4).

Davin and Troyan (2015) argued that students need both comprehensible input and interaction to learn, and that teacher questions and responses shape the classroom discourse practices, influencing the overall classroom discourse as it unfolds. The number and type of questions asked by the teacher are important, as is as how s/he responds to student questions (for example, assisting questions to encourage student elaboration). They found that teacher candidates develop some aspects of these two HLPs more quickly than others, and that we must give methods students time to anticipate, plan, and practice the HLPs before they have to implement them in the field site. For this reason, they recommend that we require the students to script and rehearse their lessons before implementing them.

Overall, Davin and Troyan (2015) found that, of the 24 total descriptors for the two HLPs of focus, teacher candidates were rated *proficient* for seven descriptors (29%), *partially proficient* for 11 descriptors (46%), and *not proficient* for six (24%) descriptors. Interestingly, they were not proficient at those HLP descriptors that were more context-dependent. These require the specific abilities to: interact (for example, responding naturally, downgrading due to student confusion, asking appropriate follow-up questions, just "seizing the conversational moment," p. 12); provide instruction that is appropriately tailored to the students' Zones of Proximal Development (Vygotsky, 1930-1934/1978); provide graduated assistance (moving from explicit to implicit); and provide contingent assistance (required by the teacher to the students only when the students require it).

METHODS

In preparing to transform a traditional, front-loaded, and theoretical methods course into a practice-based course focused on pre-service teacher performance in an actual classroom setting, the focus for this study was narrowed to four High Leverage Teaching Practices that have been supported across the literature reviewed above: I-TLC; recognizing particular common patterns of student thinking in a subject-matter domain (including their errors and misconceptions); selecting and using particular methods (such as questioning, or requiring short performance tasks) to check understanding and monitor student learning; and eliciting and interpreting individual students' thinking. The pre-service participant engaged in lesson planning, curriculum and material design, supervised teaching, and guided reflection with the researcher throughout the course of one academic semester. Extensive field notes were taken by the researcher during the planning and reflection sessions, and the participant was videotaped each time she taught a class. Each video was then transcribed and qualitatively coded by the researcher for evidence of the HLTPs of focus, using a rubric created by Troyan (2013, p. 180). Triangulation of data was

achieved through a reflective process of comparing and contrasting the researcher's field notes, her reflexive journal entries, the video transcripts, and the completed coding rubrics. The use of a reflexive journal (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) helps ensure the credibility of the findings of a qualitative research study, along with its dependability, transferability, and confirmability (Erlandson, 1993).

PARTICIPANT

The participant in this study was a 20-year-old college student majoring in Spanish Education at a small liberal arts college in the Mid-Atlantic United States. She is a heritage speaker of Spanish, embodying the definition by Valdés (2000, 2001, 2005) as someone who was raised in a home where a language other than English is spoken, who is to some degree bilingual in English and the heritage language, and whose language use depends upon both longer-term and more immediate sociocultural contexts. She spoke primarily Spanish with her family, but English virtually everywhere else. She had studied Spanish as a world language in high school, and was in her second year in college when the data for this study were collected. She had not yet participated in a study abroad experience in a Spanish-speaking country.

PROCEDURE

This was an action research project. Action research involves: identifying a problem in an actual classroom; gathering, organizing, and analyzing data to shed light on that problem; acting on the evidence by implementing research-based interventions; critically reflecting on the effects of the interventions; applying the findings to improve the practice in that classroom; and, finally, sharing the findings with others to help them improve their classrooms and build theory on effective teaching (Ferrance, 2000). This study was undertaken in the spirit of strengths-based teaching (Liesvield & Miller, 2005) to determine which, if any, of the HLTPs of focus were employed by this novice pre-service teacher to some degree without explicit training in them.

The participant was videotaped each time she taught a lesson in the community-based Children's Spanish Program, for a total of 12 lessons. Each video was transcribed, and each transcript was carefully scrutinized by the researcher for evidence of the HLTPs of focus in this study. The coding process was a reiterative and reflective one in which a reflexive journal was used by the researcher to record any questions about coding and notes on the overlap of existing descriptions of the HLTPs, and also to determine for which HTLPs no consistent evidence was found. One result of this reflective, reiterative process is that three originally separate categories were combined into one: *using the target language maximally & comprehensibly during instruction* (Glisan, 2010) and *making connections between multiple representations* (Hlas & Hlas, 2012) were subsumed under the HLTP of *increasing interaction and target language comprehensibility* (Davin & Troyan, 2015), with the addition of the parenthetical note *including through modeling, examples, and multiple representations* (Lorenzen, n.d.).

RESULTS

Valuable insight was gleaned from this investigation. While some evidence was found for all but one of the HLTPs investigated (*leading a whole-class discussion*), there was ample evidence for one HLTP in particular, namely I-TLC. The pre-service teacher used approximately 95% Spanish while teaching, which likely contributed to her success in simultaneously promoting target language interaction while providing comprehensible target language (I-TLC).

A rubric created by Troyan (2013) was employed to code for the HLTP of *I-TLC*. Based on this rubric, the participant in this study consistently met the majority of the expectations for this HLTP. She was able to meet performance indicators across multiple instructional activities in all three categories: *creating comprehensible language, supporting student comprehension through contexts and strategies for comprehension,* and *creating comprehensible interactions with students* (Troyan et al., 2013, p. 180). The examples given below are representative of her work, and all come from a single 50-minute class that she independently planned and taught, in order to place the use of this HLP in a specific situated context.

CREATING COMPREHENSIBLE LANGUAGE

The pre-service teacher in this study was able to create comprehensible language for her students by using vocabulary and structures that the students knew, and by building on them over time (Troyan et al., 2013). For example, during this sample class she asked a student who was struggling to understand *Él es* (He is): "*¿Cómo se dice 'él' en inglés?*" ("How do you say *él* in English?")". When the student responded "he", she said, "*Sí, uh-hmm. ¿Cómo se dice "él es" en inglés?*" ("Yes, uh-hmm. How do you say "*él es*" in English?"), and the student correctly responded: "He is."

When introducing new words or structures, the pre-service teacher would often signal them by changing her tone of voice (Troyan et al., 2013). For example, during this sample class she signaled the start of a new activity by stretching out the word *ahora* (now), and she raised her tone of voice when introducing the verb *alzar* (to raise) when telling students she wanted them to raise their dry-erase boards up when they finished writing their answer.

This teacher would occasionally slow down the rate of her speech due to the students' beginner level of study (Troyan et al., 2013), but more often she would take care to pronounce letters that she would normally skip in her conversational Spanish. For example, she would pronounce all of the letters in *terminado* (finished) when students were done with an activity, instead of her more usual "*terminao*."

Finally, she would use new words and expressions multiple times, adding these language elements frequently in the input that she provided to the students (Troyan et al., 2013). An example from the sample class was the following introduction of the verb *acordarse*: "*¿Quién [se] acuerda, acuerda en inglés es* 'to remember', who remembers, *¿quién [se] acuerda cómo conjugar 'ser' en 'yo', en la forma de 'yo'? ¿Quién [se] acuerda cómo conjugar en 'yo'* form?" ("Who remembers, *acuerda* in English is to remember, who remembers, who remembers how to conjugate *ser* in the *yo* form? Who remembers how to conjugate the *yo* form?").

Supporting Student Comprehension through Contexts and Strategies for Comprehension

The pre-service teacher in this study would communicate authentically with the students, despite their beginner level, by supplementing her words with gestures, visual support, and knowledge of the students to create reliably compelling contexts for communication (Troyan et al., 2013). During this sample class, for example, she reacted to a technological glitch by saying "*¡Oh no! ¿Qué pasó?*" ("Oh no! What happened?)" while putting her hands to her face and making an expression of surprise before saying "*No sé qué hacer*" ("I don't know what to do"). After the problem was resolved, she acted relieved and said "*Oh, OK. No me gusta la tecnología.*" ("Oh, OK. I don't like technology"), using grammar that the students already knew (the verb *gustar* and indirect object pronouns), along with a cognate that they could easily understand.

In her lessons, the pre-service teacher used visuals and props to support comprehension in contexts that were meaningful and purposeful (Troyan et al., 2013). In every class, she would lead the students in a circle time to talk about the day's date and weather, as well as how everyone in class was doing. The calendar was a PowerPoint

slide projected on a smart board. It was entirely in Spanish, and was linguistically and culturally correct (with the name of the month and the days of the week starting with lowercase letters, and the week starting with *Lunes* (Monday), and it included images as visual clues as to the current month. The teacher required the student leader to write out the current day's date (day, month, and year) on the calendar slide, after eliciting the information from a classmate. When talking about the weather and the classmates' emotions, visually appealing posters were used, which were written entirely in Spanish but had visual images to aid comprehension. Individual students were called up to lead circle time, and they used a pointing stick to point at the specific areas of the visuals as they were mentioned.

This pre-service teacher created her own lesson plans, aiming for meaningful and purposeful context that was relevant to her students (Troyan et. al., 2013). A simple example from this sample class was using the verb *ser* (one way to say "to be") when talking about where people are from. The pre-service teacher had students in her class from Germany, Romania, and the United States, and they were very animated as they engaged in asking the teacher how to say the names of these countries, in order to say where they were from.

Finally, she used gestures to make new language clear in a meaningful and purposeful context (Troyan et al., 2013). For example, during this sample class, she acted out writing when she wanted the students to write on their dry-erase boards, and then acted out erasing the boards when it was time to prepare them for the next round in the writing activity.

Creating Comprehensible Interactions with Students

The pre-service teacher in this study involved the students in the interaction in several ways instead of merely lecturing to the class (Troyan et al., 2013), including the provision of useful phrases to help her students negotiate meaning, such as requesting repetition, asking for clarification, checking their comprehension, and confirming their understanding. She required students to use these and modeled them herself, often asking her supervising professor how to say things in Spanish. Two examples from the sample class were asking her professor how to say binder and projector, at two different points in class.

Within the HLTP of *I-TLC*, this pre-service teacher would need to focus on the following skills in order to meet all of the criteria from Troyan (2013): defining new words with examples rather than translations, focusing student attention on input by ensuring that students know the lesson topic and objectives before starting input activities, and using more effective question sequences that begin with simple yes/no questions and progressively move to the more complex options of forced-choice questions and finally open-ended, personalized questions. However, it is clear that this student was able to demonstrate proficiency even in the HLP descriptors that were more context-dependent, contrary to Davin and Troyan's (2015) findings.

Discussion and Recommendations

This action research study sought solutions to the problem of the front-loaded and theory-heavy nature of the traditional language teaching methods course. Several potential solutions are described below, including the incorporation of Cycles of Enactment and Investigation and an increased focus on Interactional Competence, with a specific focus on the strengths that heritage speakers of Spanish bring to their pre-service teacher field experiences.

Cycles of Enactment and Investigation

What was learned from this pilot study will be applied to improve the researcher's methods course in the future, which, together with the community-based program, compose a "reflective practicum" (Schön, 1983; Schön, 1987). Students will engage in Multi-staged Cycles of Enactment and Investigation (CEIs), as advocated by the LTP project (LTP, n.d.). A CEI is very similar to Lesson Study (in Hlas & Hlas, 2012) and to Davin and Troyan's (2015) four phases of deconstruction, demonstration, rehearsal & coaching, and implementation. One Cycle of Enactment and Investigation engages a class or pre-service teachers in observing an enactment of an Instructional Activity (IA; either live or via video), collectively analyzing the principles, practices, and content in the IA, preparing to teach the same IA, publicly rehearsing their teaching plans and receiving feedback, recording their enactment of the IA, and repeating the collective analysis using these recordings (LTP, n.d., para. 7). The ultimate goal is to guide the pre-service teachers toward adaptive competence: "Over multiple enactments and analyses, the beginners learn which aspects of an IA remain relatively constant and what parts of their performance need to be adapted to what students know, what they are learning, and what they still need to understand and be able to do" (LTP, n.d., para. 7).

Each CEI will be centered on a particular IA, to be defined based on the HLTPs outlined previously, with enactment taking place in our existing community-based children's Spanish program. As in previous work by Troyan et al. (2013), the methods course and the pre-service teachers' field experiences will be "inextricably linked" (p. 160), to meet the requirements that community-based learning involve students in applying their classroom learning to an authentic community problem—in this case, meeting the demand to teach Spanish to local children—while reflecting on their service as related to their classroom learning (Root, 1997).

Interactional Competence

Given that this particular pre-service teacher consistently demonstrated some of the HLTPs without prior training, future data will be closely examined for any evidence that heritage speakers perform better than non-heritage speakers on any of the HLTPs, with the hypothesis that I-TLC (Davin & Troyan 2015) might come more easily to heritage speakers, in part due to interactional competence (Kramsch, 1986; Walsh, 2006). This could include the ability to manage contingencies (Davin & Troyan, 2015); to make connections across multiple representations (Hlas & Hlas, 2012); and to tap their own Funds of Knowledge (Moll et al., 1992). It could very well be the case that heritage-speaking pre-service teachers have a greater ability to engage in context-dependent I-TLC for that language, and can therefore serve as a valuable resource within any language teacher preparation program with a community teaching component.

To conclude, the participant in this study had no explicit training in HLTPs, yet demonstrated proficiency in the HLTP of I-TLC. An implication would be for future iterations of the methods class to focus more heavily on the other HLTPs, while recognizing and celebrating the existing knowledge and skills brought to the methods class by the pre-service teachers. These students are at a point in their undergraduate education where their abilities in both Spanish and Education have been honed toward an advanced level, and students are ideally at a level where they can engage in meaningful field experiences that combine their abilities in situated teaching practice. One suggestion would be to use the videos from previous iterations of the course with subsequent groups of students, as part of the Cycle of Enactment and Investigation. Another direction for future research would be to study the ability of in-service teachers to continue employing HLTPs and situating them within Instructional Activities.

A limitation of this study involves the lack of a comparison with a pre-service Spanish teacher who was not a heritage speaker of Spanish.; future studies should further investigate any potential advantages

or disadvantages that heritage speakers may bring to the language teacher development process. As with any qualitative study, the findings are not directly transferable to another setting without a deep understanding of the similarities and differences of the two contexts and their participants. To this end, every attempt has been made here to provide a rich, thick description of this study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), so that this action research project could be replicated in other places and with other participants by researchers committed to conducting thoughtful, rigorous, and thorough qualitative research.

REFERENCES

Ball, D.L. & Cohen, D. K. (1999). Developing practice, developing practitioners: Toward a practice-based theory of professional education. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice (3-22). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 60, 497–511.

Ball, D.L., Sleep, L., Boerst, T.A., & Bass, H. (2009). Combing the development of practice and the practice of development in teacher education. The Elementary School Journal, 109(5), 458-474.

Carracelas-Juncal, C. (2013). When service-learning is not a "border-crossing" experience: Outcomes of a graduate Spanish online course. Hispania, 96(2), 295-309.

Davin, K.J., & Donato, R. (2011, November). Toward a practice-based approach in second language education. Paper presented at the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages Convention, Denver, CO.

Davin, K. J., & Troyan, F. J. (2015). The implementation of high-leverage teaching practices: From the university classroom to the field site. Foreign Language Annals, 48(1), 124-142.

Erlandson, D. A. (1993). Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ferrance, E. (2000). Themes in education: Action research. Providence, RI: Brown University. Retrieved November 1, 2011 from http://www.lab.brown.edu/pubs/themes_ed/act_research.pdf.

Freeman, D. (1993). Renaming experience/reconstructing practice: Developing new understandings of teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 94, 485-497.

Gass, S. M., Mackey, A., & Pica, T. (1998). The role of input and interaction in second language acquisition. Modern Language Journal, 82, 299–305.

Ghousseini, H., & Sleep, L. (2011). Making practice studyable. ZDM Mathematics Education, 43, 147-160.

Glisan, E. (2010). Envisioning foreign language education through the lens of high-leverage practices. Foreign Language Annals, 43, 359–360.

Grossman, P., & McDonald, M. (2008). Back to the future: Directions for research in teaching and teacher education. American Educational Research Journal 45(1), 198-205.

Hellebrandt, J., & Jorge, E. (2013). The scholarship of community engagement: Advancing partnerships in Portuguese and Spanish. Hispania, 96(2), 203-214.

Hildebrant, S.A., & Swanson, P. (2014). World language teacher candidate performance on edTPA: An exploratory study. Foreign Language Annals, 47(4), 576-591.

Hlas, A.C., & Hlas, C.S. (2012). A Review of high-leverage teaching practices: Making connections between mathematics and foreign languages. Foreign Language Annals, 45(21), S76-S97.

Kazemi, E., Lampert, M., & Franke, M. (2009). Developing pedagogies in teacher education to support novice teachers' ability to enact ambitious instruction. In R. Hunter, B. Bicknell & T. Burgess (Eds.), Crossing divides: Proceedings of the 32nd annual conference of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia. (Vol. 1, pp. 12-30). Palmerston North, NZ: MERGA.

Kearney, E. (2015). A high-leverage language teaching practice: Leading an open-ended group discussion. Foreign Language Annals 48(1), 100-123.

Kramsch, C. (1986). From language proficiency to interactional competence. The Modern Language Journal, 70(4), 366-372.

Lampert, M. (2010). Learning teaching in, from, and for practice: What do we mean? Journal of Teacher Education 61, 21-34.

Lampert, M., & Graziani, F. (2009). Instructional activities as a tool for teachers' and teacher educators' learning in and for practice. Elementary School Journal, 109(5), 491-509.

Lantolf, J.P., & Johnson, K.E (2007). Extending Firth & Wagner's (1997) ontological perspective to L2 classroom praxis and teacher education. Modern Language Journal, 91, 877-892.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Learning in, from, & for Teaching Practice (n.d.). Retrieved June 19, 2014 from http://sitemaker.umich.edu/ltp/home

Liesvield, R. & Miller, J.A. (2005). Teach with your strengths. Washington, DC: Gallup.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Long, M. H., & Porter, P. A. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk and second language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 207–228.

Lundgaard, G. (2015). The A-B-Cs to a performance-based learning plan. The Language Educator, 10(1), 32-35.

Medina, J. (2008). Brain rules: 12 principles for surviving and thriving at work, home, and school. Seattle, WA: Pear Press.

Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. Theory into Practice, 31(2), 132-141.

Pica, T. (1994). Research on negotiation: What does it reveal about second-language learning conditions, processes, and outcomes. Language Learning, 44, 493–527.

Root, S.C. (1997). School-based service: A review of research for teacher educators. In J.A. Erickson & J.B. Anderson (Eds.), Learning with the community: Concepts and models for service-learning in teacher education (42-72). Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. Language Learning, 52, 119–158.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B.

Seidelhofer (Eds.), Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H. G. Widdowson (pp. 125–144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

TeachingWorks. (n.d.). TeachingWorks. Retrieved June 19, 2014, from http://www.teachingworks.org.

Troyan, F.T., Davin, K.J., & Donato, R. (2013). Exploring a practice-based approach to foreign language teacher preparation: A work in progress. Canadian Modern Language Review, 69(2), 154-180.

Valdés, Guadalupe. (2000). Introduction. Spanish for Native Speakers: AATSP Professional Development Series Handbook for teachers K-16. New York, NY: Harcourt College.

Valdés, G. (2001). Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. In Peyton, J.K., Ranard, D.A., & McGinnis, S. (Eds.) Heritage languages in America: Preserving a national resource: 37-77. McHenry, IL and Washington, DC: Delta Systems and Center for Applied Linguistics.

Valdés, Guadalupe. 2005. Bilingualism, heritage learners, and SLA research: Opportunities lost or seized? Modern Language Journal, 89, 410-426.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, (Eds.) Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). Thought and language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Walsh, S. (2006). Investigating classroom discourse. New York: Routledge.

Charla Lorenzen holds a Ph.D in Foreign Language Education from the University of Texas at Austin, and has taught Spanish at the pre-school through college levels. She is currently an Associate Professor of Modern Languages at Elizabethtown College in Pennsylvania, where she teaches introductory through advanced Spanish. She supervises the Spanish Education major, which certifies candidates to teach Spanish at the pre-kindergarten through secondary level. Dr. Lorenzen and her students volunteer many hours each week to the Children's Spanish Program, uniting theory and practice while teaching Spanish to local children.