

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Different approaches, similar results: Preparing foreign language teachers to implement high-leverage teaching practices

Scott Kissau¹ | Kristin J. Davin²  | Helga Haudeck³ |
Chuang Wang⁴

The Challenge

Research has identified a set of 10 high-leverage teaching practices that when implemented well can have a positive impact on student learning. To what extent are these practices emphasized in foreign language teacher training programs? How successful are novice teachers at implementing them, and are some subcomponents more challenging to master than others? Answering these questions will help to guide the preparation of foreign language teacher candidates to implement these critical practices in their classrooms.

¹Cato College of Education, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, North Carolina, Charlotte, USA

²Department of Middle, Secondary and K-12 Education, University of North Carolina, Charlotte, North Carolina, USA

³Institute of English, University of Education Ludwigsburg, Ludwigsburg, Germany

⁴Faculty of Education, University of Macau, Macau, China

Correspondence

Scott Kissau, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, NC, USA.

Email: spkissau@uncc.edu

Abstract

Research has identified 10 high-leverage teaching practices (HLTPs) that can impact student learning of a foreign language. While acknowledging the importance of this work, more research is needed to inform the preparation of novice teachers to enact these practices. In response, the researchers conducted a case study involving two foreign language teacher preparation programs in the United States and Germany, to better understand how the two very different programs prepare their candidates to implement HLTPs, which HLTPs are emphasized, and how successful they are at preparing their aspiring teachers

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2023 The Authors. *Foreign Language Annals* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of ACTFL.

to implement one practice that has been identified in the research as particularly important (facilitating target language comprehensibility). Survey, teaching observation, and interview data collected from teacher candidates and their instructors suggested the critical nature of select HLTPs, that some of the subcomponents of one of these practices may be more challenging for novice teachers to master than others, and that there may be multiple approaches to preparing foreign language teachers to implement HLTPs.

KEYWORDS

high-leverage teaching practices, foreign/second language teacher preparation, all languages, case study

1 | INTRODUCTION

Traditional, university-based teacher training programs are frequently criticized for being too theoretical and not sufficiently practice-oriented (Grossman et al., 2009). Completers of such programs are often described as knowledgeable about, but ill-prepared to implement the many teaching strategies they learn in their teacher preparation coursework (Glisan, 2010; Grossman & McDonald, 2008). In response to this consistent criticism, there has been a growing movement in the field to adopt a practice-based teacher education (PBTE) approach that prepares teachers to apply a select number of high-leverage teaching practices (HLTPs), which have a positive impact on student learning (Grossman & McDonald, 2008; Sleep, 2009).

Led by pioneering work in the preparation of mathematics teachers (Ball et al., 2009), the PBTE movement has spread to include other disciplines (Grossman et al., 2009; Windschitl et al., 2012), including foreign language teacher preparation (Davin & Troyan, 2015; Glisan & Donato, 2017; Kearney, 2015). Buoyed by research priority initiatives (Glisan & Donato, 2012; Hlas & Hlas, 2012), the foreign language teaching community has made strides in building its own body of related research to guide and inform this work. Over the last 10 years, researchers have not only identified and revised a list of HLTPs specific to teaching a foreign language (Glisan & Donato, 2017, 2021), but have also begun to investigate how teacher candidates are prepared to implement these HLTPs in classrooms (Barahona & Davin, 2020; Troyan et al., 2013) and identify components of specific HLTPs where candidates tend to be more or less successful in their implementation (Davin & Troyan, 2015).

Although the field's progress in this work is undeniable, questions remain. For example, in streamlined foreign language teacher preparation programs, what HLTPs are prioritized over others? How successful are programs at preparing candidates to implement these HLTPs and how confident are program completers to implement them in K-12 classrooms? Further, although Barahona and Davin (2020, p. 181) make reference to "the international trend toward a practice-based approach in teacher education," the large majority of related research has taken place in the United States (Davin & Troyan, 2015; Glisan & Donato, 2017; Kearney, 2015;

Troyan et al., 2013). The field could benefit from understanding what practices are emphasized in the preparation of foreign language teachers in other countries, how these practices are taught, and to what degree of success. Hoping to build upon the existing body of related research and to address some of these questions, the researchers conducted a case study involving two foreign language teacher preparation programs in the United States and Germany, to better understand how two very different programs prepare their candidates to implement HLTPs, which HLTPs were emphasized in their respective programs, and how successful they were at preparing their candidates to implement them.

2 | REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 | Practice-based approach to teacher preparation

In a practice-based approach, candidates typically engage in a four-phase cycle (McDonald et al., 2013). They first observe and deconstruct the selected HLTP. For example, they might watch a video of a lesson illustrating a specific teaching practice, discuss the theoretical underpinnings of the practice, and break the practice down into subcomponents. In the second phase, candidates typically plan a brief lesson or learning segment that highlights the HLTP, followed by the third phase, in which they rehearse the lesson with classmates and the instructor. During this rehearsal phase, the instructor periodically pauses their lesson to coach and provide feedback. In the final phase, candidates implement the practice in an authentic context (i.e., during a clinical field experience) and record their instruction, so that they may later view and reflect upon their performance.

A practice-based approach differs from a traditional approach in which candidates are introduced to a variety of instructional practices at a superficial level and not provided sufficient time to deeply analyze, deconstruct, rehearse, and reflect upon these practices. Instead, a practice-based approach focuses on a set of practices that are considered learnable by beginner teachers (Troyan et al., 2013). By focusing on a select number of critical practices in teacher training coursework, teacher candidates have sufficient time to learn about and practice these skills before being asked to implement them in K-12 classrooms (Ball & Forzani, 2010).

2.2 | HLTPs

The expanding practice-based approach movement necessitated a discussion of what those specific practices should be. In this discussion, the term HLTPs was used to describe practices that, when implemented effectively, can have the highest impact on student achievement (Ball et al., 2009). HLTPs occur with high frequency in classrooms, span content areas and grade levels, are skills that novices can master, and are research-based practices that can lead to improved student learning (Grossman et al., 2009).

Research has made headway in identifying HLTPs that new teachers should master (Franke et al., 2006; Sleep et al., 2007). As part of a reform initiative originating at the University of Michigan aimed at ensuring that all students have an effective teacher, TeachingWorks (2021) identified 19 practices that are applicable to all content areas and grade levels. Ball et al. (2009)

recommended that teacher preparation programs identify and focus on a select number of these practices deemed most pertinent to their context.

2.3 | High-leverage foreign language teaching practices

Spurred by a clarion call for research on high-leverage practices in language teaching (Glisan, 2010), research priority initiatives (Glisan & Donato, 2012), and foundational research conducted in other content areas (Ball et al., 2009; Grossman et al., 2009), the foreign language education community has responded with a growing body of its own related work. Over the past decade, related research has, for example, adapted HLTPs in the pioneering field of mathematics education and applied them to foreign language teaching (Hlas & Hlas, 2012), proposed a new HLTP to improve student interpersonal communication (Hlas, 2021), studied how a select number of HLTPs are enacted in foreign language classrooms (Kearney, 2015), and investigated how foreign language teacher preparation programs prepare aspiring teachers to implement HLTPs (Trojan et al., 2013; Trojan and Peercy, 2018), and the extent teacher candidates are successful in implementing them (Davin & Trojan, 2015). Most recently, Trojan et al. (2022) examined WL teachers' perceptions of their abilities to implement key HLTPs via online instruction during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic.

Of particular relevance to the current study, only recently has related research expanded beyond the United States. Barahona and Davin (2020) shared their experiences implementing a practice-based approach in foreign language teacher preparation programs in Chile and the United States. The authors chronicled each of the four steps of a practice-based cycle and provided specific recommendations and words of caution to guide other teacher education programs in their implementation of a practice-based approach.

Founded in much of the above-mentioned research, Glisan and Donato (2017), presented six HLTPs. These practices include (1) facilitating target language comprehensibility (FTLC); (2) building a classroom discourse community; (3) guiding learners to interpret and discuss authentic texts; (4) focusing on form in a dialogic context through pace (Presentation, Attention, Co-construction, Extension); (5) focusing on cultural products, practices, and perspectives in a dialogic context; and (6) providing oral corrective feedback to improve learner performance. The authors connected these practices to research (Davin & Trojan, 2015; Hlas & Hlas, 2012; Trojan et al., 2013), deconstructed them "into various instructional moves" (p. 1), and provided guidance on how to rehearse and assess these practices. Glisan and Donato (2021) subsequently added four additional HLTPs in a second volume of their text. They included (7) establishing a purposeful and meaningful context; (8) planning for instruction using an iterative process for backward design; (9) engaging learners in purposeful written communication; and (10) developing contextualized performance assessments. For a complete list of Glisan and Donato's 10 HLTPs, along with a description of each, please see Table 1.

2.4 | FTLC

Of the 10 HLTPs identified by Glisan and Donato (2017), FTLC has perhaps the strongest research basis. FTLC refers to the ability to use the target language at least 90% of the time in the classroom by making language comprehensible and engaging students in also using the language. Multiple studies have emphasized the critical nature of this practice (Davin & Trojan, 2015; Trojan &

TABLE 1 Comparisons between US and German samples in teacher preparation programs.

Teaching practices (abbreviation)	Description	United States	Germany	<i>t</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
FTLC	Use of the target language at least 90% of the time in the classroom by making language comprehensible and engaging students in interaction in the language	4.42 (1.17)	4.08 (0.89)	.99	.35
Building a classroom discourse community (Building a Discourse Community)	Engaging learners in oral classroom communication and how to design and conduct oral interpersonal pair and group tasks	4.50 (1.17)	3.73 (1.04)	2.04*	.71
Guiding learners to interpret and discuss authentic texts (Authentic Texts)	Guiding learners to interpret authentic texts (texts written by native speakers for native speakers) and leading a text-based discussion	4.50 (1.17)	2.54 (0.95)	5.51***	1.92
Focusing on form in a dialogic context (Focus on Form)	Teaching grammar dialogically in context through steps such as presentation of an authentic text, drawing students' attention to the target form/function, discussion of the grammar form/function, and extension activities where they use the form	4.33 (1.23)	3.46 (0.99)	2.34*	.82
Focusing on cultural products, practices, and perspectives in a dialogic context (Culture)	Teaching students about cultural products, practices, and perspectives while interacting in the target language	4.58 (1.17)	3.27 (0.67)	4.43***	1.55
Providing oral corrective feedback to improve learner performance (Corrective Feedback)	Error correction, including topics such as when to correct errors, which errors to correct, and how to correct errors	3.92 (1.51)	4.04 (0.82)	-.32	-.11
Establishing a meaningful and purposeful context for language learning (Context)	Situating lessons and activities in meaningful and cultural contexts	4.58 (1.17)	3.92 (0.80)	2.05*	.71
Planning for instruction using an iterative process for backward design (Planning)	Creating units of instruction by starting with the targeted knowledge and skills, then designing the assessments, then designing the lessons	4.50 (1.17)	3.27 (0.96)	3.43***	1.20

(Continues)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Teaching practices (abbreviation)	Description	United States	Germany	<i>t</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Engaging learners in purposeful written communication (Writing)	Teaching writing through a genre-based approach in which students first deconstruct examples of a particular written genre (i.e., a travel brochure) and then create their own text within the same genre	4.17 (1.27)	2.81 (1.13)	3.31**	1.16
Developing contextualized performance assessments (Assessment)	Creating and administering oral interpersonal performance assessments, how to create presentational writing assessments, and how to provide feedback to learners through performance assessment rubrics	4.50 (1.17)	2.81 (0.75)	5.40***	1.88
Average		4.40 (1.14)	3.39 (0.47)	3.91***	1.37

Note: Numbers in parentheses are SDs.

Abbreviation: FTLC, facilitating target language comprehensibility.

**p* < .05.

***p* < .01.

****p* < .001.

Peercy, 2018; Troyan et al., 2022). For example, Vyn et al. (2019) investigated how 27 teacher variables (e.g., textbook use, small group work, interpersonal activities) related to foreign language students' year-long gains on a language proficiency assessment. Of these 27, they identified two significant predictors—time spent in the target language and the use of explicit grammar instruction. Greater use of the target language by teachers corresponded to greater outcomes in students' proficiency gains. Further speaking to the importance of FTLC, Zhai (2019) examined over 27 h of recorded classroom instruction illustrating exemplary practices in foreign language teaching lessons to identify the presence of HLTPs. Using the HLTP rubrics created by Glisan and Donato (2017) as coding instruments, she found that the teaching behaviors associated with FTLC (see Table 2) were evident in 96% of all videos.

Perhaps most similar to the present study, Davin and Troyan (2015) sought to explore their candidates' ability to carry out FTLC. In their case study, they found that candidates were more proficient in aspects of FTLC for which they could plan in advance, such as the incorporation of visuals and gestures, the use of repetition to introduce new vocabulary, and the use of familiar vocabulary. In contrast, the teachers struggled to carry out more context-dependent subcomponents of the practice, particularly related to engaging students in interaction. Candidates struggled to ask clarifying or follow-up questions to push students to produce more target language. However, their sample size was small, consisting of only four teachers—all of whom taught in US schools. Thus, the present study sought to build upon this work, including a greater number of participants in two different countries.

2.5 | Summary and need for research

The existing literature has identified a list of 10 HLTPs (Glisan & Donato, 2017, 2021) and their subcomponents that, when enacted well, can have an impact on student learning of a foreign language. Focusing on the preparation of beginning teachers, related studies have illustrated how these practices can be integrated into a traditional teacher preparation program (Troyan et al., 2013), provided recommendations to support teacher educators and novice teachers in their preparation and enactment (Barahona & Davin, 2020; Troyan & Peercy, 2018), provided insights into the subcomponents involved in HLTPs that are challenging for new teachers to master (Davin & Troyan, 2015), and underscored FTLC as a critical skill that novice teachers should learn (Troyan & Peercy, 2018; Troyan et al., 2022; Vyn et al., 2019; Zhai, 2019). Although the foreign language teaching community has made strides over the last 10 years in building a body of knowledge related to PBTE and HLTPs, the related research is still in its infancy and more research is needed (Hlas & Hlas, 2012). Much of the extant research has been conducted in the United States and has involved a traditional four-phase PBTE approach to the preparation of foreign language teachers to enact HLTPs (Davin & Troyan, 2015; Troyan & Peercy, 2018; Troyan et al., 2013). Peercy et al. (2022) cautioned that the field “must avoid overgeneralizing ‘what works’ (p. 2)” with respect to the preparation of teacher candidates to enact HLTPs. Further, while research has investigated how foreign language teacher preparation programs prepare candidates to enact a select number of HLTPs (Davin & Troyan, 2015; Troyan et al., 2013), there is little mention in the research of what practices are stressed over others and why these practices are emphasized. Peercy and Troyan (2017) found little research explaining how teacher training programs “have approached the process of identifying and refining core practices for use with novice teachers” (p. 34). The field stands to benefit from research conducted in other countries and that illustrates how foreign language teacher preparation programs prepare candidates to implement HLTPs in different contexts.

TABLE 2 Comparisons between US and German samples in teacher preparation programs.

Teaching behaviors	United States	Germany	<i>t</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Situating lessons in a meaningful and cultural context that is relevant to students' lives to drive the lesson.	4.83 (0.39)	3.48 (0.77)	5.72***	2.01
Using the target language more than 90% of class time.	4.58 (0.67)	4.28 (0.89)	1.04	0.37
Paraphrasing and adjusting rate of speech, defining new words with examples, including new words frequently in teacher input, signaling new words with structures and tone of voice, and using familiar vocabulary and structures.	4.58 (0.67)	3.72 (0.79)	3.26**	1.14
Using gestures, visuals, and objects in creative ways to support student comprehension.	4.83 (0.39)	4.32 (0.69)	2.39*	0.84
Providing all students with the opportunity to participate using the new language and structures.	4.83 (0.39)	3.48 (0.87)	5.11***	1.79
Engaging students in interaction from the first moment of instruction, asking questions to check comprehension.	4.67 (0.65)	3.76 (0.78)	3.48***	1.22
Posing follow-up questions to clarify, probe, and extend students' language use and thinking.	4.67 (0.65)	3.56 (0.65)	4.84***	1.70
Average	4.71 (0.44)	3.80 (0.45)	5.83***	2.05

Note: Numbers in parentheses are SDs.

**p* < .05.

***p* < .01.

****p* < .001.

3 | RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In response, the researchers conducted a case study involving two foreign language teacher training programs, one in the United States and one in Germany, to better understand how they prepare their teacher candidates to implement HLTPs and the extent they succeeded in their endeavor. In conducting this study, the researchers' intent was not to compare the effectiveness of these two very different teacher preparation programs in preparing candidates to implement HLTPs, but rather to explore the approaches that they employed to prepare their candidates to implement these skills, and the extent they were successful in preparing them to implement one practice that has been highlighted in the literature as particularly critical (i.e., FTLC). More specifically, the researchers sought answers to the following questions:

1. To what extent do 2 foreign language teacher preparation programs in the US and Germany emphasize the 10 HLTPs identified by Glisan and Donato (2017, 2021)?
2. To what extent are candidates in two foreign language teacher preparation programs, one in the U.S and one in Germany, prepared to implement FTLC in their classrooms?

4 | METHODOLOGY

To examine the aforementioned research questions, a convergent mixed methods case study design was employed (Creswell, 2003). Quantitative data were collected from an online survey and observation instrument to examine the extent the 10 HLTPs were emphasized in 2 foreign language teacher preparation programs in 2 different countries and the extent the candidates in the 2 countries were prepared to implement them. Qualitative data were collected through interviews with foreign language education faculty who teach in these two programs to better understand which HLTPs they emphasized and why, as well as to provide their insights into the subcomponents of FTLC where their candidates were more or less prepared than others. Quantitative and qualitative data were collected and analyzed simultaneously and merged during the interpretation of the results.

4.1 | Context and setting

The project was facilitated by a long-standing research partnership between a college of education in the southeastern United States and a university that focuses strictly on teacher preparation in the state of Baden-Württemberg, Germany. Both institutions offered programs to prepare foreign language teachers. The US university offered a 1-year (3 semester) graduate program for aspiring foreign language teachers pursuing an initial license to teach 1 of 17 different languages, ranging from French to Japanese. Due to the large number of languages represented, and because all foreign language teacher candidates completed common coursework, English was the primary language of instruction. To reach prospective candidates from across the state, the US program was offered entirely online via the use of a learning management system (Canvas) and a combination of both synchronous and asynchronous instruction. However, clinical components accompanied online learning. In candidates' second semester, they spent 1 day per week in a classroom completing tasks assigned by their

university professors. In their final semester, all candidates completed an internship that involved 5 days a week spent at a school.

A distinguishing characteristic of the US program was that it included a combination of both traditional and nontraditional “residency” teacher candidates. Due to the critical shortage of qualified foreign language teachers in the US (Commission on Language Learning, 2017; p. ix; Skorton & Altschuler, 2012), school districts often hire foreign language teachers who possess an undergraduate degree and proficiency in the intended language of instruction, but no formal teacher training. These residency teachers are given up to 3 years, to complete their teacher training to maintain their employment. Although traditional candidates completed all clinical experiences under the supervision of a mentor teacher, residency teachers completed the clinical experiences in their own classroom under the supervision of a university faculty member.

The German university offered a 6-semester bachelor's degree for aspiring primary school teachers. Candidates were required to choose one teaching subject in addition to English. The program prepared foreign language teachers to teach in all school types except vocational schools (Berufsschule) and high schools for the most academically gifted (Gymnasium). Unlike its US counterpart, all teacher preparation coursework in the German programs was conducted on campus. As all teachers in the program were training to be English teachers, all of their courses except for one seminar were taught in English. Similar to the US context, the German program included a 4-month student teaching internship. Candidates spent 4 days a week at a school, working under the supervision of a mentor teacher, and 1 day per week completing coursework on campus.

Candidates in both programs learned about and observed various teaching practices deemed critical in the field of foreign language instruction. In the US context, preparation involved a traditional four-phase PBTE approach. More specifically, candidates learned about and analyzed the components of the HLTPs in online coursework, video-recorded themselves rehearsing these practices in small groups, rehearsed the practices for instructor and peer feedback in a whole-group synchronous session, and finally recorded and submitted for instructor assessment a video of themselves implementing the practices in an authentic foreign language classroom during a clinical experience. In the German context, candidates were introduced to methods of foreign language teaching illustrated by exemplary video recordings in different classrooms and role plays. After observing several videos depicting a specific teaching practice, German candidates were provided opportunities to practice the strategies and receive feedback from their instructor during classroom role-plays and during their internship in Semester 4 of the program.

4.2 | Participants

The study utilized a convenience sample of foreign language teacher candidates completing the final semester of a teacher training program in the United States and Germany, and faculty members from each country who taught methodology coursework in the respective programs. In fall 2021 and spring 2022, aspiring foreign language teachers in each context were invited to complete an online survey. In addition, five survey completers from each context were invited to submit a video of their enactment of FTLC for instructor evaluation. To gain the perspective of instructors, one faculty member from each program in the United States and Germany was invited to participate in a semistructured interview.

4.2.1 | US sample

Nineteen graduate students studying to become foreign language teachers at a US university completed the survey. Four (21%) were males and 15 were females (79%). Although the license offers certification for grades K-12, the majority (84%) wanted to teach at the high school level, one (5%) aspired to teach middle school, and two (11%) elementary school. Thirteen of the 19 US candidates (68%) reported to be native speakers of their intended language of instruction (Spanish, French, German, or Chinese) and all but 2 of the 19 (89%) had spent a minimum of 3 months living in a country where the targeted language was the primary language of communication. A unique characteristic of the US candidates was that 12 of the 19 (63%) were already working as paid foreign language teachers, despite not having completed their licensure requirements (i.e., residency teacher candidates).

Five of these 19 survey respondents submitted a video that they selected to highlight their ability to implement the practice of FTLC (Chapter 1; Glisan & Donato, 2017). Four were female and one was male. All five were studying to become high school Spanish teachers. Three of the five were residency teachers in their first year as full-time teachers.

To complement the teacher candidate data, the director of their foreign language teacher preparation program and instructor of multiple required courses participated in a semi-structured interview. The instructor had 5 years of K-12 foreign language teaching experience, 10 years of experience as a faculty member in foreign and second language teacher preparation programs, and a doctoral degree in foreign language education.

4.2.2 | German sample

Twenty-six candidates studying to become English teachers at a university of education in Germany completed the survey. Two of the candidates (8%) were males and 24 were females (92%). Unlike their US counterparts, all 26 were aspiring elementary school teachers pursuing an undergraduate degree. Another distinguishing feature between the German and US participants was that none of the Germans were currently working as paid English teachers. Only one (4%) of the Germans reported to be a native speaker of English and 11 (42%) spent more than 3 months living in a country where English was an official language. As with the US sample, 5 of these 26 survey respondents also submitted a video that they selected to highlight their ability to implement FTLC. All five were females studying to be elementary school English teachers.

The German instructor who agreed to participate in the semistructured interview was a senior lecturer in the field of foreign language methodology at the participating German institution. Similar to her US counterpart, the German instructor had 5 years of teaching experience at the K-12 level, 23 years as a faculty member in English teacher preparation programs, and a doctoral degree in foreign language education.

4.3 | Data collection

The researchers collected both quantitative and qualitative data. Data for the US participants were collected during their second semester methods course, whereas data for the German participants were collected during a 4-month-long internship in a primary school classroom in

the middle (Semester 3) of a six-semester-long program. All data collection instruments used in the present study can be freely downloaded on the IRIS Database; iris-database.org.

4.4 | HLTP survey

Quantitative data were collected via an online survey completed by candidates in both countries in fall 2021 or spring 2022. The first section of the survey solicited demographic information about the participants. For example, participants were asked to indicate the level of schooling they hoped to teach (e.g., primary school) and if they were a native speaker of the language they intend to, or currently teach. The second section inquired about the extent to which the two teacher training programs emphasized the HLTPs (Research question #1). In this section, each of the 10 HLTPs identified by Glisan and Donato (2021) were listed and described (see Table 1), and participants were asked to indicate using a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) the extent to which they felt their teacher preparation program focused on preparing them to exhibit that specific practice. The third and final section of the survey inquired about the extent to which the teacher candidates in both countries felt prepared to implement FTLC (Research question #2). The seven subcomponents of FTLC that were listed (see Table 2) were drawn from an observation tool to monitor target language comprehensibility (Glisan & Donato, 2017). Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they felt prepared to exhibit these seven subcomponents on a scale of 1 (not at all prepared) to 5 (very prepared).

4.5 | Teaching observation

To further address the second research question, all participants submitted a 10-min video recording of their enactment of FTLC. Purposeful random sampling (Coyne, 1997) was used to select the videos of five candidates from each country to ensure the participation of an equal number of US and German candidates, as well as a variety of different backgrounds and perspectives (e.g., language of instruction, residency/traditional teacher candidate).

4.6 | Interviews

To complement the quantitative data collected from teacher candidates, and to gain the perspective of faculty members who teach in the participating programs, qualitative data were collected from a faculty member in both the US and German programs who taught methodology coursework to the participating teacher candidates. In alignment with the first research question, during these 10 min, audio-recorded interviews, the two faculty members were asked to describe the HLTPs addressed in their coursework, how they prepared candidates to implement these practices, which practices were emphasized more than others, and why some skills were paid additional attention. Related to the second research question, the two faculty members were asked to comment upon the degree of their candidates' preparation, as evidenced by their performance on the videos. More specifically, the instructors were asked to describe areas where their candidates appeared

well-prepared in the videos to exhibit the subcomponents involved in FTLC and where they needed additional preparation.

4.7 | Data analysis

A quasi-experimental comparison design was used to investigate the extent two foreign language teacher preparation programs in the United States and Germany emphasize HLTPs (Research question #1) and the extent their candidates are prepared to implement one of those practices (FTLC) in their classroom (Research question #2). Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was employed to examine differences between the German and US samples in their overall perception of the extent their teacher preparation program emphasizes HLTPs and the extent they feel prepared to implement those practices. Independent sample *t* tests were used to examine differences in program attention to particular HLTPs (Research question #1) and preparation to implement specific HLTP components or subcomponents (Research question #2). A familywise α level of .05 was used to avoid Type-I error and effect sizes were reported together with statistically significant levels. η^2 was used as a measure of effect size for MANOVA, whereas Cohen's *d* was used as a measure of effect size for *t* tests. According to Cohen (1988), partial η^2 of .01, .06, and .14 were considered small, medium, and large effect sizes, respectively. Further, Cohen's *d* of .20, .50, .80, and 1.20 were considered small, medium, large, and very large effect sizes, respectively (Cohen, 1988).

Quantitative data collected from the teaching observations were also analyzed to address the extent the candidates were prepared to implement FTLC (Research question #2). The videos were analyzed by three of the researchers, all of whom have extensive experience as foreign language teachers, researchers, and methodology instructors. While analyzing each video, the researchers assessed candidate ability to enact each of the seven subcomponents involved in FTLC (see Table 2). Candidate performance was evaluated using an observation instrument (see Appendix A) with a three-point scale (1 = *approaching expectations*, 2 = *meeting expectations*, 3 = *exceeding expectations*). To ensure inter-rater reliability, the three scorers watched two videos together (one from each country), scored the video using the observation instrument, and then discussed their scores together, and in some cases returned to the video for further analysis, until they came to a consensus. After arriving at a common understanding of the rubric expectations, the three evaluators scored each of the remaining eight videos independently. Next, they met to discuss scores, discussed any inconsistencies in scores, and arrived at a consensus score for each video. Individual candidate scores for each of the seven subcomponents of FTLC were tabulated in an Excel spreadsheet, as was each candidate's total score. The mean score for each subcomponent and the mean total score were then calculated for US and German teacher candidates.

Qualitative data collected during the interviews were also analyzed. The researchers transcribed and uploaded interview transcripts into N-Vivo. In response to the first research question, they read each transcript and coded excerpts related to which HLTPs were and were not emphasized in each program. Using the constant comparative method (Corbin & Strauss, 2015), the researchers looked for patterns of similarity and difference across the two programs. They also compared instructor interview responses to the survey responses of the candidates, seeking patterns of alignment. In response to the second research question, the researchers returned to the transcripts and sought themes related to each instructors' commentary on their candidates' performance in the video. These, too, were compared across cases.

5 | RESULTS

5.1 | Program attention to HLTPs

The first research question investigated the extent to which two foreign language teacher preparation programs in the United States and Germany emphasize the 10 HLTPs identified in the work of Glisan and Donato (2017, 2021). The main effects of the difference between the two samples in their perceptions of the extent the teacher preparation programs emphasized the HLTPs and the extent they believed they were prepared to implement the targeted HLTP were statistically significant, Wilks' $\lambda = 16.21$, $F(2,32) = 16.21$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .50$ (large effect size). Tests of between-subjects effects suggest that the US teacher candidates perceived their teacher preparation program devoted more attention to the 10 HLTPs than did their German counterparts, $F(1,33) = 14.51$, $p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .31$ (large effect size). Table 1 shows the means and SDs of the 10 HLTPs and the average of these 10 HLTPs for each sample with t test results.

The US candidates indicated that Culture and Context (scores of 4.58) were the most emphasized practices in their program, closely followed by Building a Discourse Community, Authentic Texts, Planning, and Assessment (scores of 4.50). In contrast, the German candidates identified FTLC (4.08) and Corrective Feedback (4.04) as the most emphasized practices. However, they also reported that Context (3.92) and Building a Discourse Community (3.73) were emphasized, similar to the US candidates.

Interviews with program faculty provided additional insight and questions related to these results. Both instructors reported that all 10 HLTPs were addressed in some way in their respective programs. The US instructor stated that her program explicitly emphasized five of these practices. Her candidates took one course that focused on Planning and then studied four other HLTPs in a practice-based lab, spending 5 weeks on each following the practice-based learning cycle. Regarding the other HLTPs, she explained that they were not addressed specifically in her courses, "not because I don't want to, but my methods course is very much focused on edTPA and there's not a close enough, tight enough way for me to incorporate those readings or those practices." When asked to identify which practices were addressed in her program, the German instructor responded, "I think we address all of them." She explained how each practice was embedded across courses, some more so than others, but that they were not referred to as HLTPs. Methodology coursework in the German program also employed videos of teachers' practice and rehearsal sessions. The German instructor explained that they used "video recordings of lessons to illustrate good examples." She stated,

We also give them tasks such as what would you do and say when, for instance, introducing the following lexical items, so we see whether they apply the guidelines on concrete examples, because they know all the theory, but as soon as they have to get more concrete, it's a different matter, and as I said, we have regular [classroom visits] by us lecturers, which are very helpful to them, because they get immediate feedback and detailed feedback.

Thus, although she did not follow a formalized format of a practice-based approach, she too allowed for candidates to rehearse and get immediate feedback.

Both instructors were asked to identify the most emphasized HLTPs in their programs and both underscored the importance of FTLC. The US instructor stated that FTLC was one of the most emphasized practices in her program, although this practice ranked 6 out of 10 in terms of

emphasis based on her candidates' scoring. She indicated that their low ranking of this practice was surprising, stating, "We address FTLC first, so that the candidates can continue to practice it as they work on the subsequent practices." The German instructor also stated that FTLC was one of the most emphasized practices, stating, "our students know that they are expected to stick to English and not switch to German, so I think this is something that is a kind of a general rule that they have to follow." Her response aligned with those of her candidates who indicated this practice was the most emphasized in their program.

The other practices identified by both instructors as emphasized were Building a Discourse Community and Context, responses which aligned to HLTPs identified by candidates as emphasized in their programs. Regarding the former, the US instructor explained, "I think research shows, and my belief on how language develops, is that it's through interaction. Creating and getting students to engage interpersonally in the classroom is critical, in my opinion." Similarly, the German instructor stated that this HLTP was "emphasized a lot", but she cautioned that one must be "careful with the design and conduct of oral interpersonal pair and group tasks" because the students "are still beginners." She explained that she first "emphasizes the development of listening comprehension" and teaches candidates to initially "get them involved by reactions that take place nonverbally or with short answers or yes or no questions."

Regarding context, both instructors reported that they emphasized situating instruction in meaningful and purposeful contexts, but both reported that their candidates struggled with this HLTP. The US instructor explained that her candidates often situated their lessons in a context that "was not very interesting or relevant to the learners" and stated her belief that "without a meaningful context, everything else just falls apart and the end is meaningless." She mentioned that the other HLTPs were "really important too, but maybe not as applicable to all levels, all languages." Similarly, the German instructor also felt that this HLTP was critical, but difficult. She stated, "I think this is what is most difficult for my students, establishing a meaningful and purposeful context for language learning. I think my students are still very much influenced by a form-oriented way of teaching."

5.2 | Preparation to facilitate target language comprehensibility

The second research question investigated the extent candidates in the two foreign language teacher preparation programs in the United States and Germany were prepared to implement FTLC. Tests of between-subjects effects suggested the US sample felt more prepared to implement the various subcomponents associated with FTLC in comparison to the German sample, $F(1,31) = 28.26$, $p < .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .46$ (large effect size). Table 2 shows the means and standard deviations of the teaching behaviors and the average of these behaviors for each sample with t test results.

Although the US teacher candidates perceived themselves more prepared to implement the teaching behaviors associated with FTLC than their German peers, the data suggested that both groups felt that their respective programs prepared them to enact the skills associated with this HLTP. Using a five-point scale, where a score of 5 indicates that candidates felt very well-prepared and a score of 1 indicates they felt not at all prepared, both groups reported a score of ~3.5 or higher for all seven instructional moves associated with FTLC, and for two of the seven skills, both groups reported scores exceeding 4.

Ratings on a three-point scale (1 = *approaching expectations*, 2 = *meets expectations*, 3 = *exceeds expectations*) of teacher candidate performance on a video intended to showcase

their abilities was also used to address the extent they were prepared to implement FTLC. Analysis of candidate ratings indicated both similarities and differences in their degree of preparation. Although the German candidates received higher mean scores for all seven of the subcomponents of FTLC than did their US counterparts, their mean scores were similar (within 0.2 pts) for four of the seven. For example, the data suggested that both groups were equally adept at (1) communicating consistently in the target language (amount of target language used); (2) paraphrasing, adjusting their rate of speech, and using familiar vocabulary and structures (comprehensible language); and (3) engaging students throughout the lesson (interaction). Both groups also demonstrated similar weaknesses in their ability to ask follow-up questions to clarify and extend thinking based on student responses (clarify and extend thinking). On the other hand, the data suggested that the German candidates were more successful than their US peers at using gestures, visuals, and objects to support student comprehension (contextual support) and involving students in the presentation of new material (comprehensible interactions). As shown in Table 3, the greatest difference between the two groups of teacher candidates was with respect to their ability to create a meaningful context for their lessons (lesson context). On a three-point scale, the mean German score (2.4) was more than one half point higher than the mean score received by the US teacher candidates (1.6).

During the interviews, both instructors spoke about how their candidates succeeded at speaking only in the target language, but they noted that this was only one aspect of FTLC and both noted concerns with other subcomponents of the practice. The US candidates' lessons lacked meaningful and purposeful contexts and instead focused on decontextualized language functions such as stating where someone lives, identifying colors and numbers, listing a schedule of activities, and making introductions. The US instructor explained, "I'm starting to wonder if creating a meaningful context is the number one most important [HLTP], which is why I've added that into the methods class," referring to a curricular revision that she had made since the videos were recorded.

Although the German candidates' lessons were more contextualized and all showcased either a prereading or during-reading activity, they revealed insufficient interaction in the target language. The teacher candidates were often the ones speaking for the majority of the lesson and they did not include sufficient comprehension checks in their instruction. When they did, similar to the US candidates, they rarely elicited more than one-word utterances from their students. Their instructor expressed that, "half of them need to be reminded of not only focusing on nouns, but first focusing

TABLE 3 Comparisons between US and German teaching performances.

Subcomponent	US (mean score)	German (mean score)
Meaningful context	1.8	2.4
Target language use	3	3
Comprehensible language	2.4	2.2
Contextual support	2.2	2.6
Comprehensible interactions	2.4	2.8
Interaction	2.6	2.4
Clarify and extend thinking	1	1.2
Total score	15.4	16.6

on more meaningful interaction.” She wondered if their lack of interaction stemmed from a lack of confidence or insufficient models of how such interactions should look. She poignantly noted that her candidates needed to be more attuned to students’ reactions, because in the videos, it was sometimes clear that “the learners were not with them.”

Although methodology instructors were asked to describe areas where their candidates appeared well-prepared in the videos to exhibit the subcomponents involved in FTLTC, and where they could improve, their responses often extended to include reasons for their performance. For example, when discussing areas for improvement among her teacher candidates, the US methodology instructor made multiple references to edTPA, a performance-based assessment that her candidates must pass to graduate and be recommended for license. She stressed that edTPA took up a lot of instructional time because “typically English was not [the candidates’] first language” but the assessment required them to write in English “10-page narratives.” She explained,

It’s very meaningful to, you know, in thinking about Task 2 [of edTPA], to make sure that teachers are getting students to talk about culture, that they are building and eliciting speech from students and then building on their responses, that they are creating a supportive environment. Those are all really important critical things.

However, she stressed that the problem was “for every component of that rubric, students had to write a multi-paragraph justification” of their practices, which she felt was inauthentic for teachers, explaining, “Teachers in their careers teaching do not have to write 10-page papers on things.”

She also noted that her program was just 16 credit hours, allowing candidates to complete licensure requirements in less than a year. This streamlined program included just one lab (one credit hour) where candidates learned about and practiced the HLTPs. On the other hand, when asked about areas where her candidates performed well, the German methods instructor mentioned that she encourages all of her candidates in coursework to use storytelling to create context in their instruction. Such attention to storytelling may help to explain why three of the five German videos involved storytelling and why the Germans were more successful at creating context than their US peers. However, in regard to the lack of interaction in some of the videos, she explained, “I would say half of them need to be reminded of not only focusing on nouns, but first focusing on more meaningful interaction.” She felt that sometimes her candidates were “not confident enough to do that,” perhaps “because it’s hard for them to do that in the English language.”

6 | DISCUSSION

With respect to the study’s first research question, the extent the two programs emphasize the ten HLTPs identified by Glisan and Donato (2017, 2021), the results support the critical nature of these practices in foreign language instruction. The survey and interview data from both teacher candidates and their instructors indicated that both programs incorporate all 10 of the HLTPs into their instruction, although not all to the same extent. The results indicated, for example, that in the US context, greater attention is paid to how to prepare candidates to teach students about target language cultural practices, planning for instruction, and how to create and administer assessments. Although understanding the reason behind these differences extends beyond the scope of the study, it is interesting to note that planning for instruction and assessment represent

two of the three primary tasks associated with a performance-based assessment that the US program completers must pass to graduate and earn their license to teach.

Further related to the first research question, the results provide evidence supporting previous research (Vyn et al., 2019; Zhai, 2019), indicating the critical nature of select HLTPs (i.e., FTLC, building a discourse community, and context). Underscoring the critical nature of FTLC, the German teacher candidates and both the German and US methodology instructors emphasized the role that providing comprehensible input in the target language played in their coursework. In contrast, the results also suggested specific HLTPs that are perceived as perhaps less critical for novice teachers to learn. Attention to teaching writing skills and the use of authentic texts were skills that neither the US or German programs appeared to stress.

With respect to the second research question, although the US teacher candidates perceived themselves to be more prepared to exhibit many of the teaching behaviors associated with FTLC than their German peers, analysis of their instruction by content experts suggested both groups exhibited common strengths and areas for improvement. Supporting the earlier work of Davin and Troyan (2015), the study's results suggested that both groups were equally successful in enacting specific moves related to FTLC that they could plan in advance, such as the incorporation of visuals and gestures and the use of repetition to introduce new vocabulary. On the other hand, they struggled in regard to other more context-dependent subcomponents for which they could not prepare in advance. For example, both groups struggled to engage students in follow-up questions.

Building upon previous research, the study drew attention to both the importance and the challenge of creating a meaningful context. With respect to this subcomponent of FTLC, both methodology instructors noted weaknesses among their candidates, and in the words of the US instructor, without a meaningful context the "lesson falls apart." Due to its importance and difficulty, further time and attention to this subcomponent might be warranted in foreign language teacher training programs. Given the prevalence of storytelling in the German videos and their higher ratings on this subcomponent of FTLC, the incorporation of storytelling approaches (e.g., Total Physical Response Storytelling) into teacher training programs may be worthy of consideration.

Perhaps the study's greatest contribution to the existing body of knowledge is that it provides evidence of more than one way to prepare candidates to enact HLTPs in their instruction. The US teacher training program employed a four-step, practice-based cycle that involved candidates analyzing and deconstructing instructional moves, video-recording their own instruction, receiving instructor and peer feedback, and reflecting on their performance. The German program, on the other hand, relied more on candidates viewing exemplary practices, role-playing in class, and receiving instructor feedback during a student teaching internship. Despite not specifically naming HLTPs in program coursework, and not following the practice-based cycle recommended in the related research (Ball & Forzani, 2010), the German program was successful at preparing its candidates to enact the principles of FTLC.

The study's findings suggested that not only did the two programs approach the preparation of candidates to implement HLTPs differently, but also that their specific areas of focus differed, and that this difference was influenced by program context. Calling to mind the research of Percy and Troyan (2017), and Percy et al. (2022), in which teacher educators struggled with how to make a practice-based approach to language teaching fit with program-specific goals and realities, the German and US programs in the study seemed to adjust their practice-based approach to meet their local context. The US candidates reported, for example, that their program emphasized HLTPs related to planning and assessment more than did their German peers. It is noteworthy that both planning and assessment represent two of the three tasks on a performance assessment (edTPA) that US teacher candidates must successfully complete to be licensed in their state. The US

instructor acknowledged that a lot of her instructional time was spent preparing her candidates to pass edTPA. On the other hand, in the context of preparing primary school teachers, the German program placed less attention on building a discourse community than did its US counterpart, and instead was reported to place greater initial attention on the development of listening skills and providing short “yes” or “no” answers. Again, in line with preparing teachers of young children, the German program also devoted more time to preparing candidates to enact another HLTP (creating a meaningful context) via the reported emphasis on storytelling.

6.1 | Limitations and directions for future research

Although the study's findings are interesting and worthy of consideration, there are limitations to consider. The study involved only two foreign language teacher training programs, one in Germany and one in the United States. Its results, therefore, cannot be generalized. Future related research should include more institutions in a variety of different countries. Likewise, studies investigating teacher candidate preparation to enact specific HLTPs should extend their focus beyond FTLC to better understand subcomponents of other practices that may be more or less challenging for novice teachers to master.

When considering the study's results, it is also important to consider the different contexts of the two teacher preparation programs that may have influenced the results. The German program was six semesters in length, compared to the more streamlined US program that candidates can complete in <1 year (3 semesters), and that has just a one-credit-hour lab devoted to teaching and practicing HLTPs. The US program also devotes a significant amount of time in preparing its candidates to pass a high-stakes performance assessment (edTPA) that could otherwise be used to enhance candidate mastery of targeted HLTPs. The extended time available in the German program may provide additional opportunity for the candidates to learn about and practice the skills that were investigated in this study. The German program also focused strictly on preparing candidates to teach at the primary level, where storytelling may be a more commonly used instructional strategy than at the high school level. Greater use of storytelling in the videos may have led to the Germans receiving higher scores for one of the FTLC subcomponents (lesson context) than their US peers. These limitations suggest the need for further research. Related studies should explore the optimal amount of time needed for candidates to master specific HLTPs, the extent to which attention to HLTPs in teacher preparation programs is influenced by contextual factors like performance-based assessments and accreditation standards, and the extent specific teaching methodologies, such as Total Physical Response Storytelling and Communicative Language Teaching align with the 10 HLTPs identified by Glisan and Donato (2017, 2021). Given that both teacher preparation programs appeared to devote the least amount of time to preparing candidates to teach writing and to incorporating authentic texts into their instruction, and that candidates in both countries struggled to clarify and extend student thinking in the target language, future studies might also explore when is the optimal time to prepare novice teachers to master these skills and what strategies are effective in these pursuits.

7 | CONCLUSION

The study investigated the extent two foreign language teacher preparation programs in the US and Germany emphasized 10 HLTPs and the extent that their teacher candidates were prepared to implement a select HLTP that has been identified in related research as particularly important (i.e.,

FTLC). Results suggested that all 10 HLTPs were addressed in both teacher preparation programs, thus confirming their importance in the teaching of foreign languages, and also emphasized the critical nature of select HLTPs that novice teachers should master (i.e., FTLC, building a discourse community, and context). The results also suggested that some subcomponents of HLTPs may be more challenging for novice teachers to master than others, and that creating a meaningful context is a particularly important and challenging instructional move associated with FTLC. Finally, the study described two very different programs that were both successful in preparing their candidates to enact HLTPs and, in the process, provided compelling evidence that there is not just one approach to preparing foreign language teachers to implement HLTPs. The targeted HLTPs and the manner in which they are addressed should be contextually driven. Foreign language teacher training programs should consider the study's findings when designing and implementing curriculum to ensure attention to critical skills that novice teachers should master and to ensure that their unique program goals and context are taken into account.

OPEN RESEARCH BADGES



This article has earned an Open Materials badge for making publicly available the components of the research methodology needed to reproduce the reported procedure and analysis. All materials are available at <https://iris-database.org/details/s2YBk-trYHp>.

ORCID

Kristin J. Davin  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3590-7086>

REFERENCES

- Ball, D. L., & Forzani, F. M. (2010). What does it take to make a teacher? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92, 8–12.
- Ball, D. L., Sleep, L., Boerst, T. A., & Bass, H. (2009). Combining the development of practice and the practice of development in teacher education. *The Elementary School Journal*, 109, 458–474.
- Barahona, M., & Davin, K. (2020). A practice-based approach to foreign language teacher preparation: A cross-continental collaboration. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 23(1), 181–196.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Erlbaum.
- Commission on Language Learning. (2017). America's Languages: Investing in language education for the 21st century. Retrieved from <https://www.amacad.org/publication/americas-languages>
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2015). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing theory* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Coyne, I. T. (1997). Sampling in qualitative research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 26(3), 623–630.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed method approaches* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Davin, K. J., & Troyan, F. J. (2015). The implementation of high-leverage teaching practices: From the university classroom to the field site. *Foreign Language Annals*, 48(1), 124–142.
- Franke, M., Grossman, P., Hatch, T., Richert, A., & Schulz, K. (2006). *Using representations of practice in teacher education*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Glisan, E. (2010). Envisioning foreign language education through the lens of high leverage practices. *Foreign Language Annals*, 43(3), 359–360.
- Glisan, E. W., & Donato, R. (Eds.). (2012). ACTFL research priorities in foreign language education phase I [Special issue]. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(S1).
- Glisan, E. W., & Donato, R. (2017). *Enacting the work of language instruction: High-leverage teaching practices*. ACTFL.
- Glisan, E. W., & Donato, R. (2021). *Enacting the work of language instruction: High-leverage teaching practices* (vol. 2). ACTFL.

- Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching*, 15, 273–289.
- Grossman, P., & McDonald, M. (2008). Back to the future: Directions for research in teaching and teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45(1), 184–205. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831207312906>
- Hlas, A. C., & Hlas, C. S. (2012). A review of high-leverage teaching practices: Making connections between mathematics and foreign languages. *Foreign Language Annals*, 45(S1), s76–s97.
- Hlas, A. C. (2021). High-leverage teaching practices: Designing tasks for interaction. In P. M. Wesely (Ed.), *One vision—Multiple perspectives: 2021 Report of the Central States Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages* (pp. 31–45). Robert M. Terry Publishing. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED614612.pdf>
- Kearney, E. (2015). A high-leverage language teaching practice: Leading an open-ended group discussion. *Foreign Language Annals*, 48(1), 100–123.
- McDonald, M., Kazemi, E., & Kavanagh, S. S. (2013). Core practices and pedagogies of teacher education: A call for a common language and collective activity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(5), 378–386.
- Peercy, M. M., Tigert, J., Fredricks, D., Kidwell, T., Feagin, K., Hall, W., Himmel, J., & DeStefano Lawyer, M. (2022). From humanizing principles to humanizing practices: Exploring core practices as a bridge to enacting humanizing pedagogy with multilingual students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 113, 103653. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2022.103653>
- Peercy, M. M., & Troyan, F. J. (2017). Making transparent the challenges of developing a practice-based pedagogy of teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 61, 26–36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.10.005>
- Skorton, D., & Altschuler, G. (2012). *America's foreign language deficit*. Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/collegeprose/2012/08/27/americas-foreign-language-deficit/#170d332e4ddc>
- Sleep, L. (2009). Teaching to the mathematical point: Knowing and using mathematics in teaching (*unpublished doctoral dissertation*). University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Sleep, L., Boerst, T., & Ball, D. (2007). *Learning to do the work of teaching in a practice-based methods course*. NCTM Research Pre-Session.
- TeachingWorks. (2021). *High-leverage practices*. Retrieved from <https://www.teachingworks.org/work-of-teaching/high-leverage-practices>
- Troyan, F. J., Başok, E., & Carr, D. R. (2022). Core Practices for world language teaching in the United States during COVID-19: A nationwide questionnaire. In J. LeLoup & P. Swanson (Eds.), *Handbook of research on effective online language teaching in a disruptive environment*. IGI Global.
- Troyan, F. J., Davin, K. J., & Donato, R. (2013). Exploring a practice-based approach to foreign language teacher preparation: A work in progress. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 69(2), 154–180.
- Troyan, F. J., & Peercy, M. M. (2018). Moving beyond ‘Très bien’: Examining teacher educator mediation in lesson rehearsals. In J. Sharkey & M. M. Peercy (Eds.), *Selfstudy of language and literacy teacher education practices across culturally and linguistically diverse contexts* (pp. 263–281). Emerald Group Publishing, Ltd.
- Vyn, R., Wesely, P. M., & Neubauer, D. (2019). Exploring the effects of foreign language instructional practices on student proficiency development. *Foreign Language Annals*, 52, 45–65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12382>
- Windschitl, M., Thompson, J., Braaten, M., & Stroupe, D. (2012). Proposing a core set of instructional practices and tools for teachers of science. *Science Education*, 96(5), 878–903.
- Zhai, L. (2019). Illuminating the enactment of high-leverage teaching practices in an exemplary world language teaching video library. *American Educational Research Journal*, 56, 1681–1717.

How to cite this article: Kissau, S., Davin, K. J., Haudeck, H., & Wang, C. (2023). Different approaches, similar results: Preparing foreign language teachers to implement high-leverage teaching practices. *Foreign Language Annals*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12688>

APPENDIX A
Table A1

TABLE A1 FTLC observation instrument.

Criteria	Approaching Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeding Expectations
Lesson context	Context may not be meaningful or purposeful.	Lesson has a meaningful context.	Meaningful and cultural context drives lesson.
Amount of target language used	Target language is used less than 3/4 of class time.	Target language is used ~3/4 of class time.	Target language is used more than 3/4 of class time.
Comprehensible language	Candidate paraphrases but may not adjust rate of speech, tends not to define new words with examples, and may resort to English at times uses familiar vocabulary.	Candidate paraphrases and adjusts rate of speech, defines new words with examples, and uses familiar vocabulary and structures.	Candidate paraphrases and adjusts rate of speech, defines new words with examples, re-enters new words frequently in input, signals new words with structures and tone of voice, and uses familiar vocabulary and structures.
Contextual support	Little use of gestures, visuals, objects to support comprehension.	Teacher uses gestures, visuals, and/or objects to support comprehension.	Teacher uses gesture, visuals, and objects in creative ways to support comprehension.
Comprehensible interactions	Students are passive as teacher presents new material.	Teacher involves some students in presentation of new material.	Teacher engages all students in presentation of new material.
Interaction	Teacher does not pause frequently to ask students comprehension questions.	Teacher does not engage students in interaction consistently throughout lesson.	Teacher engages students in interaction in the target language from the first moment of instruction.
Clarify and extend thinking	Candidate does not pose follow-up questions to clarify, probe, or extend thinking based on student responses.	Candidate poses follow-up questions to clarify, probe, or extend thinking based on student responses.	Candidate poses follow-up questions to clarify, probe, and extend thinking based on student responses without leading the student to one correct answer.

Note: Glisan and Donato (2017).
Abbreviation: FTLC, facilitating target language comprehensibility.