Dear FLAG Members,

I know that your school year is well underway and everyone is working diligently to ensure that you have the BEST methods in place, so that all of your children can learn a second language. Every year as teachers, we strive to establish the best language learning environments for our students, including language instruction, providing cultural experiences, differentiating instruction and much more. Of course, with a new school year we tend to become overworked and a little frazzled. Always remember that the ultimate conference of the year is just around the corner in our great state of Georgia. Our FLAG Conference each year provides an excellent opportunity to come together as an organization and share our knowledge with many colleagues. It provides a refresher to all our methods and pedagogical practices, and brings new, fresh and innovative ideas to make us our BEST at teaching the children of Georgia.

I challenge you this school year to take part in our great association! Make the move, if haven’t done so, and get other colleagues to join FLAG. The more memberships we have the stronger our organization becomes thus empowering our teaching field. FLAG has the power to move you in a new direction with our excellent FLAG Facebook page, where networking with colleagues is at your fingertips. Our yearly Spoken Language Contests at the elementary, middle and high school levels, encourage your students to use their knowledge of a second language and apply the beauty of the language in a spoken, fun and competitive way.

We have much to celebrate! FLAG remembers the great work of ALL teachers across the state of Georgia, and our FLAG members know that we have the best language teachers in the nation. Our prestigious FLAG Awards are an incredible opportunity to celebrate and recognize outstanding colleagues for their dedicated and exemplary work in the world language field. Our very own FLAG K-12 Teacher of the Year 2009 Clarissa Adams-Fletcher, Spanish Teacher at Dunwoody High School (DeKalb), went on to be awarded SCOLT Teacher of the Year 2010 and ACTFL Teacher of the Year 2011. Later, another magnificent teacher from Parkview High School (Gwinnett), Dr. Robert Patrick, who was FLAG Teacher of the Year 2012, later went on to be awarded SCOLT Teacher of the Year 2013. Dr. Patrick will represent us at the 2013 ACTFL Convention in Orlando, Florida. Go Dr. Patrick! FLAG is cheering for you!

Remember, FLAG is here for you! Let’s celebrate together, and remember you’re a member of one of the best world language organizations in Georgia. Load up the car and bring your friends to this year’s events, so you can visit with your FLAG family. Thank you for all that you do!

Your FLAG President,
Joe Frank Uriz, Ed.S.
The Foreign Language Association of Georgia announces the 2014 FLAG Conference

“Taking Flight to Global Awareness”
to be held at

Renaissance Concourse Atlanta Airport Hotel
One Hartsfield Center Pkwy
Atlanta, Georgia 30354
March 7-8, 2014

Please be sure to make your hotel reservations as soon as possible. Be sure to mention that you are attending the FLAG conference so that you will receive the conference rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard Guestrooms:</th>
<th>Standard Guestrooms:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King @$125.00 (1-2 people)</td>
<td>Q/Q Suite @$125.00 (1-4 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard guest room with one King Bed</td>
<td>Two room suite with two queen beds, refrigerator, microwave and living room</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To make hotel reservations, please contact:
Renaissance Concourse Atlanta Airport Hotel
(404) 209-9999

Please do NOT send hotel reservations with your conference registrations.
FLAG does NOT handle hotel reservations

Call for Papers

The Editors of the FLAG Journal are extending an invitation to the language teaching community to submit papers for publication consideration. We publish an annual, refereed, on-line journal in the fall with articles about all aspects of foreign language education across all levels: innovative teaching strategies, learner variables, policy and issues, research, curriculum development, assessment and technology among other topics. Articles on all languages are welcome and manuscripts must be written in English to accommodate our readership. See the full description on the website.
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Editors’ Message

Susan Crooks
Co-Editor
Kennesaw State University

Joe Terantino, Ph.D.
Co-Editor
Kennesaw State University

Hello FLAG community,

As teachers we know that the beginning of a new school year always brings changes: new students, new schedules, sometimes new colleagues and administrators. That is part of what keeps us fresh, for no two school years are ever the same. To provide evidence of this constant change, after reviewing the recent foreign language enrollment figures from the Georgia Department of Education, we marvel at the diversity of languages that are now offered in our state. At the K-12 level we see Spanish, French, Latin and German leading the way, but also such diverse languages as Chinese, Japanese, Arabic, Portuguese, Russian, Italian, Turkish, and Korean.

With regard to this peer-reviewed issue of the FLAG Journal, thank you for taking the time to review the articles. We feel they provide invaluable insight to a variety of complex and important issues that are currently relevant in foreign language education at all levels. The first article, “Demystifying the Cultures Standards: A review of projects and assessments in the professional literature”, by Paula Garrett-Rucks, addresses the importance of intercultural understanding as it relates to the ACTFL Standards and how educators may go about assessing cultural learning outcomes. The second article, “The impact of a summer study abroad program on pre-service teacher foreign language anxiety”, by Victoria Russell, examines the effect study abroad experiences may have on teacher candidates’ foreign language anxiety. Last, in the article “The evolution of a university Japanese language program: Past, present, and future”, Kathryn Negrelli tells the story of KSU’s Japanese language program, recently bolstered by a UISFL grant from the Department of Education. Enjoy!

We hope your school year is off to a good start and we hope to see you at the annual FLAG conference in March in Atlanta! Last, we hope that each of the colleges, universities, and school districts will send us information this year about new people or initiatives taking place. The spring issue of the Journal is the perfect place to share news of this kind.

Cordially,
Susan and Joe
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Abstract

The importance of intercultural understanding is outlined in the expected learner outcomes of foreign language (FL) instruction in the ACTFL Standards for Foreign Language Learning (SFLL 1999, 2006)—the relationship between cultural products, practices and perspectives (Standards 2.1 & 2.2) and cross-cultural comparisons (Standard 4.2). However, the ACTFL 2011 Standards Impact Survey reports that the “Cultural Framework with the 3Ps (products, practices, perspectives) is neither taught nor assessed by a sizable number of teachers” (Phillips & Abbott, 2011, p. 7). The aim of this paper is to empower FL educators with a stronger understanding of ways to meet and assess the Cultures Standards in their classrooms by presenting culture learning projects and assessment tools commonly found in the professional literature and to put forth a call for a common yardstick to assess FL students’ mastery of the Cultures Standards (SFLL 2.1, 2.2, 4.2) to better inform our instruction.

Introduction

People of diverse nationalities are being asked to communicate and work together in an increasingly mobile and global society. As foreign language (FL) educators, we must prepare our students for this new world and help them to develop an understanding of other cultures. Monolingual speakers are at a competitive disadvantage for a growing number of jobs (Ghemawat, 2007). The disadvantage of monolingualism, as explained by Tochon (2009), is that language learners “step inside the mind and context of another culture,” (p.656) and consequently they develop the kind of intercultural sensitivity that “builds up trust and understanding, can bridge the gap between peoples, and promotes peace and international trade” (p. 656). The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) responded to the need to prepare learners for cultures and worldviews other than their own as an outcome of their FL learning experience as evidenced in the addition of the Cultures Standards to the Standards for Foreign Language Learning (SFLL 1996, 1999, 2006) in 1999. In the same vein, Byram (1997) also underscored the importance in European FL education to move beyond an understanding of communication as an exchange of information but rather to “understand and relate to people from other countries” (p.5). Despite the clear expectations and needs for intercultural learning in foreign language instruction, the research shows that FL educators are unsure about how to include meaningful cultural instruction and assessment in the world language classroom (Cutshall, 2012; Fox & Diaz-Greenburg, 2006; Phillips 2011).

As noted by Fantini (2009), assessing learners’ cross-cultural understanding is a dauntingly subjective task. Insights from the professional literature can provide K-16 FL instructors with examples of intercultural learning projects and their assessments of second language (L2) learner’s ability to understand diverse worldviews and cultural perspectives. Common aspects of intercultural learning include: 1) how students exchange perspectives, opinions, and views with target language speakers in virtual intercultural encounters (e.g., Chun, 2011; Furstenberg et al., 2001; Hanna & de Nooy, 2003; Schenker, 2012); 2) how native speakers (NS) and non-native speakers (NNS) co-create cultural impressions in discussions (Byram, 1997; Lee, 2011; Johnson, 2008; Woodin, 2001); 3) how learners reflect on
their own cultural beliefs in cross-cultural projects (Corbett, 2010; Furstenberg et al., 2001; Garrett-Rucks, 2013; Holmes & O’Neill, 2012; Ware, 2005). This article provides FL instructors with a deeper understanding of definitions of culture and terms for culture learning in FL Education followed by a review of exemplary culture learning projects and assessments in the literature.

**Defining Culture in Foreign Language Education**

As Block (2003) pointed out, the definition of culture is vast and “the sociological literature is full of definitions and even full-length treatments of culture” (p. 128). Omaggio Hadley (2001), echoed Brook’s (1971) earlier definition of culture which emphasized the beliefs, behaviors, and values of a cultural group in her definition of culture as “the patterns of everyday life, the ‘do’s’ and ‘don’ts’ of personal behavior, and all the points of interaction between the individual and the society” (p. 349). The Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition (CARLA) posts multiple definitions of culture on its website for their Intercultural Studies Project, and preface the definition they use as serving the purpose of their Intercultural Studies Project:

Culture is defined as the shared patterns of behaviors and interactions, cognitive constructs, and affective understanding that are learned through a process of socialization. These shared patterns identify the members of a culture group while also distinguishing those of another group. ([http://www.carla.umn.edu/culture/definitions.html](http://www.carla.umn.edu/culture/definitions.html), retrieved May 26, 2013)

As noted by Hall (1990), cultural codes and frames of references are not static because “far from being eternally fixed in some essentialized past, they are subject to the continuous ‘play’ of history, culture and power” (p. 225). As FL educators, it is difficult to transmit to students the cultural aspects that influence the identity of members of the target culture when recognizing the multitude of individual differences within the cultural group, and when considering that cultural codes and frames of reference are continually changing. This is one of the reasons why culture learning in foreign language education increasingly emphasizes learners’ intercultural understanding over discrete knowledge about target culture facts.

Over the past 30 years, intercultural understanding has become progressively more important in FL education. Recognizing the importance of cultural understanding in communicative competence, Omaggio (1986) advocated that the study of culture be an integral part of FL study if students were to derive lasting benefits from their FL learning experience. Byram (1988) furthered the notion of communicative competence adding that language is envisioned as a social practice carrying the meanings and values of a community, a social group, and as such language refers to the cultural context. The American Association of Teachers of French (AATF) National Commission on Cultural Competence (1996) suggested that a consensus be reached on a common core of cultural information offered in French language programs to fill in the void left in the ACTFL Proficiency Testing Guidelines. The Commission argued that the core would ensure cross-cultural competence, vital to avoid the dangers of ethnocentrism (Singerman, Nostrand & Grundstrom, 1996). In 1999, FL educators concurred cultural understanding needed to start in FL classes as evidenced in the addition of the Cultures Standards to National Standards for Foreign Language Education (1996, 1999). Yet despite professional consensus on the importance of culture in FL learning, there remains a lack of consensus regarding appropriate instruction and assessment in the area of cultural knowledge (Schulz, LaLande, Dykstra-Pruim, et al., 2005).

**Intercultural Learning**

The promotion of intercultural learning emerged in the 1990s in response to increased interest in how to develop cultural understanding into foreign language learning. Byrnes (1991) had
long suggested an emphasis on the subjective component of culture, serving as a precursor to current pedagogical approaches of intercultural learning. Also recognizing the learner’s identity in cultural instruction, Kramsch (1993) suggested that the process of cultural reflection take place in a negotiated space, which she refers to as a third place, the location between the C1 (first culture) and the C2 (target cultures) where all behavior (both that of others and that of oneself) is seen as being grounded in a particular cultural context. Similarly, Byram (1997) described the process of intercultural learning as reflective, internal, and individual.

The broad concept of intercultural learning has led to a range of definitions and models that have served as the basis for different approaches to its assessment. In a review of 238 publications, Fantini (2006) extrapolated commonalities on intercultural communicative competence and provided a comprehensive list of related terms used across the literature including intercultural competence (IC), cross-cultural awareness, intercultural sensitivity, ethnorelativity, and global competencies which all essentially account for the ability to step beyond one’s own culture and function with individuals from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds. Byram (1997) underlined the importance to move beyond an understanding of communication as an exchange of information in FL education, but rather to “understand and relate to people from other countries” (p. 5). Described by Hoyt (2012a) as “a constellation of notions” (p. 94), Byram’s multimodal model contains prescriptive definitions and 28 performance assessment objectives centering on learners’ attitudes, knowledge, skills, and critical cultural awareness. In sum, Byram (2000) described successful intercultural learners as “conscious of their own perspective, of the way in which their thinking is culturally determined” (p. 10).

Similar to Byram’s definition of successful intercultural learning, Bennett (1993) also underscored the importance of understanding and accepting diverse cultural perspectives in order for individuals to shift from ethnocentric to ethnorelative ways of responding to cultural differences in the six stages of his Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS). The first three stages (Acceptance Stage, Adaptation Stage and Integration Stage) are considered ethnocentric or monocultural in that one’s own culture is seen as the only culture or the “better” culture. The second three DMIS stages are ethnorelative (Acceptance Stage, Adaptation Stage and Integration Stage) where the individual’s culture is one of many equally valid worldviews. The DMIS greatly influenced the creation of a cultural sensitivity survey called the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) commonly used in the quantitative tradition of IC research. The IDI is a 50-item self-assessment with a five-point Likert scale. Although considered by many as a convenient IC assessment tool, administering the IDI can be cost-prohibitive, and it lacks the ability to capture the unique individual differences found in the rich descriptions of qualitative research.

Researchers interested in qualitative approaches to intercultural learning assessment have argued that IC development may be represented best in direct assessment situations such as performance assessment (Byram, 1997), portfolio assessment (Byram, 1997, Jacobson et al., 1999) or interviews (Fantini, 2006; Straffon, 2003). Performance assessment typically involves the elicitation of an individual’s ability to display IC in conversations with interlocutors. Portfolio assessment typically encourages students to reflect on their evolving intercultural competencies as represented in their work or personal documents. Interview assessment involves in-depth interviews in which researchers pose questions to elicit data on the nature and development of IC. Qualitative assessment designs are not as common as quantitative assessments of IC development, perhaps due to the time-consuming nature of collecting and analyzing direct data. However, studies comparing quantitative and qualitative assessment (Fantini, 2006; Straffon, 2003) suggest that qualitative approaches can provide more personalized, detailed accounts of the process of IC development that cannot be assessed by quantitative assessments alone.

Implications for Classroom Instruction

Getting students to consider the world through the eyes of another culture is not only the goal of the Cultures Standards, (NSFLL 2.1, 2.2, and 4.2) it is an essential component of IC development (Byram, 1997; Ortega, 2012). Unfortunately, textbooks often fail to address meaningful
cultural reflection, and teacher programs have not yet integrated IC assessment and learning. Although the Cultures Standards have initiated more emphasis on cross-cultural learning, as noted by Cutshall (2012) even after more than a decade of Standards, instructors continue to struggle integrating opportunities for students to address way of perceiving themselves and others.

The professional literature provides examples of how to assess student culture learning in performance assessment (Byram, 1997), portfolio assessment (Byram, 1997, Jacobson et al., 1999), interviews (Fantini, 2006; Straffon, 2003), and intercultural virtual communication projects (Corbett, 2010; Chun, 2011; Furstenberg et al., 2001; Garrett-Rucks, 2013; Holmes & O’Neill, 2012; Schenker, 2012). Additionally, more extensive projects could involve oral history or digital storytelling. In the United States, such projects need not be done abroad, as one could often find native speaker (NS) informants who may well be eager to share their experiences. NS informants in the U.S. can be found quite easily for Spanish (Lee 2011), or with somewhat more effort for French (Hoyt, 2012b). Both Lee and Hoyt found that ethnographic interviews with native speakers in combination with reflective writings can be quite effective in facilitating IC development.

According to Sercu’s (2005) international study on FL teachers and cultural instruction, the majority of FL teachers have a strong familiarity with target cultures, yet they struggle to integrate meaningful cultural instruction into their classroom instruction. The majority of these teachers reported that they relied heavily on their textbooks to teach culture, but that they were concerned that the cultural information in textbooks becomes outdated quickly, deals only with the “middle class culture at the expense of social diversity” (Sercu, 2005, p. 100), and appears superficial, shallow, and impersonal. Another criticism concerns the textbooks’ lack of culture learning tasks, meaning cultural information is delivered explicitly rather than an approach where learners process the information in an autonomous manner. Findings from IC research have corroborated previous theorists (Bennett, 1993; Byram, 1997; Byrnes, 1991; Kramsch, 1993) who have long purported that the development of cross-cultural understanding demands interpretation, introspection, and self-reflection. Unfortunately, few textbooks reflect this approach to cultural instruction, teacher certification programs often lack this training and classroom instruction time does not always afford the opportunity for students to participate in meaningful cultural inquiry, particularly in beginning levels of instruction with their limited linguistic mastery (Garrett-Rucks, 2013; Schultz, 2010; Sercu, 2005).

Students need opportunities and time to explore and cultivate their understanding of target culture products, practices, and perspectives from classroom instruction outside of the class. Schulz (2007) recommended providing learners with opportunities to record their “emerging awareness” (p. 18) as she discussed objectives and approaches to promote the development of cross-cultural understanding. Reflective journals, blogs, online classroom discussions, or wikis could play this role. Reflective journals offer a means for learners to analyze their experiences and feelings toward alternate cultural practices and perspectives. Providing students with examples of blogs or journals, particularly from students who have completed a successful study abroad experience could also provide helpful modeling, to encourage learners to move beyond simplistic descriptions and superficial reactions. Online classroom discussions provide learners the opportunity to situate their personal perspectives toward their own cultural norms compared to their peers’ diverse perspectives prior to exposure to alternate cultural perspectives. Garrett-Rucks (2013) recommends exposing learners to pre-recorded videos of target-language informants discussing their impressions of U.S. culture for learners to step back and view their own culture through the eyes of another culture. In her study, beginning French language learners collectively discussed alternate cultural products, practices and perspectives in online classroom discussions outside of classroom instruction time, in English. Given the emotional investment when dealing with cross-cultural perspectives, it may be advisable to give students the choice of writing in their native language, while suggesting that they gradually move to more target language use (Garrett-Rucks, 2013; Schultz 2007).
Flexibility in language use must be considered in cultural instruction. Claire Kramsch points to the benefits of learners engaging in playful, creative use of language (2009) that may involve a period of code-switching in the transition from English use to TL use. In this same vein, cultural instruction could encourage students to write a poem or a story to express their thoughts and feelings about imagined cross-cultural encounters, or in reaction to their exposure to alternate cultural perspectives toward their own native culture norms as well as target culture norms. Likewise, use of proverbs and idiomatic expressions could be encouraged. As always, the learning outcomes must be considered—whether the goal of the activity is cultural reflection (Standards 2.1, 2.2 & 4.2) or perfected presentational communication (Standard 1.3).

These types of suggested activities encourage students to explore the cultural representations present in their own culture as well those in the target culture as they begin to understand how language and culture are interrelated. Researchers and foreign language (FL) educators alike have investigated changes in learners’ intercultural competence in response to pedagogical interventions aimed at preparing learners for cross-cultural encounters. Byram’s (1997) multimodal model of intercultural competence (IC) and Bennett’s (1993) Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) are two assessment models commonly used in FL Education research in the literature. However, without a common yardstick to measure student mastery of cultural understanding, FL educators will struggle to collaborate and exchange ideas about the success of their culture learning projects and to determine the applicability of the pedagogical interventions in their own unique learning situations. Likewise, FL teacher preparation programs need to address realistic ways to meet the Cultures Standards. In the meantime, this article is intended to provide some camaraderie, guidance and suggestions to support frustrated FL educators in their attempt to meet the Cultures Standards as we move forward as a field with preparing learners for success for the global demands of the 21st century.
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Abstract

This study examined pre-service teacher foreign language anxiety and whether participating in a five-week summer study abroad program had an effect on teacher candidates’ levels of language anxiety. The study abroad program took place at a university in Southern Spain and participants took teacher preparation coursework abroad alongside Spanish nationals who were training to teach Spanish as a foreign language in Spain. There were seven undergraduate participants in the present study, all of whom were enrolled in an ACTFL/NCATE accredited initial certification program in foreign language education (Spanish) at a regional university in Georgia. Horwitz’ (2008) Teacher Foreign Language Anxiety Scale (TFLAS) was administered as a pre- and posttest. A quantitative analysis of mean TFLAS scores indicated that pre-service teachers’ levels of language anxiety were significantly higher at pretest compared to posttest. The findings of this study have implications for study abroad and teacher preparation programs.

Introduction

Impetus for the Present Study

Teacher candidates in an accredited undergraduate foreign language education (FLED) initial certification program in Spanish at a regional university in Georgia who are not native or heritage speakers of Spanish have reported high levels of language anxiety to their methods instructors and to their student teaching supervisors. Their anxiety appears to be highest when they are required to deliver instruction in the target language (during model teaching in their methods courses, during their seven-week teaching practicum in P-5 settings, and during student teaching when they are required to deliver at least 90% of instruction in the target language). In order to help FLED teacher candidates increase their proficiency in Spanish and alleviate their levels of language anxiety prior to the student teaching semester, a study abroad program in Spain with a special focus on FLED was created.

Background

Study Abroad Program

The study abroad program is sponsored by a regional university that is part of the University System of Georgia (USG). Thus, any student at a USG college or university may participate in the program as a transient student. Academic credit is awarded by the sponsoring institution, which transient students must transfer back to their home institutions. Participants may earn up to 7 credit hours and a wide range of courses are available in Spain. In addition to basic and intermediate-level language classes, several specialized courses such as Civilization and Culture of Spain, Spanish for Professionals, Peninsular Literature, Advanced Grammar, and Secondary Methods are also offered in Spain for students who are eligible to take them.

Students who participate in the program spend approximately five weeks in Spain, with four weeks at the host institution and five travel days in Spain that occur at the beginning of the trip. At the host institution, which is a Spanish university located in Andalucía, languages classes...
are comprised of students from various nationalities. Since all students are grouped into language classes based on their proficiency level in Spanish, students from the sponsoring institution may not necessarily take classes with their peers from home. Rather, students are likely to have classmates from the European Union, China, and from other U.S. institutions. Participants who take Secondary Methods study alongside native speakers of Spanish who are training to teach Spanish as a foreign language (FL) in Spain. All students take two two-hour classes per instructional day. To ensure that students are enrolled in the correct language course level, they are given a placement exam on their first day of classes. The Spanish university uses the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) for teaching, learning, and assessment. The CEFR has six levels that range from A1 to C2. Mosher, Slagter, and Surface (2010) conducted research that mapped the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines with the CEFR levels. They found the following: (1) A1 corresponds to ACTFL’s novice low, mid, and high, (2) A2 matches up with intermediate low and mid, (3) B1 coincides with intermediate high and advanced low, (4) B2 matches up with advanced mid and advanced high, and (5) C1 corresponds with superior. The majority of participants in the study abroad program who take language classes fall into the novice mid to intermediate mid levels (A1 and A2) while students who take specialized classes such as Secondary Methods and Peninsular Literature are typically at the intermediate high to advanced low levels (B1).

The instructors at the Spanish university employ communicative and task-based instructional techniques. For the language classes, there is an emphasis on developing speaking proficiency and all lessons are infused with culture and technology. The language curriculum is designed by the host institution and their professors create all of their own pedagogical materials and resources. Therefore, students are not required to purchase any textbooks or materials abroad. Participants’ lodging is a home-stay accommodation and students are matched up with their host families based on a survey that they take regarding their preferences and habits. The host families do not speak English and students are forced to communicate in Spanish on a daily basis while living in the home-stay environment for four weeks.

Foreign Language Education Program at Sponsoring Institution

The FLED program at the sponsoring institution is interdisciplinary and it is shared between the College of Education (COE) and the College of Arts & Sciences. In addition to 35 hours of upper-level coursework in Spanish, FLED majors also complete an entry into education course, two methods courses (Elementary Methods and Curriculum and Instruction of Foreign Languages / Secondary Methods), a professional development seminar, and student teaching in the Department of Modern & Classical Languages, which is housed in the College of Arts and Sciences. Teacher candidates also complete five education classes, including courses on diversity and technology, with the COE. Thus, students in the FLED program are exposed to a wide array of courses, topics, and professors. The FLED program at the sponsoring institution is accredited by ACTFL/NCATE and it is one two undergraduate initial certification programs in FLED (Spanish) in the state of Georgia that holds NCATE/ACTFL national recognition. Since all FLED students complete their student teaching at the secondary level at the sponsoring institution, the content covered in Curriculum and Instruction of Foreign Languages (Secondary Methods) is instrumental for teacher candidates’ success during student teaching. Curriculum and Instruction of Foreign Languages focuses on various FL teaching methods and approaches, their theoretical underpinnings, theories of second language acquisition, individual differences, instructional strategies and materials, assessment, lesson/unit planning, national (ACTFL) and state (GPS) standards, techniques for teaching the four skills and culture, technology tools and resources, and professional development. The main goal of the course is to provide students with the knowledge, skills, dispositions, understandings, and other attributes that are associated with accomplished teaching.
Teacher Training Abroad

Secondary Methods is offered each summer at the host institution and the course content is very similar to the Curriculum and Instruction of Foreign Languages course that is offered at the sponsoring institution; however, CEFR standards are covered in Spain and all instruction is delivered in Spanish. The majority of students who take Secondary Methods at the host institution are Spanish nationals who are training to teach Spanish as a FL in Spain. During the course, students are placed in groups to create and present a unit of instruction. Thus, study abroad FLED students have the opportunity to work closely with their native speaker classmates from the host institution as they create their unit of instruction. Moreover, FLED majors from Georgia who take Secondary Methods in Spain are exposed to an internationalized curriculum. In addition to exposure to CEFR standards, some aspects of the internationalized curriculum include the following: (1) students learn about communicative and task-based techniques that are currently used in Spain, (2) students receive numerous authentic materials and resources that they may employ in their future classrooms in the United States, and (3) students learn how technology and cultural content is infused into the FL secondary curriculum in Spain.

Preparation for Teacher Training Abroad

To be prepared to take advanced teacher preparation coursework abroad, teacher candidates must be committed to working with a methods instructor from the sponsoring institution for six weeks prior to the study abroad trip. Candidates must complete weekly reading assignments and the FLED instructor provides lectures on the course content in English via WIMBA virtual class. Each FLED study abroad participant must also create and submit a unit plan that incorporates ACTFL and GPS standards prior to departure. Thus, FLED teacher candidates have a solid foundation in the majority of the course content in English before taking Secondary Methods in Spain where the content is delivered in Spanish.

Review of Literature

Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale

According to Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986), language anxiety is “a distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process” (p. 128). The researchers asserted that language anxiety can be debilitating for some students and that language anxiety could potentially negatively impact students’ performance in a language class. To assess a learner’s level of language anxiety, Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) created the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), which incorporated three related anxieties: (1) communication apprehension, (2) test anxiety, and (3) fear of negative evaluation. The researchers took these three types of performance anxiety into account when devising the FLCAS because they posited that language anxiety is related to performance evaluation within social and academic contexts. Communication apprehension was defined by McCroskey (1984) as an individual’s level of anxiety or fear that is associated with either anticipated or real communication with others. Sarason (1984) defined test anxiety as “the tendency to view with alarm the consequences of inadequate performance in an evaluative situation” (p. 214). Watson and Friend (1969) asserted that fear of negative evaluation relates to three areas: (1) anxiety about being evaluated by others, (2) distress about others’ negative evaluations, and (3) the expectation of receiving negative evaluations from others. In order to capture the specific anxiety reaction of learners in FL contexts, Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) used three existing scales to create the FLCAS: (1) McCroskey’s Personal Report of Communication Apprehension, (2) Sarason’s Test Anxiety Scale, and (3) Watson and Friend’s Fear of
Negative Evaluation Scale. Horwitz (1986) found that FLCAS scores correlated with McCroskey’s Communication Apprehension measure ($r = .28$, $p = .063$), with Sarason’s Test Anxiety Scale ($r = .53$, $p < .01$), and with Watson and Friend’s Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale ($r = .36$, $p < .01$).

The FLCAS has 33 items that are rated on a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree). An anxiety score is derived by summing the ratings on the 33 items and FLCAS scores range from 33 to 165. When statements are negatively worded, responses are reversed and recoded so that a high score represents high anxiety. Horwitz (1986) investigated the validity of the FLCAS and she found that higher FLCAS scores were associated with lower final course grades in two beginning-level Spanish classes ($r = -.49$, $p < .01$) and in two beginning-level French classes ($r = -.54$, $p < .01$). Thus, Horwitz (1986) found that language anxiety and final course grades were negatively correlated.

Price (1991) examined language anxiety among 106 second semester French students and found that FLCAS scores correlated positively with public speaking anxiety ($r = .43$, $p < .001$) and with test anxiety ($r = .58$, $p < .001$). Price also found that FLCAS scores correlated negatively with oral exam scores ($r = -.27$, $p < .05$), with final grades ($r = -.22$, $p < .05$), and with final exam scores ($r = -.29$, $p < .01$). However, when Price controlled for language aptitude with students’ Modern Language Aptitude Test scores, the only significant correlation that remained was that between FLCAS scores and oral exam scores.

Aida (1994) administered the FLCAS to 96 university-level students of Japanese to examine the construct of FL anxiety with students of a non-Western language. The researcher found that the FLCAS is a reliable tool regardless of language, as the internal consistency reliability for the FLCAS among students of Japanese as a FL was .94 as measured by Cronbach’s alpha. Moreover, Aida found that the test-retest reliability correlation coefficient for the FLCAS was high ($r = .80$, $p < .01$). Thus, the studies conducted by Horwitz (1986), Price (1991) and Aida (1994) indicate that the FLCAS is a valid and reliable instrument.

Aida (1994) also compared the FLCAS scores of students who had traveled to Japan ($n = 36$) with students who had not traveled to Japan ($n = 60$). The researcher found that students who had traveled to Japan had significantly lower levels of language anxiety as measured by the FLCAS than those who had not. The mean FLCAS score of those who had traveled to Japan was 92.5 while the mean score of those who had not traveled was 98.1. This difference was statistically significant, $F(1, 94) = 4$, $p < .05$. Aida suggested that students’ prior contact with the people and culture in Japan may have contributed to this finding.

Teacher Foreign Language Anxiety Scale

Horwitz (1992, 1993, 1996) asserted that language anxiety is also a factor for teachers who are nonnative or seminative speakers of the languages that they teach, as teachers who fall into these categories are, in fact, advanced language learners themselves. Horwitz (1996) also suggested that high levels of teacher FL anxiety may have negative consequences on classroom practices; namely, she suggested that a high level of language anxiety “can inhibit a teacher’s ability to effectively present the target language, interact with students, and serve as a positive role model as a language learner” (p. 366). Further, Horwitz (1996) claimed that other potential negative consequences to high levels of teacher FL anxiety include subconsciously choosing instructional strategies that require little language production and choosing linguistic interactions that are controlled and predictable. Horwitz (1996) suggested that these practices may send negative messages to students about language learning.

In order to measure a teacher’s level of language anxiety, Horwitz (2008) created the Teacher Foreign Language Anxiety Scale (TFLAS). This instrument is based on the FLCAS; however, the TFLAS does not address the construct of test anxiety. The TFLAS measures communication apprehension, fear of negative evaluation, and self-efficacy. Horwitz (2008) asserted that when feelings of self-efficacy are higher, anxiety is lower. The TFLAS has 18 items that are rated
on a 5-point Likert Scale (ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree).

While teacher FL anxiety has the potential to negatively impact pedagogical decisions and classroom practices, no published studies on the TFLAS were found despite an exhaustive search of the major language, linguistics, and education databases. In addition to searching the databases, the following journals that focus on foreign and second language education were also searched: *Foreign Language Annals, Language Teaching Research, Modern Language Journal*, and *TESOL Quarterly*. Thus, the purpose of this study was to help fill in the gap in the present body of literature on teacher FL anxiety. More specifically, this study investigated whether participation in a short-term summer study abroad program resulted in lower levels of teacher FL anxiety among pre-service teachers prior to the student teaching semester.

**Research Question**

What is the effect of participating in a short-term summer study abroad program on pre-service teacher FL anxiety as measured by the TFLAS?

**Method**

**Participants**

The participants were seven undergraduate students enrolled in an initial certification program in FLED (Spanish) at a regional university in Georgia. Participants were enrolled in third and/or fourth year Spanish courses at the sponsoring institution and were planning to complete student teaching one to two semesters after returning from Spain.

**Data Collection and Analysis**

The TFLAS was administered as a pretest to the seven participants on the nine-hour flight to Spain. Similarly, the TFLAS was administered as a posttest to the same seven participants on the flight home from Spain. Data were collected over two summers (summer semester 2011 and summer semester 2012) in order to have enough FLED participants to run the statistical analysis. Data were analyzed quantitatively using a paired samples t-test. All data were analyzed using SAS® 9.2 for Windows software. Data were screened for outliers prior to running the statistical test.

**Instrument and Scoring**

Horwitz’ (2008) Teacher Foreign Language Anxiety Scale (TFLAS) was used to measure participants’ level of FL anxiety as a pre- and posttest. The TFLAS has 18 items that are rated on a 5-point Likert Scale. An anxiety score is derived by summing the ratings on the 18 items. When statements are negatively worded, responses are reversed and recoded so that a high score represents high anxiety. TFLAS scores range from 18 to 90. To facilitate interpreting TFLAS scores, Horwitz (2008) suggested dividing raw scores by 18 to arrive at a TFLAS score on a scale of 1 to 5, with scores greater than 3 demonstrating at least some level of anxiety on the part of the learner.

**Results**

**Descriptive Statistics**

Raw TFLAS scores at pretest ranged from 46 to 70 and raw scores at posttest ranged from 40 to 56. Participants’ raw scores on the TFLAS at pre- and posttest are presented in Table 1.
Table 1

Participants’ Raw Scores on the TFLAS at Pre- and Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Raw Score at Pretest</th>
<th>Raw Score at Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 7

A visual examination of Table 1 indicates that all participants had lower raw scores at posttest compared to pretest. Participant 4 exhibited the greatest difference in raw scores from pre- to posttest, with a decrease of 27 points in the posttest raw score compared to the pretest raw score. Conversely, Participant 6 did not appear to have a significant decrease in raw scores from pre- to posttest, with only a six point decrease in the raw score at posttest compared to the raw score at pretest.

To interpret TFLAS scores more easily, raw scores were adjusted by dividing each raw score by 18 to arrive at a TFLAS score on a scale of 1 to 5. Howitz (2008) asserted that adjusted scores of 3 or higher indicate that at least some level of language anxiety is present. Participants’ adjusted TFLAS scores are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Participants’ Adjusted Scores on the TFLAS at Pre- and Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number</th>
<th>Adjusted Score at Pretest</th>
<th>Adjusted Score at Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 7

A visual inspection of Table 2 reveals that six of the seven participants had language anxiety at pretest as measured by the TFLAS, as all participants except for Participant 6 had adjusted...
TFLAS scores that were greater than 3. While Participant 6 did not exhibit significant language anxiety at pretest (2.56), the adjusted posttest TFLAS score for this participant was still lower than the pretest score (2.22). Participant 4 had the highest level of anxiety as measured by the adjusted TFLAS score at pretest (3.89), yet this participant had the second lowest adjusted TFLAS score at posttest (2.39). An examination of the adjusted TFLAS scores at posttest indicates that only two of the seven participants demonstrated language anxiety at posttest. Participants 2 and 7 still appeared to demonstrate a low level of language anxiety at posttest, with adjusted TFLAS scores of 3.11 each.

Results of Quantitative Analysis

To determine if the mean TFLAS score was significantly higher at pretest compared to posttest, raw TFLAS scores were subjected to a paired-samples t-test. The analysis revealed a significant difference between mean levels of anxiety observed at the two times of testing, \( t(6) = 5.02; p < .01 \). Mean anxiety scores were significantly higher at pretest (M = 61.43, SD = 7.52) than at posttest (M = 47.71, SD = 6.18). The observed difference between the mean scores was 13.71 and the 95% confidence interval for the difference between means extended from 7.03 to 20.39. The effect size was computed as \( d = 1.896 \). According to Cohen’s (1992) guidelines for t tests, this represents a very large effect.

Discussion, Limitations, and Suggestions for Future Research

Discussion

The results of the statistical analysis revealed that mean anxiety scores were significantly higher at pretest (prior to arrival in Spain) than at posttest (immediately after completing the study abroad program). These results indicate that pre-service teachers’ FL anxiety levels were significantly lower by the end of the five-week study abroad program. This finding resonates with Aida (2004) who found that students who traveled to the target language country had significantly less FL anxiety as measured by the FLCAS than those who had not. The researcher suggested that exposure to the people and culture of the target language country may have contributed to the lower levels of language anxiety among the students who had traveled abroad. However, Aida did not specify how long the participants in her study spent abroad. The teacher candidates who participated in the present study were immersed in the target language culture throughout the program because they stayed with host families and they took coursework with Spanish nationals who were native speakers. Thus, their exposure to the people and culture was significant. Many study abroad programs offer students lodging in dormitories where the vast majority of students speak English. Further, almost all participants in summer study abroad programs take classes alongside other English-speaking students where the temptation to speak English in class is great. However, the participants in the present study were required to communicate in Spanish with their native-speaking classmates in order to complete course projects. Thus, it appears that participating in a five-week study abroad program with a high level of linguistic and cultural immersion was beneficial for lowering teacher candidates’ levels of language anxiety, at least in the short-term.

Implications

The findings of this study have implications for pre-service teachers; namely, teacher candidates in FLED programs who are anxious about teaching in the target language may want to consider participating in a study abroad program prior to student teaching. Horwitz (1996) asserted that teachers with high levels of language anxiety “may unconsciously choose instructional strategies that shield themselves from having to use the language publicly” (p. 366). Her statement
is likely to resonate with anyone who has supervised or observed FL teacher candidates during student teaching, as it is not uncommon to observe a multitude of activities that require very little production in the target language on the part of the student teacher.

There are also implications for study abroad programs, as the program described in this article had a high level of linguistic and cultural immersion. Furthermore, in order to prepare to take advanced teacher preparation coursework abroad (Secondary Methods), teacher candidates were required to complete six weeks of instruction pre-departure, which included attending lectures in a virtual classroom, completing weekly reading assignments, and planning a unit of instruction. Thus, it was important for the study abroad program director to communicate the course expectations in advance for FLED majors who took Secondary Methods abroad. The teacher candidates who participated in the present study were well aware of these expectations and they enthusiastically complied with them. This may have occurred because the participants appeared to appreciate the unique opportunity of taking teacher preparation coursework abroad, which provided them with an international perspective on FL teaching methods and approaches.

**Individual Differences**

The statistical analysis for this study compared group means at pre- and posttest. However, an examination of each participant’s score revealed that there were individual differences among the participants regarding their levels of language anxiety. For example, at pretest there was one participant who did not exhibit significant language anxiety and at posttest there were two participants who still exhibited low levels of language anxiety as measured by the TFLAS. In addition, one participant had a dramatic 27-point drop in TFLAS scores from pre- to posttest. Thus, some participants seemed to benefit more than others from the program with respect to decreases in levels of language anxiety. Further, two of the participants may have needed more time in the target language country in order to lower their levels of teacher FL anxiety. It is also likely that other factors such as introversion/extroversion, language aptitude, and feelings of self-efficacy may have influenced the results of this study, especially with respect to the two participants who still exhibited some language anxiety at posttest. Regarding Participant 6 who did not exhibit significant language anxiety at pretest, the study abroad program still proved to be beneficial because all of the participants, including Participant 6, demonstrated lower levels of anxiety at posttest.

**Limitations**

As with all studies, the present study was not free from limitations. Namely, the number of participants was low (seven), only one measure was used to assess language anxiety, and the TFLAS was not delivered as a delayed posttest after participants returned to their home institutions. Although the number of participants was low, the effect size was very large \((d = 1.896)\); thus, the statistical test had sufficient power to detect a significant difference in means with the small sample size. If the effect size were small or medium, seven participants may not have been sufficient to detect a significant effect.

Moreover, the TFLAS was used to measure general language anxiety. However, there are several different types of anxiety that may factor into language anxiety such as reading anxiety, writing anxiety, and speaking anxiety. Measures that specifically focus on speaking anxiety could have been used in conjunction with the TFLAS, as teacher candidates often report that speaking anxiety is their greatest concern.

Another limitation of the present study is that delayed posttests were not conducted to determine if lower anxiety levels persisted for weeks and/or months after returning from Spain. While the results of the present study clearly indicate that participants had significantly less anxiety immediately after completing the study abroad program, it is unclear whether these effects were durative.
Suggestions for Future Research

Future studies could replicate this one but could also measure proficiency in addition to language anxiety. The relationship between proficiency and language anxiety could be studied to determine if there is an inverse relationship between the two constructs, with increased proficiency leading to decreased anxiety. Since language anxiety is an individual difference (an affective factor), other individual differences such as cognitive style, personality factors (such as introversion / extroversion), learner strategies and/or other affective variables such as tolerance for ambiguity, motivation and self-efficacy could be examined to determine if there is a positive or negative correlation with teacher FL anxiety. Further, this study only employed quantitative methods. Future studies could examine teacher FL anxiety with both quantitative and qualitative methods. By examining the construct of teacher FL anxiety qualitatively, it may be possible to uncover in which settings and/or with which topics language anxiety appears to be more problematic for teacher candidates at home and abroad.

Future studies could also replicate this one but could examine language anxiety among in-service teachers. There are many opportunities for in-service teachers to study abroad during the summer months (e.g., the Embassy of Spain sponsors summer courses for teachers from the U.S.A. and Canada) and it is possible that participating in a summer study abroad program could also result in lower levels of language anxiety for in-service teachers. According to Horwitz (1992, 1993, 1996), in-service teachers may suffer from crippling levels of language anxiety. Thus, future studies could examine this population with respect to teacher FL anxiety and study abroad.

Conclusion

This study found that participating in a short-term study abroad program results in lower levels of language anxiety as measured by the TFLAS among pre-service teachers of Spanish who spent five weeks abroad. While the sample size in the present study was small, the findings suggest that pre-service teachers who experience language anxiety should consider studying abroad prior to student teaching in order to help lower their levels of teacher FL anxiety, as lower levels of language anxiety may have a positive impact on pre-service teachers’ instructional practices and strategies during student teaching.
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Abstract

The purpose of this article is to describe the 16-year evolution of the Japanese language program at Kennesaw State University. The article traces the program from its beginning as a critical language offered under the self-instructional language program to the recent addition of an Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language grant, which will strengthen the Asian Studies program and simultaneously further develop the Japanese program. Much of this growth has been in response to the increasing economic ties between Japan and the state of Georgia.

Introduction

As Leger (2012) points out, “the importance of Japanese language programs at the university level in the United States is self-evident given the long-term U.S.-Japan foreign diplomatic relationship and the increasing roles each plays in the worldwide economy” (p.28). As two major economic powers, Japan and the U.S. together account for over 30% of world domestic product, for a significant portion of international trade in goods and services, and for a major portion of international investment (Cooper, 2013). This economic clout makes the U.S. and Japan potentially powerful actors in the world economy, and as a result the economic conditions in the U.S. and in Japan have a significant impact on the rest of the world. More specifically, in the state of Georgia, in which the Japanese language program described here resides, there are more than 350 Japanese businesses, and these companies employ more than 35,000 workers in the state (Georgia Department of Economic Development, 2013).

Combined with, or as a result of, the increasing diplomatic and economic ties between the two countries, the U.S. has also experienced a Japanese language boom, bolstered in the 1980s and 1990s by financial pragmatism, Asian immigration, and a deep curiosity and interest in the culture. This boom brought with it an increase in the number of high schools, colleges and universities offering Japanese including advanced placement (AP) Japanese classes, a College Board SAT subject test in Japanese, and proficiency tests developed by the Japanese Ministry of Education. Similarly, the United States Census Bureau’s National Data Book’s 2012 Statistical Abstract shows an exponential increase in higher education enrollment between 1970 and 2009, respectively, from 6,600 students to 73,400 students enrolled in Japanese courses (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2012).

Thus, it is imperative that in the state of Georgia, much like in the rest of the U.S., colleges and universities continue to expand Japanese language programs to meet the increasing demand for knowledge related to Japanese language and culture. With this focus in mind, the remainder of this article describes the 16-year evolution of a Japanese language program at Kennesaw State University (KSU), which was recently named a recipient of a Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language (UISFL) grant from the U.S. Department of Education to develop an undergraduate Asian Studies program.

Past: Background of Japanese via the Critical Languages Program

The Department of Foreign Languages at KSU first offered Japanese in 1997 via the Critical Languages Program (CLP), adhering to the self-instructional language program model (SILP).
This model is supported by the National Association for Self-Instructional Language Programs, which specializes in instruction for less commonly taught languages (Dunkel, Brill, & Kohl, 2002). At KSU, the CLP is used primarily for the purpose of cultivating languages for potential inclusion in the regular curriculum of the department. For example, Chinese, German, and Italian were once offered under the CLP and now are regularly offered as a major and minor. Similarly, other institutions, such as the University of Alabama and the University of Arizona, have thriving Critical Language Programs, which focus on speaking and listening comprehension.

Under the SILP model at KSU, international student tutors have worked with the students for weekly language practice, two meetings per week at 75 minutes per class meeting. These sessions have been dedicated primarily to conversation practice, question and answer, and drill and repetition activities. Simultaneously, the students have also been encouraged to rehearse the language on their own via audio resource materials. Ultimately, outside oral examiners administer final exams to assess the students’ oral proficiency and to establish the students’ grades for the semester. Although students were encouraged to complete and submit written assignments and take periodic quizzes in class, their final grade for the course was comprised of attendance and class performance (20%) and an end-of-semester oral exam (80%).

While statistically the numbers of students enrolled in Japanese in universities and colleges declined across the U.S. in the mid-2000s due to, as some believe, the sudden growth and interest in Chinese (Dillon, 2010; Rhodes & Pufahl, 2009), the Japanese program at KSU has enjoyed consistent enrollments from its inception in 1997 through 2012. Table 1 highlights the enrollment patterns for Japanese over the past five years. Although no official instructor was designated to these courses, the enrollment numbers remained fairly constant. It is also important to note that enrollment in these courses was dictated in large part by the availability of student tutors to guide the students. If more student tutors or an instructor were available, the enrollment numbers would have been higher based on reported student demand.

Table 1. Japanese 5-year enrollments at the university, 2008-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Level</th>
<th>F08</th>
<th>S09</th>
<th>F09</th>
<th>S10</th>
<th>F10</th>
<th>S11</th>
<th>F11</th>
<th>S12</th>
<th>F12</th>
<th>S13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1002</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 1 indicates, via the CLP, Japanese was offered on a regular basis with 1001 and 2001 courses offered in the fall semesters and rotating with 1002 and 2002 courses in the spring semesters. The attrition rates between classes are also apparent. In the fall semester of 2012, the last semester before a full-time instructor was hired for the Japanese program, two sections of JPN 1001 were offered with maximum enrollments of 12 students each, and one section of JPN 2001 with a maximum enrollment of 15 students. These sections were delivered by five international student tutors who co-led the classes.

**Benefits of Japanese via the CLP**

The Japanese program at KSU did experience limited benefits under the self-instructional language program model, primarily fiscal and logistical in nature. For example, implementing the
SILP program allowed the university to offer Japanese, a language not regularly offered, at a low-cost, because there was no instructor or related salary. It was significantly less expensive to hire international Japanese students and pay them at an hourly rate as opposed to hiring a part-time or full-time instructor. In addition, these international students were granted out-of-state tuition fee waivers as the primary source of payment, but this money was not considered a payroll item and it was not paid by the department. In this manner, the department was able to respond to the needs of diverse learners, experiment with offering various languages to determine which may be popular and successful on campus, limit class sizes, and focus primarily on oral proficiency. Ultimately, the CLP via the SILP model enabled offering Japanese courses to students at an institution where the language would not have been offered otherwise.

**Challenges of Japanese via the CLP**

Although there were benefits to offering Japanese via the CLP, as just outlined, the program model was not without its challenges. In the case of Japanese at KSU, it can be said that the most critical issue may have been the challenge of locating, hiring, and training student tutors given the frequent turnover of international exchange students. As an extension of this inconsistency, it was also a constant challenge to maintain continuity in the curriculum of the courses, which often contributed to its attrition rate. Likewise, limitations placed on the capacity of these Japanese courses also limited the number of students who could enroll and ultimately led to low course enrollments at the 2000 level. With regard to the students, within the SILP model there was an increased need for learner self-motivation and self-regulation, because they are participating in language learning primarily via a self-instructed learning environment.

**Present: Development and Growth of the Japanese Language Program**

Concurrent with the understanding of the importance of U.S.-Japan relations and the critical need for Asian language and culture proficient students, KSU applied for and successfully secured a Title VI-Part A UISFL grant in 2012. The main purpose of this grant was to expand and strengthen opportunities for international learning by supporting KSU’s Asian Studies program and its proposed Asian Studies major. Development of the Asian Studies program began more than 20 years ago, as the university began creating several courses focusing on Asia in history, business, political science, international affairs, philosophy, languages, and the arts. Concentration on its strong Asian language component began with the Chinese language program seven years ago, which attracted an increasing number of students and experienced a rapid growth that assisted in the creation of an Asian Studies minor just two years after that. The Asian Studies major proposed in the UISFL grant was conceived to expand on this foundation in Asian cultures building on the Chinese program with the inclusion of Japanese and Korean languages to the regular curriculum of the department. With the grant as the centerpiece of this initiative, additional external support via a salary assistance grant was also received from the Japan Foundation, putting the program on track to an anticipated solid sustainability three years after the UISFL grant ends.

The grant then allowed the university to continue strengthening its Asian language and culture curriculum, and with assistance from the Japan Foundation, helped address the issues and challenges facing the Japanese program by assisting its transition from the CLP to the traditional, instructor-based classroom environment. While the funding aided all Asian languages offered at KSU, it specifically supported the strengthening of Japanese through these provisions:

1. the addition of a temporary full-time Japanese instructor in the spring semester of 2013, and the national search for a full-time tenure-track faculty who would begin in Fall, 2013.
2. the development of four 3000-level courses to be offered beginning in the spring semester of 2014.

3. the development of an Interdisciplinary B.A. in Asian Studies, requiring students to take 12 credit hours at the 3000-level in Japanese (or one of the other Asian languages), and to reach the Intermediate-Mid level on the ACTFL proficiency scale in the language of concentration.

4. the requirement of all Asian Studies majors to participate in an approved study abroad program or internship (Leger, 2012).

The first three items are areas concentrated strictly within the university. The temporary instructor added in the spring taught two sections of JPN 1002 in the traditional, classroom format, thus ending the delivery of first-year Japanese courses via the SILP model. The full-time tenure-track faculty, whose teaching responsibilities would eventually include the four 3000-level courses developed during this time, was finalized in May, 2013. These four courses are: Practical Conversation, Grammar and Composition, Advanced Reading, and Readings in Japanese Culture, and formed a series of courses intended to coincide with the language requirement of the B.A. in Asian Studies.

The study abroad/internship component involves relationships with organizations outside of the university or institutions in Japan. The university currently enjoys exchanges with three Japanese universities: Soka University in Tokyo, established in Fall, 2010, Chukyo University in Nagoya, established in Fall, 2011, and Tokyo Keizai University, established in 2010. Since the inception of these programs, KSU has received four incoming students from Soka, five from Chukyo while sending two to study there, and none to or from Tokyo Keizai to date. The new Asian Studies major requirement strengthens these current programs by recruiting more students to study in Japan as well as recruiting more Japanese students to come to study at KSU, and also serves as a driving force in taking initial steps to establish new exchange programs with universities in Japan, increasing the opportunities for all Japanese language students as well as the Asian Studies majors.

Future: Projections and Direction

The UISFL grant and Japan Foundation salary assistance, therefore, are major forces behind the growth and continued development of the Japanese program at KSU. The creation of the B.A. in Asian Studies proposed in the grant has the assurance of the highest quality as it borrowed from the curriculum design of solid programs around the country, following the national standards set forth by ACTFL and its proficiency tests, ensuring a proficiency-based Japanese language program with opportunities for semester- or year-long study abroad. The expansion of Japanese is also made possible by the support of faculty from various offices and departments within the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, such as the Education Abroad Office, the International Center for Innovations in Technology, the Psychology, and the History departments to name a few. The university also supports the program by its commitment to hire an additional part-time lecturer in Japanese to assist the language classes from the Fall of 2015, and by its agreement to match a portion of the UISFL grant funding, committing $5,000 per year for two years to purchase additional Asian Studies-related library holdings, the current collection of which 32% is Japanese-related. Work has already begun to request additional funding in 2014 specifically for the purchase of Japanese language teaching and learning materials to be housed and available to students in the Foreign Language Resource Center.
Furthermore, the development of the Japanese language and culture program at KSU requires a major long-term institutional commitment to fund it beyond the scope of the two-year UISFL grant. As such, the university has developed a comprehensive five-year plan to raise additional external funds that will support the program in the short-, mid-range-, and long-term. All players are very committed to the university’s initiative and there is a healthy balance of Asian studies and language and culture experts involved, including several senior administrators, to ensure fiscal sustainability after the grant period ends. Efforts are also being made to develop a marketing campaign, with recruitment plans for new enrollment both on- and off-campus as well as advertisement of the anticipated approval of the B.A. in Asian Studies and the new course offerings in Japanese, Chinese and Korean from the Spring of 2014. Projected enrollments in the Japanese program are as follows:

Table 2. Projected enrollments in Japanese courses (adapted from Leger (2012))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Projection</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While enrollment numbers in the Japanese classes are important as they provide a basic benchmark for measuring the effectiveness of the program, they do not necessarily ensure the quality of the program. A comprehensive Assurance of Learning (AOL) plan modeled after a template used on campus for all degree programs to satisfy accreditation (SACS) and other State and Federal requirements will be established to assess the quality of the Asian Studies B.A. Similarly, an evaluation plan will be developed specifically for the Japanese program, and will involve tracking student surveys of the Japanese courses, and evaluating their ability to meet the learning outcomes of the courses and to reach the proficiency levels set forth in the course syllabi. The purpose of this plan is to gather sufficient, reliable data on the quality of the Japanese program, allowing for necessary adjustments to the curriculum and continuous improvement.

Another contribution to the promotion of Japanese at KSU is The “Year of...” program—an annual year-long series of events coordinated by its Institute of Global Initiatives. Japan is the featured country in the 2013-2014 Year Of program at KSU, offering yet another opportunity to promote the Japanese program and encourage enrollment as well as focusing on Japan under the Asian Studies major. Under the Year Of initiative, designed to immerse the campus and local community in a designated country’s language and culture, the university will offer a series of lectures, cultural events, a spring conference, and a variety of forums on Japanese language and culture, inviting artists, guest speakers and world-renowned experts from around the globe.

Based on past record, present development, and future needs assessment, it is predicted that project activities, course enrollment, and an increase in interest in Japan will continue at KSU. By offering a focus on Japanese as a major to students who come from a significantly different demographic than those who can afford a similar B.A. from other less-affordable Georgia universities, KSU shows its commitment and support of the expansion of its Japanese program in the wake of the growing demand and national need for students with a greater exposure to and understanding of Japan.

Conclusion

The growth of the Japanese program at KSU has been slow and steady since its humble beginnings in 1997 and not without its challenges. It is evident as described in this article however, that the university is proactive in its endeavors to ensure that the program continues to grow, strengthen, and gain a yet even stronger momentum. The Japanese program is but one component
of KSU’s budding Asian Studies program and major, and will serve as a growing contributor in the department, university, surrounding community, state of Georgia, and in global arenas as it prepares its students to play an ever increasing role in the world economy and politics, broaden their worldview and provide them with the knowledge, skills, and expertise necessary to succeed in the global environment of our ever-shrinking world. With most Japanese manufacturing investments coming to South U.S. (Japan-America Society of Georgia) and with Georgia regarded as the center of Japanese industry here in the U.S. Southeast (Consulate General of Japan in Atlanta), coupled with its numerous cultural and educational organizations within close proximity, the university is in a perfect position to help strengthen and have a positive impact on the Japan-Georgia relationship through the education of its emerging world leaders.

References


FLAG Awards Information

Teaching Awards

- **Teaching Award** Recognizes teachers who effectively strive to use various strategies, techniques, and materials to enhance the students' interest in, acquisition of, and proficiency in a second language. Two divisions will be recognized: P-12 and Post-Secondary.

- **Teacher of Promise Award** Recognizes teachers in their first, second, or third year of teaching who show the promise to be an outstanding teacher and leader in foreign language education. Two divisions will be recognized: P-12 and Post-Secondary.

Leadership & Support Awards

- **Administrative Support of Foreign Languages** Recognizes a Georgia Dean, Superintendent, Principal, or other administrator who has evidenced strong and overt support for foreign languages.

- **Fostering Partnerships With Foreign Languages** Recognizes teachers who have sought to involve the community/business/colleges in foreign language activities, which may occur on or away from campus.

- **Leadership Award** Recognizes those who have taken an active role in promoting foreign language education through professional and/or academic endeavors. Two divisions will be recognized: P-12 and Post-Secondary.
  - See the FLAG website for nomination information  http://www.flageorgia.org/flag.htm
FLAG Membership Form

FLAG dues are due by September 1 of each year and should be sent to FLAG Treasurer, Mary Ellen Foye, P.O. Box 734, Griffin, GA  30224 (eyofme@aol.com).

[  ] $15.00 - Student/Retired Membership
(“student” means fulltime, undergraduate student only; “retired” means retired and NOT teaching). Benefits: Subscription to The FLAG Journal, “Fall Features”, FLAG Conference at member rates, participation at the FLAG Contests.

[  ] $25.00 – Regular Membership
Benefits: Subscription to The FLAG Journal, “Fall Features”, FLAG Conference at member rates, participation at the FLAG Contests

[  ] $40.00 Joint Spouses’ Membership
Benefits: Subscription to The FLAG Journal, “Fall Features”, FLAG Conference at member rates, participation at the FLAG Contests

[  ] $50.00 Patron Membership
Available to individuals. Benefits: Subscription to The FLAG Journal, “Fall Features”, FLAG Conference at member rates, participation at the FLAG Contests. Name will be Listed on the FLAG web page, in The FLAG Journal, and in the conference program.

[  ] $50.00 Institutional Membership
Available to institutions only. Subscription to The FLAG Journal, Fall Features and FLAG Peer-Review. Name will be listed on the FLAG web page, in The FLAG Journal, and in the conference Program

Did a colleague urge you to join FLAG? If so, please let us know who it was (name, school, email), so that we can thank him or her for supporting our membership drive. Thank you for your support!

Please print clearly.

Name: _______________________________________________________________________
School: _____________________________________________________________________
County: __________________ Level of Instruction: _________________________________
School Address: __________________________________________________________________
School Phone: ___________________ School FAX: ________________________________
Language taught: _____________________________________________________________
Home address: __________________________________________________________________
Home Phone: _________________________ Home FAX: _____________________________
Email address: __________________________________________________________________