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Five Sessions of SSR: The impact of a short pleasure reading experience on reading attitude

Kyung-Sook Cho
Busan National University of Education
Department of Elementary English Education. Busan, South Korea
kscho@bnue.ac.kr

Abstract:
Intermediate level EFL students in Korea preparing to be English teachers participated in a short (five sessions) sustained silent reading (SSR) experience. Most of the reading material made available to the students was from the Sweet Valley High series. Students had a very positive reaction to the SSR sessions and reported a considerable increase in interest in free voluntary reading after the five sessions, but the improvement was less impressive one year later and the amount of actual reading reported was modest. A very encouraging result is that participants uniformly said that they would include SSR in their teaching in the future.
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Introduction

The benefits of having a long-term reading habit are well-established. Those who do more self-selected reading develop more reading ability, have better writing style, have larger vocabularies, spell better, and have better control of complex grammatical constructions. These results hold for all ages and for first and second language development (Krashen, 2004).

For this reason there is considerable interest in helping young people become long-term readers. On the basis of examining a number of case histories, Cho and Krashen (2016) concluded that factors that favor the development of a long-term reading habit include having a pleasure reading experience, having access to interesting reading material, having time and a place to read, and being able to select one's own books.

In this study, intermediate level EFL students who did not have a pleasure reading habit were provided with what promised to be a pleasurable reading experience, allowed self-selection, and were provided time and a place to read. The prediction was that this would result in the establishment of a reading habit for at least some of them, and the impact would be long-term.

Procedures
Subjects

Subjects were 26 (11 males and 15 females) third-year students majoring in elementary education with a minor in elementary English education at a university in Korea. All were students in the author's class on English reading, which was designed to prepare them to teach English reading and also to improve their own competence in reading English.

The Treatment

The course syllabus introduced students to the research on pleasure reading in both first and second language development. In particular, students were introduced to the advantage of narrow reading, doing a great deal of reading in an area of interest, reading books by a favorite author, and reading series books.

Students also personally experienced the effect of narrow pleasure reading. Students participated in Sustained Silent Reading (SSR) sessions once a week for five weeks, from October 27, 2014 to November 24, 2014. Time devoted to SSR ranged from 10 to 25 minutes, with an average of 15 minutes per session.

During this time students could read whatever they themselves chose to read. There was no accountability, that is, no test on what was read and no required book reports. Readers were not forced to finish each book they started. In addition, students were allowed to check out books if they wanted to read outside of class.

They were, however, asked to keep a record of each book they read, and to indicate how interesting the book was, as well as make other comments. They were advised to avoid looking up unknown words unless the word appeared to be vital for understanding the story.

The Reading Material

Most of the books made available to the students in their classroom library were from the Sweet Valley series. This series had been used very successfully in previous studies with students of English as a foreign language ( Cho and Krashen, 1994, 1995a,b).

The Sweet Valley books describe the adventures of identical twins with very different personalities. They are ideal for second language acquirers. One sub-series, Sweet Valley Kids, is about the twins in second grade, and it is written at the second grade level. Another, Sweet Valley Twins, is about the Twins in
middle school and is written at the fourth grade level. In the third sub-series, Sweet Valley High, the twins are in high school, and the books are written at the sixth grade level. The series thus provides a natural progression, and also supplies the reader with background knowledge of the twins and their lives, which makes subsequent reading in the series more comprehensible. Besides Sweet Valley books, some adult books were made available to students, such as John Grisham's legal thrillers and a biography of Hillary Clinton. All students except one read from the Sweet Valley series.

Measures and Results

Pre-Questionnaire

One week before SSR was instituted in class, students were given a short questionnaire in Korean, asking if they had ever read books written in English for fun. Only one subject of the group of twenty six (26) reported previous pleasure reading in English.

Students were also asked to indicate the reasons why they had not read in English. Their responses were categorized as follows, with some students providing more than one reason.

1. Reading in English is too difficult: (12)
2. Reading in English is no fun: (12)
3. Lack of access to interesting books: (7)
4. English reading is followed by a test on what you have read: (10)

Post-questionnaire

A post-reading questionnaire was administered one year after the SSR experience ended. Students were asked if they had became pleasure readers because of the SSR experience, and whether they still considered themselves to be pleasure readers one year later, at the time they took the questionnaire. Table 1 combines the responses for the pre and post-questionnaires.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reader</th>
<th>not reader</th>
<th>% reader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before SSR sessions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After SSR sessions</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One year later (currently)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Do you consider yourself to be a reader?

Subjects were asked how many books they had read in the year since SSR was completed. Of the twenty five (25) who answered this question, six (6) said they read no books and nine (9) said they had read only one. Nine (9) read from two to five books and one (1) subject reported reading more than ten books.

Subjects were also asked the reasons for not reading more during the year, but only four subjects responded to this question. They mentioned lack of time because of the pressure of examinations, as well as the lack of books of interest other than books from the Sweet Valley series. The good news is that ten (38%) of these students did maintain a reading habit for a full year after their SSR experience.

The other questions on the post-questionnaire are listed in appendix A, along with details about responses. A summary of post-questionnaire results is presented in table 2. Students clearly valued the SSR time, felt that the reading experience reduced their anxiety about reading, increased their motivation to read and their reading ability, and they said they would use SSR in the English classes they were preparing to teach. Of great interest is the finding that they felt that reading Sweet Valley books helped improve their conversational English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How was the SSR time?</td>
<td>1 = not at all, 5 = very good</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After SSR sessions, did you feel less stress about reading?</td>
<td>1 = not at all, 5 = very much</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After SSR sessions, were you more motivated to read?</td>
<td>1 = not at all, 5 = very much</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After reading Sweet Valley books, were you more motivated to read?</td>
<td>1 = not at all, 5 = very much</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you include SSR in your teaching?</td>
<td>1 = not at all, 5 = definitely</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did reading Sweet Valley books help your conversational English?</td>
<td>1 = not at all, 5 = very much</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Can narrow reading like the Sweet Valley series improve reading comprehension?  
1 = not at all, 5 = very much 4.35

Will you encourage your students to read series books?  
1 = not at all, 5 = very much 4.71

Table 2. Summary of post-questionnaire results

Conclusion

The major hypothesis of this study appeared to be confirmed: Providing access to interesting and comprehensible books and time to read resulted in a clear growth in interest in reading, even though the treatment consisted only of five sessions.

One year later, however, the number of students who considered themselves to be readers in English dropped considerably. Also, the amount of reading done over the year after the SSR program ended was not impressive: Nine of the ten who said they were readers during the year after SSR reported that they read no more than five books during the year.

The conditions indicated by Cho and Krashen (2016) that lead to the establishment of a reading habit were present during the time SSR was done, but we do not know to what extent they were present the following year. Most likely, they were not fully met.

An interesting result is that subjects felt that reading Sweet Valley novels helped them with conversation, a major concern of EFL students.

Finally, subjects were enthusiastic about doing SSR with their students when they become English teachers themselves. One hopes that they will make sure that their students will have time to read, will have access to interesting material, and will be able to select their own reading material while they are doing SSR in school and also long after the SSR program has been completed.

Acknowledgment: This paper was supported by the Busan National University of Education in Korea (2016).
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**APPENDICES**

**Appendix A: Results of the post-questionnaire**

1. How was the SSR time? (n = 25)
   - I didn't like it at all: 0
   - Not good: 0
   - Moderately good: 1 (4%)
   - Good: 8 (32%)
   - Very Good: 16 (64%)
   - Mean = 4.44 out of 5

2. After the SSR sessions, did you feel less stress about reading English books? (n = 25)
   - Not at all: 0
   - No: 0
   - Moderately: 3 (12%)
   - Yes: 14 (56%)
   - Very much: 8 (32%)
   - Mean = 4.2 out of 5

3. After the SSR sessions, were you more motivated to read? (n = 25)
   - Not at all: 0
   - No: 0
   - Moderately: 4 (15%)
   - Yes: 11 (42%)
   - Very Much: 10 (40%)
   - Mean = 4.24

Questions 4-6 were asked only of those who read books from the Sweet Valley series (n = 25)

4. After reading books from the Sweet Valley series, were you more motivated
to read?
Not at all: 0
No: 0
Moderately: 3 (12%)
Yes: 10 (40%)
Very much: 12 (48%)
Mean = 4.36

5. If given enough time and enough books, would you include SSR time in your elementary school teaching?
Not at all: 0
No: 0
Possibly: 1 (4%)
Yes: 6 (24%)
Very much: 18 (72%)
Mean = 4.68

6. Do you think that reading the Sweet Valley books helps your conversational English? (n = 24)
Not at all: 0
No: 0
Moderately: 3 (13%)
Yes: 6 (25%)
Very much: 15 (63%)
Mean = 4.5

7. Do you think narrow reading like the Sweet Valley series could help improve reading comprehension? (n = 26)
Not at all: 0
No: 0
Moderately: 2 (8%)
Yes: 13 (50%)
Very much: 11 (42%)
Mean = 4.35

8. Will you encourage your students in elementary school to read series books? (n = 24)
Not at all: 0
No: 0
Moderately: 2 (8%)
Yes: 3 (13%)
Very much: 19 (79%)
Mean = 4.71
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Interview with Dr. Bill VanPatten at The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Boston, November, 2016

By Karen Rowan, IJFLT editor

 Incoming AATSP President Bill VanPatten is Professor of Spanish & Second Language Studies at Michigan State University, as well as an Affiliate Faculty Member in the Cognitive Science Program, and the Tea with BVP podcast Co-host

I had the opportunity to sit down with Dr. Bill VanPatten, co-host of Tea with BVP (www.teawithbvp.com a podcast on second language acquisition) and ask him to share his thoughts.

What are the three most important things from Second Language Acquisition theory that you would like to see make their way into classroom practice?

1. Lots of comprehensible input in the classroom

Stop thinking about textbooks and syllabi and think about getting language use going on in class, and by “language use” I mean teachers using as much language, particularly at the early levels, with their students, as possible. So that would be...
creating units around themes and interesting questions that are age, level, and context appropriate. What I might do with a 19-year-old might be different than what I would do with a 12-year-old, but the fundamental idea is the same: that teachers have to use the language in class to communicate ideas, to use what we call “comprehensible input,” so that learners can understand what the teacher is saying.

2. Not talking at students, talking with students

Second, we’re not talking at students, we’re talking with students, so when we talk about teachers providing lots of language and input in the class, we’re not saying you stand up there and talk, we’re saying, you say one or two things and then you get the students involved.

So you might say, “Look at this guy here. His name is Ralph. What do you think? Is he a student or a teacher?” (It will depend on your level, if you recognize those words. They are cognates in Spanish. I teach Spanish and French.)

“What is his name? He’s a student at MSU, right? Is Ralph a typical student? What’s this under his arm? It’s a newspaper. A typical student reads a newspaper? Do you read the newspaper? No. Do you read the newspaper? No. How do you get your news? The internet?”

So the idea is that you are never talking at students. Students are always involved with you. Even though they give you yes/no, shouting out one word, or whatever they are so actively engaged with you that they are paying attention to everything that you do. And so that’s an important part of the flip side, what we call an appropriate level of interaction. Students have to be engaged and interacting with the teacher.

3. Let purpose and tasks drive what we do and inform how we design units and lessons

The third thing I’d want teachers to walk away with is that when we talk about using language in class, we want to be as purposeful as possible. In the sense that when people talk in real life they talk for a reason, even if they gossip they gossip for a reason. So for example, we’re right now talking, Karen. We’re talking for a reason, and you have a task at hand, which is to get me to answer some questions and my task is to provide some information so that you can convert it into something for [IJFLT]. We have a purpose.

Then we go out tonight and we have drinks and we start to say, “What did you think about the conference?” and we start evaluating the conference. We have a
purpose because we’re trying to find out what we think about the conference. So language use and communication in real life is always purposeful. So how can we get purpose in the classroom? We can’t always. But the more we try to do that the more our students see our classes as places where communication happens as opposed to language practice, so I always advocate trying to think of some kind of tasks that we can build our curriculum around and inform what we do. And tasks can be broadly defined. By “tasks,” I don’t mean pair work. Interview your partner and find out what he did last night. That’s not a task. That’s just a language practice activity.

We need things where people are getting information from each other because they are going to use that information for something.

So even with, like, TPRS [TPR Storytelling®], you’re building a story. That’s a task. The story has a beginning, middle, and end. So we’re going to create a story. That’s a task. Or we’re going to fill out this form. Or we’re going to get information from each other and then compare ourselves to this age-normed thing between these ages, 10-15, 15-120. So we’re always getting information to do something. How can we make language use in the class purposeful?

What should administrators, supervisors, or observers be looking for in a language classroom?

[Regarding] acquisition-based teaching evaluation at the college level or K-12, these [are the five criteria on which] I base observation of my teachers at Michigan State:

1. The teacher understands the role of input in the classroom
2. The quality of the input is appropriate for this level
3. The teacher understands the limited role of output at this level
4. The teacher understands the nature of tasks
5. The teacher appropriately limits the use of the textbook in the classroom

(For more on this topic, listen to Tea with BVP - Episode 39: Live from MIWLA: Educating our Administrators)

This interview was followed immediately by Tea with BVP - Live From ACTFL 2016! (http://www.teawithbvp.com/#tea-with-bvp-section)
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Non-Targeted Comprehensible Input: How it Works for My Students and Me

By Justin Slocum Bailey

Indwelling Language

Justin Slocum Bailey has been helping people of all ages acquire Latin, German, and sometimes other languages since 2005. He operates Indwelling Language (http://indwellinglanguage.com/), a collection of resources and practices for boosting teachers’ and learners’ joy and success. Justin serves on the board and faculty of the North American Institute for Living Latin Studies and devotes much of his time to supporting 21st-century Latin learners through the Latin Listening Project, LIMEN—A Latin Teaching Portal, and the Quomodo Dicitur? Podcast. Justin thrives on jujutsu and lolling lakeside with his family.

Stephen Krashen’s (2013) article “The Case for Non-Targeted, Comprehensible Input” gave a name to an approach I had seen work in my classes and, along with his (2015) lecture “TPRS: Contributions, Problems, New Frontiers, and Issues,” has provided me and many colleagues with a framework for deeper understanding of our practices. Inspired by the success I have observed in my and my colleagues’ students with contexts rich in non-targeted comprehensible input (CI), this article explores non-targeted CI from several angles: what it is, why one would or wouldn’t pursue it, what it can look like in a classroom, aids and obstacles to implementing it, and its effects on me and my students. Although I’ll summarize the theoretical basis for non-targeted CI, this article is not academic. I
leave full discussion of the theory to others, focusing instead on practical ways to plan, use, and enjoy non-targeted CI.

**What non-targeted CI is**

Non-targeted CI is simply comprehensible input that is provided because of its compellingness to a particular learner or group of learners, or to fulfill a current communicative need, rather than because it showcases or abounds in a certain feature of a language. Non-targeted CI can involve discussing students’ interests and opinions, reading or viewing content that especially interests students (perhaps selected by students individually), inventing stories with students, or interacting about anything that happens to come up that elicit strong reactions from students.

In an important way, non-targeted CI is actually very much targeted. But its primary target is the interests of specific learners; the bits of language involved in the process are determined (1) by the present desire to communicate about these interests and (2) by the language itself, i.e., by the fact that certain words and word-relationships necessarily come up frequently whenever someone uses a given language. By contrast, a language-targeting approach determines in advance the order in which students ought to learn elements of a language and then, ideally, exposes students to the next element in as engaging a way as possible.

**What non-targeted CI is not**

A non-targeted approach’s emphasis on present interest and relevance does not mean…

1. …*that the input does not abound in certain features of the language.* Non-targeted input still offers many encounters with words and language features that frequently occur in the language in general and with words that are central to the point or plot of the input.

2. …*that the input is unsheltered.* A teacher or writer can avoid unknown vocabulary, for instance, without targeting other vocabulary. Sheltering (guarding against the introduction of too many new words in a short time) is a crucial skill in a non-targeted approach.

3. …*that the input is random.* On the contrary, content selection and the sheltering of vocabulary involve continuous responsiveness to students’ interests, comprehension, and contributions.
4. …that teachers who use non-targeted CI “just talk” or abandon their hard-earned teaching skills. Theoretically, non-targeted CI could involve just talking about whatever in a way that students understood, but the efficiency of non-targeted CI in a classroom comes in no small part from clearly establishing meaning (making sure students know what a word or phrase means), steadfastly observing classroom procedures, speaking at an appropriate rate and level, checking for comprehension, repeating things when necessary for comprehension, and eliciting details and other ideas from students in efficient ways.

**Why not target?**

Why not just target, in as interesting a way as possible, whatever language we want our students to learn? Among the reasons that Krashen highlights are the impossibility of forcing acquisition and the risk of omitting the very language elements that a given learner is most ready to acquire (2013:102-103). There is no way to know exactly what a given learner, let alone each member of a group of learners, is ready to acquire, and the odds of everyone’s being ready to acquire the same thing at the same time are slim. So we cast a wide (but comprehensible!) net, increasing both the likelihood that the input will contain something that a given student is ready to acquire and the likelihood that words and features of the language will be re-encountered according to their importance.

Krashen emphasizes that targeting should not be necessary: “Given enough comprehensible input, i+1 (all the vocabulary and structures the student is ready for) is automatically provided” (2013:105). The high-frequency words and language features that many thoughtful language programs target will, by definition, occur frequently in content and communication on a wide range of subjects, whether a teacher consciously targets those features or not.

A risk of targeting mentioned both by Krashen and by many teachers who discuss non-targeted CI is that, even if we give great attention to students’ interests while targeting specific language, in practice, highly conscious targeting may involve an unintentional sacrifice of buy-in. It can be hard to have interactions that students consider worth their while if we’re concerned about making sure students hear a given word 70 times during the class period. It’s not impossible—some teachers manage to do both, which is a skill practiced, for instance, during training in Blaine Ray’s TPR Storytelling® (TPRS)—but the risk is there.

**What does non-targeted CI look like in the classroom?**

It doesn’t have to look like anything in particular, as long as students understand what they hear and read and want to keep listening or reading, but it’s nice to have some models of how it can look.
Krashen suggests two main schemes for creating environments rich in non-targeted input: “Expanded TPR” and Sheltered Subject Matter Instruction. For expanded TPR, he mentions “yoga instruction, self-defense, dance, magic tricks, juggling, cooking.” For Sheltered Subject Matter Instruction, Krashen lists “music, popular literature, SLA theory, linguistics” (2015:6-7). (The fact that Krashen, a pianist, avid reader, and linguist, has these particular topics on his shortlist highlights the role of personal interest in non-targeted instruction!) My own implementation of non-targeted CI includes these two schemes, but also the TPRS staples of Personalized Question and Answer (PQA), Storyasking, and reading (both class-created and self-selected), as well as sheltered conversation about anything that turns out to be of relevance or interest to a particular group of students in a particular moment.

**My variations and follow-up on expanded TPR**

In addition to the spiced-up TPR topics Krashen mentions, I’ve used dance, origami, making Harry Potter wands, party games, party tricks, and guided walks around the school, the block, or a nearby park. I’m pondering the use of video games, memory tricks, knots, and outdoor survival techniques for expanded TPR based on the interests of certain groups. Linear procedures—a repeated sequence of actions, for instance, or step-by-step instructions—tend to work well, because they involve a limited amount of vocabulary, much of which is naturally repeated, and students listen for understanding in order to be able to follow or complete the action.

The comprehensible input in these activities comes from describing the action or teaching the steps in the target language (TL) while sheltering vocabulary and repeating as necessary, from asking personalized questions, and from Storyasking that may grow out of the answers to personalized questions. Here is an example:

Let’s say you find out that Olivia is an origami master. You ask follow-up questions in the TL— with whom does she like to do origami, what does she like to fold, since when has she been doing origami, etc. You find out that Olivia makes a mean origami ferret. Sometime between this class and the next you ask her to show you the steps involved in folding an origami ferret and you develop some ideas about how to describe these steps with vocabulary already known to the students and two or three new words. During the next class, Olivia comes up and slowly demonstrates the steps while you narrate the instructions in the TL and ask her and the class questions about what is going on. The other students can follow her example and your instructions in order to make their own origami ferrets. By the end of this segment, you have a bevy of origami ferrets. At this point, you see if any of this might lead to a TPR Story. You can elicit details...
about one of the freshly folded ferrets (what is it called? how does it feel? what
does it like to do?) until a problem emerges that the ferret wants to solve. You can
elicit information on students’ feelings vis-à-vis ferrets until a problem emerges
that could be solved in a co-created story. The best ferret could become a popular,
recurring character in subsequent stories. The ferret might remain on a classroom
shelf all year as evidence of its folder’s prowess and as inspiration for further
conversations and quirky-skill-demonstrations.

Along with these possibilities and the conversation starters mentioned below,
extensive student-selected reading (“Free Voluntary Reading”) and listening may
be the most efficient sources of interest-targeting input. I recommend cultivating a
classroom library with books of many genres, at many levels, as well as an
annotated list of online material for reading, listening, and viewing. You can set
students on a long-term, joyful language-learning journey by providing them with
opportunities, early and often, to consume TL content that they themselves have
chosen based on their interests and level.

Planning for non-targeted CI

Here is my basic approach:

1a. Find out what students are interested in at the moment or in general.
1b. Be alert to news, pictures, cultural phenomena, minor controversies, etc., that
   students may not yet be aware of but will be intrigued by long enough for
   personalized conversation to get going.

2. Find, foster, or co-create vocab-sheltered content and interactions, whether
general conversation or Storyasking, about those interesting things.

Putting this into practice involves:

1. Getting to know my students continuously. Yes, I use student interest surveys
   and personal interviews, but I also want to constantly learn about what is on my
   students’ minds and what issues are immediately relevant, whether a school play,
dance, or sporting event, things happening in other classes, surprising news, a gift
that a student has received, a student’s recent accomplishment, or even something
that happens outside the window during class. I do this by chatting with students
in and out of class and, where relevant, attending their games and performances.

2. Determining a question or other quirky conversation starter. Ideally, students
   would always make clear as they are entering class what interactions would be
   most compelling to them on that day, and you might institute a routine that helps
students do so. But sometimes there just isn’t pressing news or a particular
interest that students are eager to share. So I usually have a conversation starter
ready—a personal question, a quirky picture, a mysterious package, an optical
illusion, a riddle, an event from “this day in history,” or a challenge. These might or might not relate to a particular piece of content (text, film, song) that students will encounter.

The conversation starter just needs to be interesting enough for us to get around to a question, answer, or observation that takes interest to the next level and leads to further conversation or Storyasking.

3. Techniques for flow. In order for non-targeted interactions to go smoothly, my students and I rely on procedures for maximizing comprehension, comfort, and the smoothness of interaction throughout class. The hundreds(!) of techniques involved (often cued by gestures or supported by assigned student jobs) include speaking slowly, repeating on request, establishing meaning, writing on the board, and “making lemonade”—turning an obstacle or surprise such as tech failure, a distracting noise, or a classroom visitor from a mere interruption into a driving force in our TL interaction. This can be done by talking factually about the issue (“Oh, no, the computer is broken! Has your computer ever broken at a bad time? What did you do?”) or invoking imagination (“What’s that noise outside? No, it’s not annoying road construction… That’s right, it’s an alien spaceship landing! Why is it landing here, of all places? What do the aliens want?).

4. Reverse planning and “make-up targeting.” Often I’m under external pressure to give my students the best shot at success in dealing with a particular text or test. Even then, my interactions with students are generally interest-targeting rather than language-targeting, because I think that this will ultimately do the most good for students’ acquisition of and long-term relationship with the language. But our students are sometimes called on to cope with texts beyond their proficiency or with tests that are not linguistically or pedagogically sound. In anticipation of such a text or test, I use “make-up targeting,” by which I identify, during the weeks before the task in question, what words or language features students have not yet sufficiently encountered in order to succeed in reading or testing. Then I ensure, usually through PQA, Storyasking, and the resulting readings, that these words and language features occur at a higher-than-usual density in our interactions during those weeks.

I can usually tell at a glance what trouble my students are likely to have with a text or test, but I can make the process a bit more scientific by “reverse planning” or “descriptive planning”: after every class session, starting from the very first of the term, I create a record of whatever bits of language seem to have been most central to that day’s interactions. Often I identify these by asking students, “What words or phrases did we use the most today? What seems most memorable or useful?” I create a physical record by taking a picture of the board and/or jotting some notes in Evernote. Then, if I want to plan make-up targeting before a text or
test, I can cross-reference the language of the test or text with the lists created by my reverse planning. Similarly, if I myself need to create a text or test for my students, I can draw on the record of what language has come up most often or seemed most noteworthy to students. The record is also informative for my students’ future teachers.

5. Preparing myself as a teacher, as opposed to “planning a lesson.” The freedom and the self-generating nature of an interest-targeting approach have made my life a lot better. Finding or creating content that showcases specific features of a language is a hassle even when it’s fairly easy, and it’s often quite hard—witness the number of requests one sees for “a movie with lots of infinitives” or “a story showing the difference between savoir and connaître.” Because I’m confident that the frequent features of a language are likely to come up no matter what, and I know that I can make-up target whatever doesn’t, I can spend my prep time boosting my own proficiency by reading/listening/viewing, exploring TL content that my students may enjoy, reading about teaching and about second language acquisition, and being on the lookout for news and other sources of high-investment conversation. In other words, I can do things that I want to do anyway—things that would help no matter what my teaching approach—many of which are the very things that I hope my students will do.

Two good effects

In addition to the benefits that have already come up, I want to emphasize these two:

1. Elimination of the “we haven’t covered that yet” phenomenon. Because it is normal in my classes for words and phrases to come up in order to fulfill communicative needs, and because it is normal for me to establish the meaning of such words and phrases, there is no sense among my students of certain words’ or language features’ having been “covered” and therefore being “fair game” to use or to test, with others not yet having been covered and therefore not being fair game. Beneath such a view lies the problematic assumption that language is a school subject like any other, with discrete lessons that that can be mastered sequentially with hard-enough work, whereas, in fact, language is a basic and wholistic human function in which humans with healthy brains can participate, provided that stress and total cognitive load don’t get in the way.

When a student doesn’t understand a word or phrase that is said or read—whether it’s come up for the first time or for the ninth time—I simply establish the meaning of the word or phrase, or invite another student to. Students don’t get upset at each other or me for using a word they “haven’t learned yet,” and I don’t get upset with them for failing to learn something they “should know.” Students
and I know that they need to understand what they hear or read in order to acquire the language, that it will probably take many meaningful encounters for them to acquire any given element of the language, and that acquisition can’t be forced. Our non-targeted approach has helped students and me take these realities more seriously without worrying about them.

2. Increased joy and success. My students and I were already pretty happy, but we’ve become happier since I started intentionally engaging in non-targeting practices. One sign of this is that almost all my students have remained in my program until graduation, even though this isn’t required and actually prevents them from enjoying a free period or taking electives in other subjects.

Reasons to target

Even teachers who recognize benefits in a non-targeted approach may choose to target. There are lots of reasons for this: You might, like I do sometimes, target in order to prepare students for the reading of specific texts or for too-specific common assessments or standardized tests. You might target because the language you teach has few cognates with your students’ first language, or a non-alphabetic writing system, making it practically impossible for novice learners to comprehend content for which they haven’t been strategically prepared. You might target because not doing so stresses you out. You might target because of uncertainty about your own proficiency in the language. You might target because teaching well involves letting go of so much control already and targets are something to hold on to. You might need to target in order to keep your job.

There are some students whose temperament or educational conditioning leads to a craving for predefined targets, and targeting may be a way of keeping these students’ stress levels down.

If you find yourself targeting language for any of these reasons, I encourage you at least to explore non-targeted CI within the bounds of what is permitted and practical in your setting. Some of the obstacles are not just obstacles to non-targeting, but obstacles to good teaching in general, and are things we are always hoping to improve in ourselves, our students, and our schools. Students, parents, and administrators usually need to be taught the differences between acquiring a language and learning a school subject. We ourselves need to push back judiciously against curriculum or tests that don’t promote our students’ success. We need to practice relinquishing some control and trusting the power of our students’ brains and contributions. We should engage in habits that contribute to our own proficiency in the languages we teach, just as we expect our students to.
Even in a department or district with common exams that cover a bunch of textbook chapters, you may not need to target words in the order or groupings that the textbook does. You can spread out and combine language from different chapters for the sake of more natural conversation or story-creation. If you’re required to test every week or two, students won’t be acquiring the tested material on that schedule anyway; they may be able simply to memorize what they need to in order to beat the test, with the actual acquisition of the language coming on its own schedule as students continue to be exposed to the language.

**The fine line between targeting and not targeting**

In practice, targeting and not targeting may not look that different. The same basic activity or TL content could be part of either a non-targeted (i.e., interest-targeted) approach or a targeted approach. If a teacher shows a scene from *El Internado* to highlight lots of examples of the perfect tense, that’s a targeted approach. If a teacher shows the same scene from *El Internado* because her students can’t get enough of the show and are begging to watch more, that’s a non-targeted approach. If a teacher initiates and directs a conversation about the relative merits of cafeteria lunch and off-campus dining in order to induce lots of repetitions of food terms and comparatives, that’s targeted. If a teacher fosters a conversation on that topic because students walk into class expressing strong feelings about a new campus policy, that’s non-targeted. If a teacher asks a TPR Story about an elf whose pointy ears have dulled in order to get lots of repetitions of *wishes that _____, goes to _____, and rejoices because _____*, that’s targeted. If a teacher asks a similar story because students seemed to be fascinated by an elvish character, decided it had the problem of dulled ears, and sent it on a quest to get them re-sharpened, that’s non-targeted.

There may be a distinction worth making between how new words and phrases come up in the first place (drawn from a list or arising because necessary for a specific task) and how words or phrases are treated in class regardless of how they come up, with a fine line between sheltering, i.e., guarding against the introduction of too many new words, and outright targeting, i.e., studiously reusing a few words or phrases as much as possible in hopes of speeding the acquisition of those words or phrases. And, of course, one can frequently transition between sheltering and outright targeting.

**Conclusion: A funny thing I’ve noticed**

During the last several years I’ve gotten to observe many skilled teachers. Some say they target painstakingly, some say they don’t, and many fall somewhere in between. But I’ve noticed another way in which the line is fine: *the more skilled a teacher becomes at the practices involved in either approach, the harder it is to*
tell the difference. Highly skilled targeters appear to be just going with the flow; the language used in class seems to emerge from the students rather than a prescribed curriculum. And in the classes of highly skilled non-targeters, the conversation is sheltered and purposeful, meaning is clear, and useful language comes up repeatedly.

Ultimately, neither targeting nor non-targeting is guaranteed to work or not to work. People acquire language by understanding it, regardless of how the speaker or writer decided what to say. This is worth keeping in mind as we evaluate and plan our own teaching, as we train and mentor other teachers, and as we share our successes and setbacks with colleagues in person and online. Here’s to scads of CI for our students, however it makes its way to them!

REFERENCES


NEW SPANISH BOOK!

Don Quijote, el último caballero is a novel for intermediate and advanced beginners in the Fluency Fast series of readers. It uses a vocabulary of fewer than 200 different Spanish words to tell a 1,400 word story in the present tense and the same story also in the past tense. It is repetitive and simple and uses many cognates to make the story comprehensible to adults and children. The stories are intentionally written to be acted out in class, but also to serve as independent reading in either the present or past tense.

Don Quijote, el último caballero is an amusing, ironic and - at the same time - tragic story. Don Quijote is an ordinary Spaniard with an extraordinary imagination who believes he must achieve great feats to honor a lady. He falls in love with a waitress that he considers to be the ideal lady. He and his companion Sancho Panza have adventures in which Don Quijote is always mistaken about what he finds along the way while Sancho sees what is really there. The story is based on Miguel de Cervantes’ The Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote of La Mancha, published in the 17th Century. Many consider it to be the best book of fiction ever written.
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Moviemaking in a Comprehensible Input (CI) classroom is a highly effective and fun application of TPRS/CI strategies that engages the entire class. It’s fast paced, collaborative and provides a framework for the material that reaches all types of student styles and interests.

I love making movies with my classes almost as much as they do. It draws on the varied strengths and multiple talents available in every student. The process can be interactive and engaging for just about every single student in the class. Some classmates are natural performers (our superstars). Some students are techies with no interest in being in front of the camera, but shine from behind it! Even those whose “role” is as an audience member are vital to the moviemaking and language acquisition process.

Movies, at their heart, are stories told through dynamic dialog. The keys to successful moviemaking in a CI class are to make that dynamic dialog
comprehensible for the students while maintaining a process that keeps it compelling for everyone.

TPR Moviemaking follows closely the common steps found in any TPR Storytelling activity:

- Target the vocabulary/structures (Establish the Meaning)
- Propose collaborative context by developing the script (Spoken Story)
- Refine, assimilate and apply target structures in rehearsal and performance (Reading – also speaking and listening)

However, where traditional TPRS “Spoken Story” is more a conduit to explore the target structures, TPR Moviemaking relies on creating a strong story with the students and then using that story to build and reinforce a comprehensive script.

**TPR Moviemaking: The Steps**

1. Establish the Story Arc (Storyboarding)
2. Establish the Characters
3. Write a group script
4. Rehearse
5. Perform
6. Record

There is a natural activity overlap to the steps, which lends itself to 3 days of work. Because of that overlap, it’s important to think about the process by step, rather than by day. Different classes (or stories) may need more time or less time to complete one or another step in the process, so a typical schedule plan would look like this:

Day 1 – Determine Story (storyboard)  
\   
   Establish Characters  
/  
Day 2 -- Write Final Script  
\   
   Rehearse  
/  
Day 3 – Perform/ Record  
\   
   Show Time

**Start with a Story**
Stories, whether for storytelling or moviemaking, generally follow the same step progression. In moviemaking, these steps are called “beats” and they make up the main plot points that bring a story to the end.

1. Introduce the characters.
2. Introduce the problem.
3. The problem gets worse – *uh oh*...
4. The problem gets even worse – *oh no*!
5. Solution – *whew*!

**Establish the Story Arc**

Goal: Develop a story that can be presented in the TL using comprehensible input.

*Las Calles de Pamplona* is a story idea that I used with my class. We had talked about the Running of the Bulls in Pamplona, Spain. The festival presented a great opportunity for a movie. Here is the story arc, created collaboratively between me and my students, with the beats.

1. Introduction of characters: two bored middle-school students are in a very boring class (not language class – another unnamed class). They fall asleep.
2. Introduction of problem: they wake up in a café in Spain. There is only a waiter in the restaurant. No other people. The students ask for a table outside and the waiter is shocked. The waiter explains about the festival that is happening right now. The students don’t believe the waiter and want an outside table anyway.

The students step outside and they are in middle of the Running of the Bulls They run for their lives.
3. Uh-oh: they turn right to avoid the bulls. They are confronted by monsters. (I always take pictures of my students in their Halloween costumes so I have a stock of still monster pictures). The bulls keep coming.
4. Oh-no!: they throw everything they have that is red at the bulls. The bulls keep coming.
5. Whew!: back in school, the frustrated teacher throws books at the sleeping students’ desks. The students wake up and decide they love school.

**Establish the Characters**

Goal: Use TL to establish motivations and dialog for story characters
Our Running of the Bulls movie has four main characters: two students, waiter and teacher, as well as “extras” of other runners in the street and “cameos” of monsters.

I form groups of two or three students. Each student group is assigned a character from the text. I keep groups small so in a large class multiple groups might have the same character. That is fine. Student groups answer the following TL questions about their character:

1. Who is your character?
2. Give a single adjective describing the character. Be creative. (If I am making a movie from something we read in class, the students have to justify their adjective with a line from the text.)
3. Write a single sentence describing your character’s problem.
4. What kinds of phrases could the character say to express what he or she wants?

After individual groups have finished the character questions, we have a class discussion. We use the Character Chart below during the class discussion to guide the conversation. All students are expected to record their notes on the chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>What are the character’s problem or motivation?</th>
<th>What are some expressions the character might use to get what they want?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td>1 – bored at school</td>
<td>–I hate school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afraid</td>
<td>2 – afraid of the bulls</td>
<td>–Help!! Run!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grateful</td>
<td>3 – grateful to be back in school</td>
<td>–Whew, I love school!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>frustrated</td>
<td>Students fall asleep</td>
<td>–Pay Attention!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiter</td>
<td>shocked</td>
<td>Two people want to eat outside during the Running of the Bulls</td>
<td>–Do you want a table?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>–Are you crazy?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Character Chart

Now we all agree on who the characters are, what the characters need or want and some ideas about what they can say to get what they want. We are ready to start writing our script.

Write the Group Script

Goal: Write a complete script in TL
I sit down in front of the class with my laptop projecting my screen so the class can see what I write. The students are required to write by hand what I type. I will be collecting their script as part of their assessment for this project. We, my students and I, write the script together. I try to keep each beat short; three or four lines. Students give me ideas of what each characters, and I accept, reject, or change their suggestions.

I print out copies of my script for the students to use the next day. That way, even though they have all written the script, the students have a correct, complete script to work with for rehearsals and performance.

**Rehearse**

Goal: Read, speak and listen to TL scripts

Everyone rehearses, even non-actors. We break into small groups with only the group members watching. This promotes a safe space for the students who may be less comfortable performing in front of the class. The rehearsal process is critical to student script comprehension. By the time we record our movie every student in the class has read, spoken and heard the lines of the script multiple times. That means when we watch our film, every student will understand the entire dialog of the movie.

All groups are rehearsing independently while I supervise.

**Rehearsal One – Table Read**

Student Groups assign individual character roles from the script to the members of the group. Students sit and read their assigned roles out loud.

**Rehearsal Two – Stand and Speak**

Students switch character roles. (Student #1 becomes The Waiter, etc.) Students stand and read their assigned roles out loud.

**Rehearsal Three - ACT**

Students switch roles again. Students should move and ACT as they read their lines. Acting means adding emotion, movement, and a little drama.

All groups are rehearsing simultaneously. By changing character roles and progressively intensifying each reading repetition (rehearsal) the students stay interested and on task.
Students have been instructed that if they finish their reading of the script before I change the instructions, they need to start reading again.

**Performance & Recording**

Goal: Produce short film in TL requiring coordinated engagement of the TL material.

Students choose whether they want to be an actor, extra, tech support or audience. Everyone has to be something.

Actors – Actors are volunteers. I have never had a class where no one wants to perform. The rehearsal process has made students comfortable speaking the script and many students seem to be ready to take the acting challenge.

Extras – Extras are students who want to perform, but not speak. I videotape extras reacting to the story.

*Example* - A fork drops in a restaurant. I video shocked looks on the faces of the extras. Overacting is encouraged.

Tech support – Tech support jobs help involve more students in the movie who don’t want to perform. How much you use tech support is your choice.

Possible Tech support jobs:

- **Executive Producer/ Director:** Usually me.
- **Videographer:** A very reliable person to videotape. I choose who videotapes.
- **Teleprompter:** I project the typed script onto the wall opposite the performers. One tech student scrolls the script on the computer as the actors perform so the character lines are always showing.
- **Assistant Director.** Sits next to the videographer and watches the video screen. Counts down the actors to action (in TL - 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 and action!) and then makes sure that everyone is in the shot. The actors watch the counter closely. If the counter makes a motion for them to move right or left, they move.
- **Lighting Tech:** Turns lights off and on.
- **Set Decorators:** Draw the background of the movie on the board.
- **Sound Effects:** Makes sound effects during the scenes.
- **Titles and Credits:** Creates credit signs to show at the end of the movie.

Audience – I push the classroom desks away from where the actors are performing to create audience seating. I tell the audience they have to be quiet
because the microphone will record anything they say. The key to keeping the
audience engaged is to keep the actors moving. I tell them where to stand and then
we record. Remember, these students have already rehearsed many times. There is
novelty to the entire recording process that keeps the audience interested.

Editing – I use a free app called Adobe Premiere Clip. It works on Apple products
(Mac, iPad, iPhone) and Android (tablets and phones). I have found this app to be
the easiest editing system out there. Sometimes I edit and sometimes a student
will. It just depends on how much more time I want to give to the project. Total
editing time for “En las Calles de Pamplona” took about 10 minutes per class
production to edit. You can find Adobe Premiere Clip here:

Show Time – Watching the Movie

Goal – watching compelling, comprehensible TL input.

Making a movie is fun. Watching a movie you made with your classmates is
great. Watching other classes’ movies when you know the performers, and
understand the scripts is even better. Together, my classes and I have produced a
short film (3–4 minutes) in the target language that is grammatically accurate,
school appropriate, and with vocabulary that is comprehensible and
compelling to

Grades and Assessments

This is a CLASS project. As long as the student has completed every required
part, he or she will earn full credit.

The student requirements are to:

- Participate in the initial group script development
- Answer initial character questions (group discussion).
- Complete a character chart (on paper).
- Write the complete script.
- Rehearse in groups.
- Be an actor, extra, tech support or audience member during production.

TPR Moviemaking is a full class activity that promotes a positive, cooperative
learning environment. It is a project you and your students can accomplish and
truly enjoy together.

Have fun.
Novellas, TPR Books & Software
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Authors:
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A Middle Schooler Acquires Chinese (Mostly) on Her Own
By Pu-mei Leng

Pu-mei Leng has been teaching Mandarin as second language for secondary schools since 2005. She currently teaches high school Mandarin at the McDonogh School in Owings Mills, Maryland.

Chloe is currently a ninth grader and a bilingual speaker of English and French who suddenly became interested in Mandarin and made spectacular progress on her own, with very little help from native speakers or teachers.

I met Chloe when I was a supervisor on a short school trip for American students to China and Chloe was in grade six. She had completed about six months of instruction in Mandarin which was done in the traditional way, with very limited oral or aural exposure.

It was clear that Chloe was very interested in the language and in China itself. While she was in China, she kept a notebook, wrote down the signs she saw, and kept notes in English about the places she visited. She also practiced using the small amount of Chinese she knew.

At the end of the academic year, both Chloe and I left the United States. I took a job teaching Mandarin in Hong Kong, and Chloe's family moved to another city. Aware of her deep interest in Chinese and China, before she left I gave her 10 books and 10 movies in Chinese, in case she could not find a Chinese class. Two years later, we were both back in the United States. Chloe's mother asked me to tutor Chloe in Chinese because her interest was still very strong.

Her competence in Chinese was astonishing. At first, I spoke slowly and used simple vocabulary, but it was clear that her Chinese ability was far beyond that of a young person who had had only one year of a traditional Chinese class in school. During our sessions, we talked about the news, the election, and a film she had seen, and she understand nearly everything, even though there were words here and there that she didn't know. When she spoke, it was slow, but fluent.

I discovered how she did it. She had very limited instruction from a tutor for four months, about once a week, using traditional methodology, toward the end of her two years in another city. But more importantly, Chloe told me that she watched the Chinese movies I had given her over and over and read the books many times. She had no other contact with Chinese until her sessions with the tutor at the end...
of her stay. After she started meeting with her tutor, she learned how to download more Chinese movies and cartoons from the internet. The movies were subtitled in Chinese and she got help from her tutor in reading and understanding the characters.

I did not administer any formal test to Chloe, but it was evident to me, a teacher of Mandarin, that she had acquired an impressive amount of Chinese—far more than any student with only one and a half years of traditional instruction.

Chloe did it the hard way—by finding meaning in what must have been, at first, incomprehensible input. But her determination and patience paid off.
I had the opportunity to sit down with Blaine Ray, inventor of TPR Storytelling® at ACTFL in Boston, November 2016, to ask him:

What are the three most important points that you would like to see make their way into classroom practice?

1. No Unnecessary Testing

I love SWCOLT Teacher of the Year Darcy Pippins’s idea: “Assess less”.

I love [Dr. Stephen] Krashen’s quote, “Weighing the pig more often will not make it grow faster.” Teachers spend way too much time weighing the pig. Do very minimal assessments that count. We are assessing every second! When we see student hesitation, we’re assessing.

2. Teach Narrow and Deep

The main idea of TPRS is we need to practice less is more. The TPRS mentality means we provide massive amounts of comprehensible input using high frequency vocabulary until each student can demonstrate acquisition and comprehension.

3. Nothing Motivates Like Success (Susan Gross)
The other thing: I would like teachers to have the concept of providing comprehensible input to students until they are not just “getting it”, but they are “so getting it.” There’s a big gap between the feeling of “I am so getting this” and “I’m getting this.” It’s a measure of confidence. It’s “Oh my gosh, this is amazing, because I’m so getting it!”
The Presence of and Demand for Comprehensible Input Sessions at ACTFL, Boston 2016
by Karen Rowan

IJFLT attended The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages in Boston, Massachusetts in November 2016 to conduct interviews and report on the presence of sessions on the topics of Comprehensible Input, TPR Storytelling® and Language Acquisition.

Is there a demand for sessions at ACTFL on Language Acquisition theory and application? Are there sufficient quality sessions to meet that demand?

ACTFL Opening Ceremony, Boston, 2016

ACTFL former Presidents at the opening ceremony, Boston, 2016
CI Sessions that were submitted prior to the January, 2016 submission deadline were self-reported on the Facebook page. Those that were accepted were compiled into a list of recommended sessions teachers wanting to attend TPRS and CI sessions. We were also unable to photograph each CI session, but our experience was similar to those of attendees at other sessions.

Three Teacher of the Year candidates are CI / TPRS teachers. Michele Whaley represented the Pacific Northwest. Darcy Pippins represented the Southwest. Grant Boulanger represented the Central States. Each candidate was initially forwarded by his or her own state organization. Michele Whaley is from Alaska. Darcy Pippins is from Oklahoma. Grant Boulanger is from Minnesota. This is the largest number of Comprehensible Input / TPR Storytelling® teachers to ever be sent to ACTFL as representatives of the regional conferences. Each presented a session at ACTFL, as well.
ACTFL plenary: Myths and facts about second language acquisition and second language teaching

Session Presenters: Dr. Bill VanPatten & Dr. Stephen Krashen
Moderator: Dr. Peter Swanson

“Standing room only in the largest conference room at ACTFL.”
Photo by Diane Neubauer

Dr. Bill VanPatten, Michigan State University
Following this joint session, several participants stayed to request autographs and photos of Stephen Krashen, resulting in a humorous “paparazzi” photo.

Video excerpts of Dr. Krashen’s presentations:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IDy9fXuGBjQ
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=D-HJw6PVr0M
As we attended sessions or tried to gain entry into sessions, the story that emerged was not the one we had originally intended to tell. For a CI teacher wondering if the time and expense of attending ACTFL are justified by the number and quality of CI sessions offered, we found the answer to be yes. Stephen Krashen, Bill VanPatten and Blaine Ray were among the most well-known presenters. In addition, three ACTFL Teacher of the Year candidates also presented CI sessions. The number of CI Teacher of the Year candidates and the presence of Drs Krashen and VanPatten are indicators that ACTFL recognizes the importance of acquisition-based teaching strategies. The demand for the majority of the CI sessions, though, was consistently significantly higher than the number of chairs in the rooms. While we attempted to take pictures from inside of each session, we quite often were only able to get photos from the doorway, as entry was blocked. In one session at which we arrived early, we were told by hotel security that the room was above fire safety capacity.

Putting SLA Principles into Practice
Session Presenters: Dr. Bill VanPatten & Carol Gaab

Dr. Bill VanPatten and Carol Gaab presenting to a full house in an exhibitor session

Conspicuous by its Absence? TPRS and CI in the college methods course
Session Presenter: Carol Dean

This session was a roundtable sharing session. Approximately 20 people were in attendance for all or part of the discussion. The table had chairs for 8-10. After
borrowing chairs, some attendees kneeled around the table. As the session ended, the table was held over for the next session and the conversation continued for a second hour.

**Assessments that guide instruction and reward growth in proficiency**
Session Presenters: Cynthia Hitz & Mrs. Krista Kovalchick, Palmyra Area School District (Thank you to Cynthia Hitz for compiling the list of sessions.)

**What’s the password? Starting class before class**
Roundtable Presenter: Bryce Hedstrom, Roosevelt High School

**TPRS in the FLES Classroom:** Use TPRS in Your Elementary Classroom Tomorrow
Session Presenters: Molly Bruno, Elvira Colmenero, Rocio Jacoby, Margaret Poleski

**Impacting Fluency with Listen & Draw, Roleplaying, and TPR + Story**
Session Presenters: Haiyun Lu, Blaine Ray

*Blaine Ray and Haiyun Lu about to begin. Participants are seated on the floor.*
Canela: a movie unit for Spanish 1
Session Presenter: Kara Jacobs, Governor Wentworth School District

Party Like it’s MMXVI: The Fun and the Fruit of 21st Century Latin Teaching
Session Presenter: Justin Slocum Bailey, North American Institute for Living Latin Studies

Justin Slocum Bailey’s session for Latin teachers attracted teachers of all languages and there were no available seats. Justin’s article is at the beginning of the Teacher to Teacher section.

Moviemaking with Sr. Wooly: How to Make your Own Videos Amazing
Session Presenters: *Jim Wooldridge, Señor Wooly, LLC & Kelly Ferguson*, LaFollette High School

**Reading Proficiency: Online Self-Assessment (Russian example)**
Session presenter: *Michele Whaley (PNCFL TOY) & Jane Shuffelton*

**Creating Impact with iPads**
Session presenter: *Theresa Schenker, Yale University & Angelika Kraemer, MSU (Co-host-of TeawithBVP.com)*

**The Art of Unpacking a Short Novel: Teaching with Comprehensible Input**
Session presenter: *Anna Matheson*

**The Compelling Input Hypothesis And The Evolution Of Teaching Methods**
Paper Presenter: *Stephen Krashen, USC School Of Education*

**Teaching Latin With The ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines: It Can Be Done!**
Session Presenter: *Rachel Ash & Elissabeth Legendre*

**One Goal, One Sequence, Ten Powerful Lessons**
Session Presenter: *Carol Gaab*

**Powerhouse CI Strategies**
Presenters: *Carol Gaab & Kristy Placido*
Making A World Of Difference: Engaging Students Globally And Locally
Session Presenter: Carrie Toth, Carlyle High School

How To Teach A Novel
Session Presenter: Darcy Pippins

Darcy Pippins, SWCOLT TOY and representative of the Oklahoma Foreign Language Association
Waiting for Darcy Pippins’ Novel session to begin

Darcy Pippins, SWCOLT’s article on Teaching for the AP exam with TPRS appeared in the May, 2016 issue of IJFLT.
ImpactFL Voices: Languages Beyond The Classroom  
Moderator: Juan Carlos Morales, Miami Dade College  
Session Presenters:  
Lynn Sessler Neitzel, Clovis Grove Elementary; Carrie Toth, Carlyle High School; Joshua Cabral, Brookwood School

Breakout EDU: Immersive Learning Games For The World Language Classroom  
Session Presenter: Leslie Davison, Summit School District

Tea With BVP 3:00 – 4:00 P.M.

Tea With BVP, live from ACTFL 2016  www.teawithbvp.com

Group photo after TeaWithBVP became the cover photo for the IJFLT CI Facebook page. www.facebook.com/groups/IFLTNTPRSCITEACHING/
Well-kept Secrets Textbook Publishers Don’t Want You To Know
Session Presenters: Dr. Stephen Krashen & Carol Gaab

Sprouting A Garden – Simple Steps To Grow A Comprehensible Input Classroom
Session Presenters: Brigitte Kahn, Massapequa School District & Janice Kincaid, Massapequa Public Schools

Storytelling 101:
How To Create Comprehensible Stories For Young Learners
Session Presenters: Rebecca Collora & Niki Tottingham

Chinese Literacy: Cold Character Reading In The Three Communicative Modes Session Presenters: Reid Wyatt, Canterbury School

From Compelling Commercials To Comprehensible Input
Session Presenter: Kristy Placido, Fowlerville High School

Putting The Big C (Communication) Back Into Immersion Programs
Session Presenters: Gayle Westerberg & Leslie Davison

Content-based Storytelling: Redefining K-8 Learner Outcomes
Session Presenter: Barbara Cartford, Janice Kittok, Karen Lichtman

Shifting To A Much Needed Proficiency-based Grading System
“Assessments That Guide Instruction And Reward Growth In Proficiency”
Session Presenter: Lance Piantaggini, Independent Scholar

Making Movie Clips Comprehensible For Cultural Impact
Session Presenters: Diane Neubauer, Pumei Leng & Haiyun Lu

Creating Culture: Speaking Before They Can
Session Presenter: Grant Boulanger (Central States TOY) & Robert Patrick
As ACTFL came to a close on Sunday and the halls emptied and attendance at sessions became typically sparse, this session by Grant Boulanger did not have an empty chair. Resources from this session were posted here: http://www.grantboulanger.com/free-stuff/

If this is a trend at ACTFL, and sessions on the topics of language acquisition, Teaching with Comprehensible Input and TPR Storytelling® continue to increase and the acceptance rate of CI sessions increases, ACTFL may become a valuable resource for CI teachers. Unfortunately, many of these sessions were in competing time slots, making it difficult to attend more of them. It may also be time for teachers to consider creating an ACTFL Special Interest Group. The number of Teacher of the Year candidates and the presence of Dr. Stephen Krashen and Dr. Bill VanPatten by itself was of great value. Many sessions on the practical application of language acquisition theory to the classroom are needed to meet the demand of the teachers in attendance and seeking those resources. IJFLT would like to encourage presenters to contribute articles to the Teacher to Teacher section of IJFLT to share their ideas with an even wider audience. We look forward to ACTFL, 2017 in Nashville, Tennessee.
To submit articles for review, send them by attachment to ijflteditor@gmail.com

Found a helpful link or interesting website that should be shared with other teachers? Have an idea for an article or something that works in your classroom? Want to let teachers know about upcoming state language conferences, workshops or trainings? Send us an email at ijflteditor@gmail.com.

IJFLT is a free, on-line journal. Its continued publication depends on the support of our subscribers & advertisers. Make a donation or pay for ads here.

After filling out your information
1) Click on the dropdown list "Cause Selection" and select “FSP – International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching.”.
2) Send the email receipt to ijflteditor@gmail.com so that we can be sure IJFLT receives full credit for each donation.
www.IJFLT.org

A free on-line, peer-reviewed journal dedicated to communicating research, articles and helpful information regarding language acquisition to support teachers as they endeavor to create fluent, multilingual students.
Join our Facebook page and connect with the IJFLT on-line community

Welcome to the International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching official page. As you join, please comment and tell us where you are from. IJFLT membership comes from over 75 countries. In our 10th year of publication, we are inviting you all to be part of an IJFLT community.

The link is: https://www.facebook.com/ijfltorrg

IJFLT Teacher to Teacher section... please join IFLT /NTPRS/CI Teaching to join an active discussion about CI teaching ideas.

 subscribe at: www.ijflt.org.
Send submissions to: ijfteditor@gmail.com.
IJFLT is a free on-line journal.
Interesting Finds

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ta93-z-cNIo

Teachers of English in Turkey teaching children using TPRS. Lessons are uploaded for free. 17 teachers from the Turkish Military were trained in TPRS and CI Methods over 3 weeks during the summer of 2014. Their current mission is to educate other teachers in TPRS and other comprehension based methods using what they learned in the U.S. (Eyüpoğlu Education Center: www.eyupogluetim.com). Lessons are taught by Koksal Ozturk. TPRS lessons are taught to educate the other civil professors who will teach TPRS English soon. The goal is to spread TPRS in Turkey. This is a 36 hour beginning course for kids, 3 hours per week. Videos are posted each week and are free.
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Tea with BVP

Weekly Podcast with Bill Van Patten

www.teawithbvp.com

Access electronic books from Fluency Fast in English:
The Adventures of Isabela, $1.99
Carl Doesn’t Want to go to Mexico, $1.99
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**4 Day Language Classes for Adults.** Learn a new language or master your second language in TPRS and CI language classes for teachers.

- **July 7, 8, 9 and 10, 2017**
- **North High School**

One class $299  
Two classes $400  
$50 discount with IFLT registration  
[https://fluencymatters.com/conference/](https://fluencymatters.com/conference/)

- **Beginning Spanish** with Colorado TOY Leslie Davison  
- **Intermediate Spanish** with Karen Rowan  
- **Advanced Spanish** for non-native Spanish teachers and speakers TBA *  
- **Beginning French** with Donna Tatum-Johns  
- **Advanced French** for non-native French teachers and speakers with Colorado TOY Sabrina Sebba-Janczak*  
- **Beginning Mandarin** with Linda Li  

*Advanced TPRS / CI classes for French and Spanish teachers who want to improve their own language skills, but don't want to take more grammar classes. Content-based, Sheltered Subject Matter Classes using TPRS and Comprehensible Input at an Advanced level.

Special presentation by Stephen Krashen