

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Faculty Publications-Languages, Literatures,
and Cultures

Languages, Literatures, and Cultures

2016

Emerging Pedagogical Content Knowledge of Preservice Spanish Teachers: An Examination of Liberal Arts and Education Majors' Writing

Anne Hlas
University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire

Susan A. Hildebrandt
Illinois State University, shildeb@ilstu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/fpllc>

Recommended Citation

Hlas, Anne and Hildebrandt, Susan A., "Emerging Pedagogical Content Knowledge of Preservice Spanish Teachers: An Examination of Liberal Arts and Education Majors' Writing" (2016). *Faculty Publications-Languages, Literatures, and Cultures*. 42.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/fpllc/42>

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the Languages, Literatures, and Cultures at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications-Languages, Literatures, and Cultures by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUREd@ilstu.edu.



From the

AERA Online Paper Repository

<http://www.aera.net/repository>

Paper Title Emerging Pedagogical Content Knowledge of Preservice Spanish Teachers: An Examination of Liberal Arts and Education Majors' Writing

Author(s) Anne Hlas, University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire; Susan A. Hildebrandt, Illinois State University

Session Title Pedagogical Content Knowledge of Foreign Language Teachers: Conceptualizations and Empirical Findings Across Different Domains

Session Type Session Paper

Presentation Date 4/12/2016

Presentation Location Washington, D.C.

Descriptors

Methodology

Unit Division K - Teaching and Teacher Education

Each presenter retains copyright on the full-text paper. Repository users should follow legal and ethical practices in their use of repository material; permission to reuse material must be sought from the presenter, who owns copyright. Users should be aware of the [AERA Code of Ethics](#).

Citation of a paper in the repository should take the following form:
[Authors.] ([Year, Date of Presentation]). [Paper Title.] Paper presented at the [Year] annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Retrieved [Retrieval Date], from the AERA Online Paper Repository.

Paper title

Emerging PCK of preservice Spanish teachers: An examination of Liberal Arts and Education majors' writing

Author names & affiliations

Dr. Anne Cummings Hlas, University of Wisconsin - Eau Claire

Dr. Susan A. Hildebrandt, Illinois State University

Abstract

This study explores second language PCK acquisition, highlighting the question of whether language teacher education programs impact teachers' knowledge base. We compared Spanish Education majors' and Spanish Liberal Arts (LA) majors' writing on pedagogical tasks at a large, Midwestern university, asking (1) how the two groups demonstrate PCK on an assessment of Spanish teacher writing? and (2) how the performance of the two groups differs on an assessment of Spanish teacher writing? Qualitative analysis revealed differing stages of PCK between the groups, suggesting teacher education's potential influence on the preservice teachers' performance. *Language awareness* between the groups was similar, but the education majors outperformed the LA majors in *knowledge of effective teaching*, providing students with rich level-appropriate input. In addition, Spanish LA majors used more English while completing the writing tasks, whereas the education majors used Spanish in their feedback. Further, the education majors were more adept at creating a worksheet focused on a specific learning target. Both groups demonstrated positive and constructive feedback on student work, but the LA majors expressed more concern for the *affective needs of students* than the education majors, who did not explicitly address students' affective needs. Each participant in this study demonstrated varying levels of PCK, supporting the contention that PCK's development is on a continuum (Cochran, DeRuiter, & King, 1993; Wing, 1993). The education majors tended to outperform the LA majors in each of the target areas, with the exception of student affective issues. Education majors' writing may have manifested heightened levels of PCK due to their future career goals or education courses, two areas in which LA majors would not have engaged. Although not definitive, this study points to a distinct PCK development process among those with education courses and those without.

Introduction

The development of pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) (Shulman, 1987) takes place over time, stemming from a mixture of preservice clinical experiences, one's own learning and teaching experiences, and beliefs formed during those events (Feinman-Nemser, 2001; Henze & Van Driel, 2015; Lortie, 1975). Van Compernelle and Henery (2015) contend that PCK involves “creating and developing in teachers an orientation to second language (L2) teaching as ‘praxis’, the unity of theory and practical activity” (p. 356). In addition, PCK is domain- and discipline-specific (Hashweh, 2013; Shulman, 1987). What makes language teachers' multifaceted PCK exceptional is that the L2 is both the medium and content of instruction. Teachers use the target language for learners' reading and listening input and for both linguistic and pedagogical ends (Johnston & Goettsch, 2000).

Defining and measuring teacher knowledge takes on great importance in the current educational policy conversations and actions across content areas, including languages. This study discusses one component of L2 teacher knowledge, PCK, and its differing levels shown on a performance writing assessment task completed by preservice Spanish teacher and Spanish Liberal Arts (LA) majors. In particular, we investigate the following research questions:

1. Is there a difference in performance between preservice teachers and non-teachers on a PCK performance assessment of Spanish teacher writing?
2. How do preservice teachers and non-teachers demonstrate PCK in a performance assessment of Spanish writing?

The following review of literature will explore the acquisition, development, and assessment of this critical component of teacher knowledge.

Literature review

Almost three decades ago, Shulman (1987) contended that at least seven categories make up teacher knowledge. That paradigm has served as the starting point for a variety of researchers within the language teaching community as they strived to define language teacher knowledge (e.g., Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Lafayette, 1993; Sanchez & Borg, 2014; Van Compernelle & Henery, 2014; Wing, 1993). PCK, which Shulman (1987) described as “that special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding” (p. 8), is a hybrid of content and pedagogical knowledge. This hybrid has taken on special prominence in teacher knowledge literature and L2 teacher education as well.

L2 teachers’ pedagogical knowledge, the first component of PCK, is derived from a variety of sources, such as formal instruction in psychology and second language acquisition and experiences in elementary and secondary language classrooms (Van Compernelle & Henery, 2014; Wing, 1993). The other component of PCK is content knowledge, what Lafayette (1993, p. 124) defines as “subject-matter content.” He tells us that this component “in the field of foreign languages consists of proficiency in and knowledge about the language and culture to be taught” (p. 124).

Although, PCK has been unpacked in a myriad of ways, the definition that most influences our construct was informed by Cochran, DeRuiter, and Kind (1993), who stated that:

The transformation of subject matter for teaching (Shulman, 1986) occurs as the teacher *critically reflects* on and *interprets* the subject matter; finds multiple ways to *represent* the information as analogies, metaphors, examples, problems, demonstrations, and classroom activities; *adapts* the material to students’ abilities, gender, prior knowledge,

and preconceptions (those preinstructional informal, or nontraditional ideas students bring to the learning setting); and finally *tailors* the material to those specific students to whom the information will be taught (emphasis in original, p. 264).

Using target language skills effectively is not the only means of defining success in teaching L2s. Rather, the language teacher's sophisticated PCK is a necessary component to engage the students with the material and with one another (Freeman, 2002). Simons (2014, p. 977) points to the need for teacher candidates to grasp both linguistic and cultural knowledge as part of their repertoire to effectively teach. She points out that language teacher knowledge "includes both oral and written competences" and an "analytic insight in the lexicon, grammar, and language pragmatics, so that they might immediately identify the causes lying behind students' mistakes and propose adequate remediation." Language teachers' PCK, therefore, lies at the center of teaching and learning, necessitating serious investigation of the construct.

Acquisition of PCK

As can be seen, there are a variety of definitions of PCK, but how do teachers acquire this critical component of their professional knowledge? The preparation of future L2 teachers begins when they take their first step into the language classroom as young learners themselves (Wing, 1993). During the "apprenticeship of observation" (Lortie, 1975), preservice teachers begin to form beliefs about L2 teaching. Teachers draw on this fund of observations to formulate their later beliefs about what constitutes good teaching (Bailey, Bergthold, Braunstein, Fleischman, Holbrook, Tuman, Waissbluth, & Zambo, 1996; Van Driel, Bulte, & Verloop, 2007).

PCK acquisition is thought to continue as preservice teachers take formal education courses that inform their manner of teaching second languages. PCK is gained through experiences (Munby, et al., 2001), such as practicum within the schools and student teaching

during the final semester of a teacher education program. Teaching experiences, in fact, are thought to be one of the major sources in PCK development (Hashweh, 2015; Van Driel & Berry, 2010). With opportunities to practice understood as essential to the PCK development process, Van Driel & Berry (2010) explain that “an implication is that preservice or beginning teachers usually have little or no PCK at their disposal” (p. 658). Preservice teachers have diverse experiences in opportunities to teach or carry out practice teaching depending on their university context, even when completing L2 teacher education programs in the same state (Hildebrandt, Hlas, & Conroy, 2013). In a sense, knowledge bases that comprise PCK seem to grow over time. Acquiring PCK as both a student and later a teacher suggests that there is a continuum of PCK development. The controversy surrounding teacher education in the preparation of teachers begs the question: How does teacher education contribute to PCK acquisition?

Teacher education and PCK

Powerful critics fuel the debate over teacher education’s value in developing PCK. Some argue that strong preparation in subject knowledge and enthusiasm to teach are satisfactory for individuals to begin a successful teaching career (Paige, 2002). More specifically, former U.S. Secretary of Education Paige argued a 2002 report, entitled *Meeting the Highly Qualified Teachers Challenge*, that “there is little evidence that education school coursework leads to improved student achievement” (U.S. Department of Education, 2002, p. 19). He then proposed that education coursework be eliminated from certification requirements and that attending colleges of education be made optional (U.S. Department of Education, 2002).

Those in favor of teacher education argue that subject knowledge is simply not enough (Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Johnson, 2009) and that coursework in pedagogy, as well

as the subject matter area, is a necessary part of teacher education. Black, Harrison, Lee, Marshall, and William (2004) contend that

a high level of qualification in a subject is less important than a thorough understanding of its fundamental principles, an understanding of the kinds of difficulties that students might have, and the creativity to be able to think up questions that stimulate productive thinking. Furthermore, such pedagogical content knowledge is essential in interpreting [student] responses (p. 17).

Advocates of teacher education posit that education courses are critical to the development of future teachers and that they are essential in PCK development.

Few researchers have compared the performance of individuals prepared for teaching in colleges of education to those who were not. In her germinal study, Grossman (1989) investigated English teachers' PCK development, comparing the PCK of teachers who completed a teacher education program and others who did not. She discovered that teachers without professional coursework in teacher education "found it difficult to re-think their subject matter for teaching" (p. 30), demonstrating the advantage of these courses in the development of teacher PCK.

Teacher education has been found to positively influence teacher knowledge, specifically PCK, in some instances. Teacher education is not a panacea, however, and PCK is often viewed as "highly specific to the context, situation, and person" (Van Driel & Berry, 2012, p. 27). As such, it is seemingly impossible for teacher education programs to completely address the components of PCK. The collection of more evidence of its effectiveness is a necessary step and the assessment of PCK is one way to provide that evidence.

Spanish teacher PCK and writing

Because of the lack of attention to writing in existing teacher assessments, the construct of Spanish teacher writing to examine PCK is explored. Writing was also selected because language teachers' classroom writing still remains an overlooked and underappreciated component of assessing Spanish teacher PCK (Aalto & Tarnanen, 2015). Aalto & Tarnanen (2015) note, "The foundation of subject teachers' pedagogical language knowledge lies in developing abilities to observe the role and characteristics of talk versus written language and variation in language use in accordance with the situation, audience, and genre..."(p. 402). On a weekly basis, teachers write tests, handouts, and comments that often blend into the background of a lesson. This written input is crucial to L2 learners as it serves as a model for their own production (Krashen, 1985). Teachers need to be precise in their writing since the written artifacts are produced for the purposes of student learning and evaluation.

The complexity of language teacher proficiency cannot be denied. On the one hand, teachers should be expected to produce Advanced-Low levels of language, as recommended by the Council for Accreditation of Teacher Preparation (CAEP) and the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) (Foreign Language Teacher Preparation Standards Writing Team, 2013). On the other hand, teaching is a special task that requires language users to tailor their level of language to the audience. Chambless (2012) tells us that "teachers need to be able to rely on their strong language skills to provide abundant and varied input as well as guide students to interact, interpret, and negotiate meaning" (p. 144). Therefore, this attention to audience means that teachers' level of discourse must conform to what the language learners in front of them are able to comprehend, even though a higher level of discourse may be technically correct.

The two components that form the construct of Spanish teacher writing proficiency are foreign language writing proficiency and teacher knowledge. The *ACTFL Writing Proficiency Guidelines* (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2012) informed the development of the construct's L2 writing proficiency component. The Advanced-Low level description was selected based on the recommendation by ACTFL and CAEP that beginning teachers of commonly taught languages, such as Spanish, maintain at least that level of language ability (Foreign Language Teacher Preparation Standards Writing Team, 2013). It must be noted here that the *ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines* have received much criticism (Valdés, Haro, & Echevarriarza, 1992; Chalhoub-Deville, 1997), although they are widely used.

Concerning the pedagogical component of Spanish teacher writing proficiency, *Minnesota's Vision for Teacher Education* (Minnesota Board of Teaching, 1986) informed the construct for the present study. That document was developed to “redesign teacher education programs to implement a research based, results-oriented curriculum” (Darling-Hammond, et al., 1999, p. 5). The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Educators' (AACTE) *Knowledge Base for the Beginning Teacher* (Reynolds, 1989) was also used in the formulation of the current construct. In particular, the “Knowledge of Effective Teaching” portion from the former report and the “Knowledge of Learners” from the latter report informed the current task.

The Present Study

This performance assessment task was designed to make inferences about preservice teachers' ability to write in Spanish in future jobs teaching Spanish in public and private high schools within Iowa. Before designing the task, the researchers gathered information about what and how often Spanish teachers write, so that a performance assessment task resembling authentic Spanish teacher writing performance could be developed. Thirty-two high school

Spanish teachers in Iowa completed a survey about the kinds of tasks they write in Spanish and with what frequency they carry out these tasks. These new and experienced teachers came from various school districts in the state and taught a variety of levels. The following, in order of frequency, were most commonly reported teacher writing tasks in Spanish: a) writing on the chalkboard, b) writing worksheets, c) writing test questions, and d) writing comments on students' papers.

Writing on the chalkboard was eliminated as a task due to the inability to simulate classroom practice in the assessment; that task is often done in response to students' immediate needs which would be difficult to reproduce. Supporting this decision, Grant (1997) divided teacher language proficiency into two parts, *spontaneous* and *planned*. In a classroom, a writing task performed on a chalkboard is generally more spontaneous, whereas the other three tasks are more planned in nature.

The final instrument contained a detailed scenario of a hypothetical teaching situation, including the demographics of the school and class, characteristics and potential motivations of the individual students, and information from a hypothetical textbook chapter. Providing "sufficient information about the context for and the goals of teaching decisions" allowed for a more authentic performance assessment (Darling-Hammond, et al., 1999, p. 52).

Each of the three items included in the task also contained a reflection section that could be written in either Spanish or English. In addition to the five sentences required to complete the Spanish writing task, participants were asked to explain in five sentences why they wrote what they did, the decisions that they made, and how the responses to the other sections demonstrate their knowledge of teaching and of students. This section was developed to simulate what might happen in reflective teaching in an authentic situation. Van Driel & Berry (2010) suggest that

opportunities for self-analysis and self-evaluation, which can only come about through reflection, are important for facilitating PCK.

Administration

Eighteen participants took part in this study; half of them were candidates for Spanish secondary teacher licensure and the other half were Spanish LA majors or minors at a public research university in Iowa. Of the nine preservice teachers, eight are female and one is male. This group, ranging in age from less than 21 to 29 years, was composed of undergraduate degree candidates and master's degree candidates in the foreign language education program and none had experience in teaching K-12 Spanish. Two of the candidates are native speakers of Spanish from Spain and five had studied abroad in a Spanish-speaking country. A wide variety of study abroad experiences were noted, ranging from two weeks to one year, with most having studied in Spain.

Of the nine Spanish majors, four are male and five are female, ranging in age from less than 21 to over 40 years old. Six had traveled to a Spanish-speaking country and one was a native speaker of Spanish from Colombia. None of the candidates had experience teaching Spanish at the K-12 level. All participants were given one hour to complete the instrument, which was administered in the first weeks of the semester. None of the participants had received previous explicit instruction about how to construct the three types of items on the performance assessment. For ease of use throughout the article, Spanish majors are addressed as Major (Mj.) before their name and Pre-service teachers as Teacher (Tr.).

Analysis

For the qualitative analysis, the two authors (one graduate from a teacher education program and one LA major) carefully examined the participants' responses, using the analysis

tool of “data reduction.” Data reduction is the “process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the data” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 10-11).

To begin, the formal qualitative data analysis process, we reviewed all of the written data created by participants individually. Researchers used line-by-line open coding to create a set of initial qualitative categories (Saldaña, 2012) and axial coding to explore how concepts and categories related (Lichtman, 2012). After our individual reviews, we compared our perceptions of characteristics that seemed relevant to all three tasks and had potential for describing differences in these types of learners. As we considered our categories, seeking themes that would link across categories and reveal potential differences for these two types of learners, we considered that our categories, as reported in Table 1, indicated aspects of language and teaching.

Table 1: Emergent Categories

Conversation Element Categories Including Definitions and Examples

<i>Category</i>	<i>Definition</i>
<i>Language: Appropriate tense</i>	Ability to select appropriate tenses based on students’ knowledge and previous content (-AR regular verbs in the preterite; present tense verbs)
<i>Language: Appropriate age/audience</i>	Ability to use simplicity, clarity and sensitivity to audience
<i>Language: Grammatical competence</i>	Knowledge of rules of morphology, syntax, sentence-grammar semantics, and accuracy (use of preterite)
<i>Language: Use of TL</i>	Ability to stay in Spanish and avoid use of English or Spanglish
<i>Knowledge of Teaching: Opportunities to practice</i>	Ability to provide multiple opportunities for practice of the content (maximizing the opportunities)

<i>Knowledge of Teaching: Variety of sample</i>	Ability to provide a variety of samples that highlight the nature and characteristics of the content (e.g. attention to placement, agreement, number, gender, etc.)
<i>Knowledge of Teaching: Focus on Task</i>	Ability to maintain emphasis of the objectives of the task
<i>Knowledge of Teaching: Assessment</i>	Knowledge of feedback
<i>Knowledge of Learners: Addressing the students</i>	Ability to address the individual learning styles and needs of students
<i>Knowledge of students: Affective issues</i>	Ability to connect to the affective needs of students (feelings, preferences, values)

Throughout this process we further refined the categories, clarifying definitions, noting typical examples, deleting categories that were not useful, and adding categories to capture elements that we felt may reveal the differences between these groups of participants. The researchers reviewed the entire data set independently and later compared perceptions, which enhanced trustworthiness and strengthened the development of coding categories.

Results

Language Awareness

Language awareness, as defined by Thornbury (1997), is "the knowledge that teachers have of the underlying systems of the language that enables them to teach effectively" (p. x). Within awareness, the first difference in performance concerned the level of the language used.

In task two, writing the beginning of an essay for students to finish, Mj. Felipe uses language that is too advanced for the learners in this context. A native speaker of Spanish, he uses imperfect subjunctive and other adjective choices that go beyond the level of the students.

Al empacar mis maletas en mi casa, creía que no iba a tener problemas, pero resultó que para el agente de viajes es mucho peso, y me tocó pagar multa por sobre peso. Al entregárselas al maletero para que me las llevara, cerca de la puerta de embarque, olvidé cogerlas todas, y una se me ha perdido. No sé que voy hacer por que el vuelo sale en 5 minutos. Me han dicho que apenas aterrice, tengo que tener cuidado con dejar cosas descuidadas porque dicen que hay muchas personas que aprovechan para robar, tengo mucho miedo y ya me estoy arrepintiendo de este viaje.

(While packing my bags at my house, I believed that I wasn't going to have any problems, but it turns out that it was too heavy for the travel agent, and I had to pay a fine for excessive weight. Upon giving them to the bagman so that he could carry them for me, close to the boarding gate, I forgot to gather all of them and one of them got lost. I don't know what I am going to do because the flight leaves in 5 minutes. They have told me that we will land soon, I have to be careful leaving things because they say there are many people who take advantage and steal, I am very afraid and I am already regretting this trip.)

In general, the preservice teachers do not have such difficulties with appropriate language. They tend to focus on the language skill of interest, direct object pronouns. They also use language appropriate for the secondary classroom and recycle previously learned grammar points, such as the preterit, in the worksheet task. Tr. Carmen, a native-speaker of Spanish, wrote for the worksheet task:

Primero llegué una hora tarde al aeropuerto. Después de llegar una hora tarde, hice cola por una hora más porque había pocas personas trabajando en el aeropuerto.

Facturé el equipaje y subí al avión. Me abroché el cinturón pero....(continuar)

(First, I arrived an hour late to the airport. After arriving an hour late, I waited in line for another hour because there were very few people working at the airport. I checked my bag and boarded the plane. I buckled my seatbelt but...(continue))

Their performance suggests that the pre-service teachers understand how to enhance the input given to students (Andrews & McNeill, 2005) and at the same time demonstrate awareness of learners' challenges and limitations.

In addition to not fully grasping the notion of providing rich level-appropriate input, the Spanish majors tend to use more English while completing the writing tasks. For example, task three requires feedback on student produced compositions in Spanish, but Mj. Sally includes much Spanglish in her feedback. An example follows:

Es posible organizar el composicion diferente. Los ideas son buenos, pero put las mismas ideas together.

(It is possible to organize the essay differently. The ideas are good, but put the same ideas together.)

In addition, three Spanish majors (Mjs. David, Shelley and Ryan) wrote only in English for the composition feedback task. In contrast, all nine preservice teachers wrote in Spanish and at a level appropriate to secondary students. This can be seen in an example from Tr. Betsy's feedback to a student composition:

La organización de ésta composición es un poco desorganizado. ¿Es posible que puedas organizar los pensamientos un poco, antes de escribir? Parece que te divertiste durante

las vacaciones. ¡Creo que hiciste mucho y también trabajaste mucho! Buena suerte en la Universidad.

(The organization of this essay is a bit disorganized. Is it possible that you can organize the ideas a bit, before writing? It seems that you had fun during the vacation. I believe you did a lot and also that you worked a lot! Good luck at the university.)

Thus far, our discussion has focused on the language awareness in the participants' performance. Pedagogical features also differed between the two groups.

Knowledge of effective teaching

Effective language teaching requires that students have opportunities to demonstrate knowledge of a variety of linguistic features and that teachers use a variety of strategies, techniques, and methods for teaching (INTASC Standards for Foreign Language Teachers, 2002). In the worksheet writing task (task one), an activity evaluating student knowledge of direct object pronouns, eight of the nine preservice teachers elicit a variety of pronouns and give students several opportunities to use grammatical concept under study. Six of these participants include at least four blanks in the worksheet, thereby including four opportunities for students to practice pronouns within their five sentences. Tr. Julie and Tr. Bev also create a dialogue that elicits at least three distinct direct object pronouns and pronoun placement both before the conjugated verb and attached to the infinitive. As an example, Tr. Julie creates the following dialogue:

Marta: Has llamado la agente de viajes para confirmar los billetes de avión?

Juan: Sí, la llamé y los confirmé.

Marta: Muy bien, gracias. ¿Tienes mi pasaporte?

Juan: Sí, lo tengo. ¿Dónde esta la maleta?

Marta: Creo que esta en nuestra habitación. La puse allí para arreglar la ropa.

Juan: Ten prisa! El vuelo sale dentro de cuatro horas. No quiero perder el avión

Marta: Tranquilo. No vamos a perderlo!

(Marta: Have you called the travel agent to confirm the plane tickets?

Juan: Yes, I called her and confirmed them.

Marta: Very good, thank you. Do you have my passport?

Juan: Yes, I have it. Where is the suitcase?

Marta: I think it's in our room. I put it there to arrange the clothes.

Juan: Hurry up! The flight leaves within four hours. I don't want to miss the flight.

Marta: Calm down. We aren't going to miss it!)

In general, the Spanish majors have more difficulty providing opportunities to practice and elicit multiple pronouns. Only two of the nine Spanish majors focused exclusively on direct object pronouns. For instance, Mj. John asks students to fill in blanks that require information beyond direct object pronouns, including verbs and nouns. Mj. John's worksheet follows:

Marta: Necesitamos hacer la maleta ¿Tienes su pasaporte y los billetes?

Juan: Sí, _____ tengo, pero no puedo encontrar mi pasaporte.

Marta: ¿_____ dejas en la oficina?

Juan: No estoy seguro. No puedo recordar si lo _____ (traer) a casa después de trabajo ayer.

Marta: Buscamos en su bolso y en la mesa. ¿Puedes recordar lo que _____ (hacer) después de trabajo ayer?

Juan: Bueno, después de salir la oficina, _____ (hacer) cola por el tren y nada más.

Marta: ¡Aquí, _____ tengo, está debajo de la maleta en el piso!

(Marta: We need to pack the bag. ¿Do you have your passport and the tickets?)

Juan: Yes, I have _____ but I can't find my passport.

Marta: Did you leave _____ in the office?

Juan: I'm not sure. I can't remember if I _____ (to bring) it home after work yesterday.

Marta: Let's look in your bag and on the table. Can you remember what you _____ (to do) after work yesterday?

Juan: Well, after leaving the office, I _____ (to wait) in line for the train and that's it.

Marta: Here! I have _____, it was under the suitcase on the floor!)

Mj. John explains the rationale behind his worksheet in the reflection:

Well, I'm not really familiar with methodology for foreign language instruction but I tried to include a little of everything in the exercise. The pronouns refer back to lesson vocabulary and the verbs are both vocabulary words as well as preterite forms. I tried to keep it simple but I also didn't want to just have the blanks be for vocabulary because I think having to select a pronoun and the correct form of the preterite tense is more challenging than just referring back to a vocab list.

His reflection highlights the conscious decision not to practice solely direct object pronouns.

Although his sample is reflective of the majority of Spanish majors, Mj. Sally does create an activity that offers both a variety of opportunities for practice and utilizes various pronouns in the dialogue. She is the only Spanish major to do so.

Despite the differences between their abilities to create focused and appropriate tasks for students, both groups are able to demonstrate principles of evaluation to an equal extent. More specifically, the groups similarly demonstrate an understanding of the importance for both positive and constructive feedback. Mj. Angie writes,

This section was hard because I didn't want to give the students the answers, but I also don't want them to be frustrated by being constantly corrected. I tried to give them clues about their errors without telling them exactly what to change.

Likewise, Tr. Chris writes:

Although I obviously responded differently to each essay, the format I used was the same. I think when correcting a first draft it is important to start by praising them, then telling them what to work on, and then end by praising them again.

Both groups seem to recognize the need for providing an area for improvement while simultaneously encouraging students.

Knowledge of learners

A final area that highlights the distinction between the two groups is evidence of knowledge of learners; that is, acknowledgement of individual development, awareness of student needs and learning styles, and personal connection with students. These differences resonate when both groups are asked to provide students with feedback in Spanish on compositions. Several Spanish majors fail to address the students, writing impersonal comments that focus on grammar solely. Five of the nine majors address students on a personal level with the informal *tú*, while four of them address generic "students." Mj. David, for example, organizes his comments with abbreviated words and English, although he does attempt a personal connection with the student.

Vocab – too much repetition of verbs

-- a lot of conjugation errors

Org – decent organization

-- a few random sentences thrown in the mix

Content – good

Pers. Comments – muy bien, sounds like a good break and some exciting summer plans.

I'd love to hear more about your college plans for next year!! Where in CA??

In Mj. David's reflection for this section, he explains his comments:

Show interest in the students [sic] school work as well as their life so they will feel comfortable to come to me w/ any questions about their work, concerns, or life in general.

Mj. David expresses his intent to develop a relationship with the student, but his feedback is impersonal and short, leaving room for interpretation.

In contrast to Spanish majors, preservice teachers tend to address the students as individuals by trying to connect with them on a personal level through their comments. Eight of the nine preservice teachers used the *tú* form to address the students and only one student, Tr. Carmen, addresses a generic "student." In general, they write in more complete sentences, in Spanish, and in paragraphs. For example, Tr. Bev writes:

La palabra para "vacation/s" es "vacaciones." Trata de organizar los eventos sobre cada tema en un parrafo, juntos. Por ejemplo, puedes hablar sobre tu trabajo en "Gardening Specialists" en una sección, y entonces seguir al próximo tema. ¿Cuáles películas viste? ¿Por qué no te gustó el fútbol? Parece que tuviste un verano muy bueno!

¿Vas a trabajar en Garden Specialists y en la universidad el próximo verano? Vas a estar muy ocupada?

(The word for “vacation” is “vacaciones.” Try to organize the events about each topic in a paragraph, together. For example, you can talk about your job at “Gardening Specialists” in one section, and then go on to the next topic. Which movies did you see? Why didn’t you like soccer? It seems like you had a very good summer. Are you going to work at Garden Specialists and at the university next summer? Are you going to be very busy?)

In her reflection for this task, she explains her comments:

By asking content questions like these, it encourages the students to write more and expand. It also lets them know that I am interested in what they wrote and that I want to know more about them.

Both Tr. Bev and Mj. David are attempting similar actions. Tr. Bev, however, incorporates relationship-building comments throughout her feedback and addresses the student directly instead of referring to the student in the third person or not at all.

Although the preservice teachers’ performance on the task generally suggests a desire to connect with learners, there is one area where Spanish majors exceed the performance of preservice teachers. The Spanish majors in this study show a greater concern for students’ affective considerations than preservice teachers. For example, Mj. Lia wants to ensure that students are enjoying themselves while learning. In one of her reflections she writes, “I also tried to keep the passage interesting and something the students could relate to.” Further, Mj. Felipe is concerned about using the right level of language for the students in the tasks. He expresses an understanding that too high a level of language can be intimidating and frustrating. In his reflection after the worksheet task he writes, “They can also be frightened by the language.”

Preservice teachers, on the other hand, do not demonstrate as much evidence that they are thinking of student affective needs in this study.

Discussion

Researchers, teachers, and students often fail to recognize the importance of L2 writing proficiency in teaching and in the evaluation of teaching; teachers write tests, worksheets, and comments on a weekly basis and in so doing serve as model writers for their students. This study documents the richness and depth present in preservice teachers' writing.

L2 teacher writing expresses language ability while at the same time revealing knowledge of teaching and learners; that is, it is a manifestation of PCK (Aalto & Tarnanen, 2015). The tasks in this study assessed preservice teachers' and Spanish majors' PCK, as demonstrated in writing for the Spanish classroom. The participant's work samples illustrate the complex decision-making process involved in planning, instruction, and assessment. L2 teaching involves a multiplicity of decision making through a PCK lens to target both linguistic and pedagogical development.

Through writing, each participant in this study articulated a different stage of PCK, which was expected since the development of PCK is thought to be continual (Cochran et al., 1993; Wing, 1993). That is, PCK is not an "all or nothing" phenomena; it develops over time through a nonlinear process (Van Driel & Berry, 2012; Hashweh, 2013). As Van Driel & Berry (2012) state "PCK development is a complex process that is highly specific to the context, situation, and person" (p. 27). While each participant demonstrated differing levels of PCK, the teacher majors, in general, showed more pedagogical and linguistic awareness than the Liberal Arts majors in these simulated L2 teacher writing tasks.

These findings reinforce that “PCK is tied directly to subject matter concepts but is much more than just subject matter knowledge” (Cochran et al., 1993, p. 264). Thus, adequate L2 proficiency is a necessary component of PCK, but not sufficient. L2 teachers’ PCK may develop due to teacher preparation experiences along their path to becoming a teacher, frequently experienced as a traditional teacher preparation program.

Teacher education programs’ influences on teacher development continues, however, to be a contentious issue in educational policy making circles. The findings from this study imply that teacher education programs could very well assist in the development of PCK and, therefore, may be a critical contributor to teacher knowledge and ability development. While the Spanish LA majors were exposed to multiple worksheets, assessments, and instruction in their Spanish classes, their written examples lack the awareness seen in the Spanish Education majors’ examples. In a situation that forced LA majors to think like teachers, they were not as able to transfer this knowledge as those in education programs. That is, the LA majors had similar levels of Spanish content knowledge, or Spanish language writing proficiency, but they lacked the pedagogical knowledge that contributes to PCK formation. Viewing teaching as a unique combination of content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge, or PCK, can help better inform teacher preparation program development and beginning teacher assessments.

Limitations and Future Research

There are limitations to the present study that must be considered. The fact that the students involved in the study were from the same university limits the findings’ generalizability. Further, the assessment task is limited in that the results are reported through a simulation and not observed in a real-life situation, in front of real L2 learners. Respondents may feel that they

should report in the written reflection what they believe should be reflected; that is they may have felt that the researchers valued a particular kind of reflection. It would be impossible to ascertain whether or not the participants were candid.

The purpose of this study was to contribute to the current understanding of Spanish teacher PCK and to document how it is manifested in Spanish teacher writing tasks. Future research is needed to further explore not only the general development of PCK, but its development within the field of language teaching. More research is also needed in L2 teacher writing and speaking, the other language skill of production. We are encouraged by research in progress being carried out in England and Russia (Korenev, Westbrook, Merry & Ershova, 2016). That research seeks to develop a domain-specific test for teacher candidates who will teach English by investigating language functions that teachers carry out in the classroom and outside of the classroom.

Additionally, it would be interesting to further understand how practicing teacher PCK compares to preservice teacher PCK. Questions worthy of investigation include: How does PCK differ in first year practicing teachers from that in more experienced teachers? How does previous teacher education and professional development activities influence (or not influence) the development of PCK in practicing teachers?

References

Aalto, E. & Tarnanen, M. (2015). Approaching pedagogical language knowledge through student teachers: assessment of second language writing. *Language and Education*, 29(5), 400-415.

- American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. (2012). *ACTFL proficiency guidelines - Writing*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Available from, <http://www.actfl.org/publications/guidelines-and-manuals/actfl-proficiency-guidelines-2012/english/writing>
- Cochran, K. F., DeRuiter, J. A., & King, R. A. (1993). Pedagogical content knowledge: An integrative model for teacher preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(4), 263-271.
- Douglas, D. (2000). *Assessing language for specific purposes*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record*, 103, 1013–1055.
- Foreign Language Teacher Preparation Standards Writing Team. (2013). *Program standards for the preparation of foreign language teachers*. Retrieved from <http://www.actfl.org/professional-development/actfl-caep>
- Gitomer, D. H., & Zisk, R. C. (2015). Knowing what teachers know. *Review of Research in Education*, 39(1), 1-53.
- Hashweh, M. (2013). Pedagogical content knowledge: Twenty-five years later. In C. J. Craig, P. C. Meijer, & J. Broeckmans (Eds.), *From teacher thinking to teachers and teaching: The evolution of a research community* (pp. 115-140).

Henze, I., & Van Driel, J. H. (2015). Toward a more comprehensive way to capture PCK in its complexity. In A. Berry, P. Friedrichsen, & J. Loughran (Eds.), *Re-examining Pedagogical Content Knowledge in Science Education* (pp. 120-134).

Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective*. New York: Routledge.

Johnston, B., & Goettsch, K. (2000). In search of the knowledge base of language teaching: Explanations by experienced teachers. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56(3), 437-468.

Korenev, A., Westbrook, C., Merry, Y., & Ershova, T. (2016). Language Teachers' Target Language project: Language for specific purposes of language teaching. *Language Teaching*, 49(01), 146-148.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lichtman, M. V. (2012). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide*. London: Sage Publications.

Saldaña, J. (2012). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London: Sage Publications.

- Sanchez, H. S. & Borg, S. (2014). Insights into L2 teachers' pedagogical content knowledge: A cognitive perspective on their grammar explanations. *System*, 44 (1), 45-53. Available from, http://opus.bath.ac.uk/38500/1/Sanchez_Borg_2014_Authors_accepted_copy.pdf#?
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-22.
- Simons, M. (2014). Future language teachers as experts in the subject: Developing cultural content knowledge in teacher education. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5, 976-984.
- Van Compernelle, R. A., & Henery, A. (2014). Learning to do concept-based pragmatics instruction: Teacher development and L2 pedagogical content knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, 19, 351-372.
- Van Driel, J. H. & Berry, A. (2010). Pedagogical Content Knowledge, 656-661
- Van Driel, J. H. & Berry, A. (2012). Teacher professional development focusing on pedagogical content knowledge. *Educational Researcher*, 41(1), 26-28.
- Wing, B. H. (1993). The pedagogical imperative in foreign language teacher education. In G. Gunterman (Ed.), *Developing language teachers for a changing world* (pp. 159-186). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

