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Curriculum, Instruction, and Leadership as a Practice of Reflexivity in World Language Education: A Systematic Review of Literature

Jerry L. Parker

The United States of America has seen tremendous growth in internationalization in the past five years. Increased usage and enhanced features on social media, the growing interest in cryptocurrency, and the change in lifestyle for many as the result of COVID-19 have reshaped what it means to be alive. For decades it has been argued that world language skills will be a necessary aspect of the American job market as it progresses deeper into the 21st-century. That statement is now truer than ever.

Many companies, community organizations, and religious leaders are seeing the necessity to reach beyond our immediate community and borders and expand globally to drive accelerated growth and support. Likewise, technology has further demonstrated that classroom learning, and linguistic reality are still disconnected. Hence, as the field develops and transforms daily, there is a needed reaction by leaders to catch up and be ahead of the learning curve to ensure the future of language learning in schools.

At such a critical point, world language educators must re-envision the field in relation to society. How does realigning programs serve the needs of diverse groups of learners and their everchanging linguistic needs? How does it maintain its relevancy when online translators and other artificial intelligence grow stronger each year? Although we already have a detailed understanding of second language acquisition, questions related to effective practices in the teaching, leading, and sustaining of world language programs still persist. This article aims to provide a response from the perspective of Robert C. Lafayette, a world language teacher-scholar. Through a systemic review of literature, the current study aims to demonstrate the avant-
garde nature and continuous validity of his research on language teaching and explain its relevancy to today’s classrooms.

Rationale

World Languages is one of the oldest fields of study throughout human history. Although technology has advanced enough that online translators have lessened much of the time and effort needed to communicate in a second language, they cannot replace the flexibilities and variability of the human brain. World language education exposes students to other languages, cultures, and gives them the time and space to train their minds to acquire it for lifelong proficiency.

Considering the period in which Lafayette published his research, it is still very appropriate to revisit his ideas. Between 1960 and 2010, language education saw a wave of innovation. During this time American classrooms experienced large inundations of innovation and constant growth in teaching ability. Teaching methods saw revolutionary advancements, language departments developed enhanced capabilities, and programs expanded their reach beyond measure. COVID-19 has brought the field back to this point as many teachers are learning to use various online tools and teach virtually. The field is seeing a steady phasing out of Foreign Language Resource Centers and their transition to Foreign Language Research Centers. Teachers need guidance on where to go and how to reconceptualize programs to meet society’s newly created needs. To further contextualize this study the following section will provide a brief biography of Robert C. Lafayette.

Biography

Robert Claude Lafayette was born on February 25, 1940, in Lewiston, Maine (Lafayette, n.d.; Legacy, 2019). In 1962, he earned a Bachelor of Arts from University of Notre Dame. In
1965, he earned a Master of Arts in Teaching from the University of Chicago. In 1971, he earned a Ph.D. from The Ohio State University in Curriculum & Instruction with a concentration in Foreign Language Education.

Lafayette was a lifelong world language educator. He started his teaching career in 1963 as a French teacher at Evanston Township High School in Evanston, Illinois. He moved on to become an assistant and later associate professor in the Department of Secondary Education and Department of Foreign Languages at Wisconsin State University at Whitewater. He would stay there until 1972 when moved on to become an assistant professor in the Department of Language Education at Indiana University. He went on to earn the ranks of associate and full professor before advancing to the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Louisiana State University, where he earned the rank of professor and would later retire in 2005. He passed away on September 6, 2019, in Baton Rouge, Louisiana holding the rank of professor emeritus.

Conceptual Framework

Position statements from the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, and existing research on Pedagogy (hooks, 1994; Reagan & Osborn, 2021) and the future of work (McGowan & Shipley, 2020) provided a framework for understanding the contemporary value of Lafayette’s work. Founded in 1967 as an offshoot of the Modern Language Association, The American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) is the official professional organization for guiding best practices in world language education throughout the United States of America. ACTFL (2016; 2019; 2021b) has well over 13,000 members who aim to fulfill the mission of “an interconnected world where everyone benefits from and values a multilingual and multicultural education” (Vision Statement). Further, many other leading professional organizations such as the American Association of Teachers of French and The
American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese rely on ACTFL for guidance on best practices in world language teaching and learning.

**What is World Language Education?**

According to ACTFL (2017a), a world language is defined as “A form of communication, essential to the culture of a community, with a system of sounds, letters, symbols, and/or signs recognized as utilized by humans” (*A world language is*) used to interact and negotiate meaning with other people. They allow the user to investigate, explain, and reflect on the relationship between products, practices, and perspectives of culture. They also allow for the exchange of information.

As it relates to education, world languages should be a core component of the curriculum rather than an optional elective because in the 21st century being bilingual allows students to have a real-world need of differentiating their resume (ACTFL, 2012c). It also allows them access to information and the ability to collaborate with other fields (ACTFL, 2013). Having linguistic skills develops students’ critical literacies and ability to think and interact in the 21st century global community (e.g., online, face-to-face, as a volunteer, as an employee). Through the growth of these skills students also become college and career ready.

In further viewing language learning through a traditional classroom setting, there is no one world language that supersedes another. Learning a second language is more important than learning any one specific language. Research suggests that once a second language is learned, the learning of a third or fourth is easier (ACTFL, 2012e). If anything, it is advised that language offerings in K-12 schools, colleges, and universities reflect the needs and interests of the students and the community and should also serve a national and international need. The rational here is
that through offering multiple languages students are prepared economically, diplomatically, educationally, and personally.

**Curriculum and Instruction**

Although program structure for guiding the educational experience is important, there are key aspects of the classroom that are just as equally vital in creating a strong world language program. Per ACTFL (2012c), language programs should be centered around the idea that “all students should learn or maintain one other language along with English” (para 1). A sequential approach with well-articulated sequences based on increasing proficiency across levels helps to achieve this. Further, best practices suggest that language classes use the target language 90% of the time at all levels of instruction both in and beyond the classroom (ACTFL, 2010). This implies that language teachers should facilitate an environment where comprehensible input pushes students toward communication in the target language. Body language, gesturing, and visual supports, along with checking for comprehension and negotiating meaning serve as great approaches for implementing this style of teaching. Further, best practices include consistently soliciting utterances from students that increase accuracy and complexity over time and encourage self-expression and spontaneous use of language (ACTFL, 2010). Most importantly, it is the teacher’s job to teach students the appropriate strategies for clarifying misunderstandings while also offering effective feedback.

**Teachers**

As it relates to teachers themselves, ACTFL (2012d) recommends that there needs to be high quality professional development for veteran teachers along with mentoring for new teachers as a way to slow down attrition. Moreover, one other contributing factor to attrition is the class size. Class size affects teacher recruitment and retention in that teachers are deterred by
not having the ability to properly create a communicative language learning environment
(ACTFL, 2021a). Smaller classes have a more positive effect on student learning than larger
classes because, as classes get larger, teachers lose the ability to speak the target language at 90%
or more. Larger classes allow for less one-to-one interaction between teacher and student.
Likewise, high quality language instruction is in part the result of giving students an educational
space where they can fully participate.

As with all subject areas in American schools, there is a direct relationship between
teacher attrition and classroom sizes. For many years the field of education has seen a decrease
in the number of educators and an increase in class sizes as a result. One common resolution to
the class size issue is to start the students toward learning a second language earlier. This
argument aligns directly with ACTFL’s position that early language learning is beneficial in the
development of pronunciation skills and developing a high level of proficiency if learning
continues into a well-sequenced program (ACTFL, 2012b). Early language learning also
strengthens first language literacy skills, raises standardized test scores, and develops students’
bicultural competency.

**Technology**

Another important aspect of the contemporary language classroom is the role of
technology. Per ACTFL (2017b), high quality language instruction is guided by educators and
not just through using technology. Hence, “language educators should be responsible for
planning, instruction, assessment, and facilitation of their language courses through leveraging
technology as a tool for learning” (ACTFL, 2017b, para. 1). Research (ACTFL, 2017b; Henshaw
& Hawkins, 2022; McGowan & Shipley, 2020) does not support the isolated usage of technology
just to say technology is present. Rather, technology should be integrated to allow students to
read, listen to, view, and engage with timely artifacts from the target culture. In essence, technology is a tool for supporting students in the classroom. Its integration should not be just a goal to be obtained by teachers.

**Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging**

Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging (DEIB) in the classroom has gained great support in the 21st century and even greater understanding in the past few years. ACTFL’s (2012a, 2012b, 2019) stance is that teachers from all backgrounds should be welcomed into language programs and that all students should have the opportunity and be provided access to learn a second language. Diversity and intercultural competency should be celebrated in the language classroom. Students should never feel marginalized for the defining aspects of their identity.

**World Languages in America**

The value of language education cannot be detached from the context in which the languages are being taught. The United States has gained an international reputation for being a mainly monolingual society that does not value language skills both domestically and internationally (Reagan & Osborn, 2021). Such sentiments equivalent to patriotism and a love for country, from the American perspective.

World languages have a history of paradox in the USA where key advances have been coupled with major failures that hinder the growth of the field (Reagan & Osborn, 2021). Hooks (1994) postulated that English is not a tool for exile, but rather a badge of conquest and domination in the United States. It hides the loss of other language and aspects of diversity throughout the country. There thus continues to exist structural, organizational, and ideological
barriers to the growth of world language programs in K-12 and post-secondary education (Reagan & Osborn, 2020).

Since around 2010 America has experienced what researchers (McGowan & Shipley, 2020) have named the Fourth Industrial Revolution which has further excelled as the result of COVID. Key dimensions of this revolution include advances in software, real-time data, and tools that augment and can replace human labor. A key example is the growth in the capabilities of artificial intelligence and its integration into various areas of the job market. Further, it is well known that the future of work will rely on learning, unlearning, and adapting information quickly. To ensure the longevity of world language programs, there needs to be a shift in how courses are taught, the content included, and the overall purpose of language learning (Reagan & Osborn, 2021).

Reflexivity in teaching practice serves as a pivotal exercise for advancing all subject areas in education (Reagan & Osborn, 2021). Effective reflexivity takes place when individuals are faced with a real problem or situation that they want to resolve in a rational manner. As enrollments and support decline for world languages, reflexivity is needed by all teachers, department heads, and supporters to prepare for the future of work and the greater infusion of technology into the field.

The current study aims to contribute a response to the question posed by Reagan and Osborn (2021) of “what does a person need to know in order to be an effective teacher?” (p. 192). The response presented by this article centers on curriculum instruction, and leadership as suggested by Robert Lafayette through analyzing his previously published research in language education. The goal was to understand in what ways was Lafayette’s research innovative, timely, and still relevant to the teaching of world languages in a post-COVID world. The next section
presents an overview of the methodological approach used to conduct this study, the research questions that guided it, and procedures used.

**Methodology**

The outlined goal of this study was to explore the research of Lafayette in terms of what he did and how his work is still valuable to contemporary language teaching and teacher preparation. Per the defined conceptual framework, the following research question was used to guide this study:

1. In what ways does the research of Robert C. Lafayette contribute to the field of World Language Education and teacher preparation?
   
   a. What are the major themes of his works?
   
   b. In what areas was he innovative in his research?

To conduct this investigation a systemic review of existing research published by Lafayette was conducted. Within the context of this study, a systemic review of literature was understood to be a rigorous and transparent review process that is reproducible and updateable (Zawacki-Richter, 2020). In other words, a process of reviewing the existing literature on a topic but from an objective rather than subjective lens in an effort to understand the arguments that the studies of investigation contain and how they can be used to shape and inform the public.

Although scholars such as Newman and Gough (2020) would argue that its purpose is to provide an overview of current knowledge, others such as Dowd and Johnson (2020) argue that such research is valuable because in education it informs others who may not be familiar with the topic when older information is included in the sample. By doing so, researchers generate new ideas and further advance society’s beliefs on effective practices in education. This study utilized a mapping approach to content analysis, as defined by Newman and Gough (2020) to investigate
the works of Lafayette for their breadth, purpose, and contribution to the field of world language education and discover emergent themes.

**Data Collection**

Data for this study consist of the results from various search engines (See Appendix & Table 1). First a search in Google was done for any existing information on Lafayette and his research. From there a CV was found (Lafayette, n.d.) that listed his academic and career accomplishments along with a bibliography of his work. Next, Google, Google Scholar, and various academic search engines (e.g., JStor, Academic Search Complete, EBSCO) were used to find the works listed on his CV. Then, each manuscript’s reference list was reviewed to find any instances of self-citation. Lastly, Google, Google Scholar, and the aforementioned search engines were manipulated using Boolean search methods to find any publications from Lafayette throughout his career that were cited by others.

Through the initial data collection process, it was discovered that Lafayette produced a large number of publications. However, many were not easily discoverable as they were published before online publishing and Open Access databases were common. The next step in data collection required consulting university librarians. Both an Access Librarian and a Reference Librarian were contacted to search for publications that were not found in the initial data collection phase and any possible manuscripts that could have been overlooked. Both were able to find articles, book chapters, and/or some other type of publications. Upon exhausting the literature, a final population for the study was created.

**Population**

As shown in Table 1 and the Appendix, the research of Robert C. Lafayette ranges over five decades and covers a wide range of topics all related to world language education. In total,
28 publications (e.g., books, articles, book chapters) were discovered to have been authored by Lafayette. Of this, 17 were able to be retrieved (See Table 1). Of the 28, he single-authored 21 and co-authored eight. He was the lead author on three of the eight. From what could be found, his publications range from 1971 to 2010.

In the 1970s, he had 12 publications. He had seven publications in the 1980s. There were four publications from the 1990s and two from the 2000’s. In terms of contributions to research in world language education, he has four publications in the *Modern Language Journal* and three in *Foreign Language Annals* which are still two of the leading journals in the field. Moreover, there were five conference presentations, four grants/ special projects, and three professional organizations that were discovered.

**Procedures**

Once a satisfiable level of saturation was achieved, it was concluded that the 17 manuscripts would be the representative sample for conducting this studying. The procedure for analyzing each manuscript is as follows. First, each manuscript was read in its entirety. While reading, thorough notes were taken related to the main points. Next, each manuscript was grouped based on chronological order. This was done for organizational purposes to ensure manuscripts were not overlooked nor analyzed twice. Next, the notes from each manuscript were revisited and critically analyzed. Through this process analysis labels for reoccurring themes were devised. Moreover, a coding scheme developed that grouped the reoccurring themes into what eventually would become sub-themes. In re-reading the manuscripts and notes, the overarching themes of curriculum, instruction, and leadership became evident as areas of interest for Lafayette. While some articles did address one of these three areas individually, there were a number of them that addressed two or more at the same time.
Findings

The following section will provide an analysis of the sample. It is divided by theme and aims to paraphrase the arguments of Lafayette in a relevant and succinct manner. It is separated based on the three overarching themes of curriculum, instruction, and leadership along with each sub-theme.

Curriculum

Within the context of this study the term curriculum was understood to be:

the result of the interaction between objectively developed plans for school study with the backgrounds, personalities, and capacities of students in a transactional environment created by teachers for the benefit of students as well as for the better implementation of the plan. (Longstreet & Shane, 1993, p. 53)

Publications classified under this code contributed to the understanding of curriculum in world language education. Particularly, this includes work that addresses aspects of course design, content layout/inclusion, targeted changes in student behaviors and attitudes as a result of learning, and other similar topics.

General Issues of Curriculum in World Languages. Per Lafayette (1972), the traditional layout of world language courses includes a level one and a level two course. Both of these courses typically focus on the teaching of basic concepts in the language. If there is a level three, these are normally a continuation of more basic concepts, but they include an emphasis on reading and writing. It is not until level four that language programs would include an introduction to literature and culture. However, he argued for the need of more meticulous attention being given to the teaching and learning process in the beginning level. In his experience, the largest number of world language students can be found in the beginning course
of the language sequence (Lafayette, 1973b). Consequently, for recruitment and retention purposes, the more fulfilling language experience students have in this course, the more likely they would advance to level two, three, four, and beyond.

Moreover, in relation to sequencing, courses were normally built on a grammatical syllabus. This layout determines the scope and sequence of the material to be taught and dictates to students that world language learning is a series of sequential steps in a predetermined order (Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984). Such a system was established because courses are normally built from the textbook and then teachers add to them as they wish (Lafayette, 1978a). While resources may evolve, grammar will likely continue to be the organizational base (Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984). Lafayette (1978a) held the belief that because both textbooks and teacher-made content will never decline, there needed to be an integration of them. By bringing both together students would be afforded the maximum amount of specialization in their courses. His overall viewpoint on world language curricula though called for less dependency on textbooks. His thoughts were that teachers should be more self-sufficient and use the autonomy that they had to align and diversify the language course to fit their student’s needs.

Lafayette championed diversity and change as it related to curriculum. He advocated for innovation at all levels and the integration of nontraditional approaches to curriculum design and development as it concerned course sequence and content. His standpoint was that eclecticism is easy to make happen in world languages because most world languages are usually considered to be an elective in schools throughout the United States of America. Thus, language teachers have the unique power of controlling what they teach and how they teach it (Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984). He held that at that point in history there was enough diversity in schools that programmatic changes to instruction were needed as well (Lafayette, 1978a). Diversification of
the curriculum was so abundant in possibility that it could even be done in the beginning levels (Lafayette, 1973a). He believed that because implementation is based on innovation in process or content (Lafayette, 1978a), in higher education there needed to be more diversification of culture and specialized courses targeted towards future teachers (Lafayette, 1973a) and that cultural understanding needed to be assessed as well to ensure validity in world language programs (Lafayette, 1975).

**Culture in the curriculum.** One consistent emergent theme found throughout the research of Lafayette on curriculum was culture. In the 90s ACTFL, the American Association of Teachers of French (AATF), the American Association of Teachers of German (AATG), and the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP) worked on the “National Standards for Foreign Language Education Project and produced the Standards for Foreign Language learning: Preparing the 21st Century” in 1995. This was the creation of the 5Cs and the 11 national standards (Lafayette, 2003). Per Lafayette (2003), culture can also be viewed intersubjectively meaning culture is understood to be shared because everyone assumes that others see the world the same as them. As it relates to culture in the curriculum, he believed that culture can be understood to be knowledge or constructed reality (Lafayette, 2003). As forms of knowledge, culture could either be “active cultural knowledge” meaning knowledge a student needs or may potentially need in a cultural context (Lafayette, 1975) or “passive cultural knowledge” or knowledge a student uses to better understand a world culture.

**Instruction**

While curriculum is understood to be focused on the educational experience, instruction is seen as the approaches and methods used to deliver the course content and guide student learning (Hoy & Hoy, 2013). Lafayette and Strasheim (1984) argued that world language
education began to take an eclectic view of instruction that included a focus on using techniques that appeared to be easily teachable regardless of the teacher’s skills, personality, and the activities. Teacher training began to focus more on what seemed to be the most learnable in relation to student needs, interests, and their ability to read, write, listen, and speaking in the target language. This is also referred to as the Balanced Skills Approach.

**Teaching Methods and Approaches.** Teaching approaches, methods, materials, and activities and what makes them valuable is determined by if students are reaching the desired level of proficiency (Lafayette, 1975). Lafayette argued that all non-traditional methods regard speaking as the most important skill and student experimentation with language is the ideal (Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984). Non-traditional methodologies consequently focus on a stress-free learning environment, the role of silence in world language learning, the role of grammar, and the development of students speaking skills (Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984).

World language classes are naturally more likely to be high stress and cause more anxiety because students enter with a preconceived notion that it will be hard because of previous experiences and reputation (Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984). Also, teaching in the target language is threatening to students when they are expected to produce it from the first class and are held responsible for errors. This causes them to become frustrated.

When using non-traditional methodologies there should also be a re-evaluation of the role of grammar (Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984). Emphasis should be placed on less grammar in the early years and more on communication. Grammar/grammatical accuracy should be a thing of study in the later years. Grammar should also be taught from the students’ perspective. Because most teachers teach it in English, their lectures normally become complex and designed for other teachers. Teaching grammar in the target language however requires teachers to keep it in a
format that is simple, clear, and responsive to students’ needs. They should therefore refrain from using structures that have yet to be taught and rather, use language from which students can infer meaning.

Lafayette presented a wide range of beliefs on instruction and its place in world language education. He suggested that during the 20th century there was a lack in variety of teaching approaches (Lafayette, 1972). Further, certain approaches seemed to dominate the profession for a time period with the hope of being forever. While many believed that a conscious learning of grammar was needed to master reading, writing, listening, and speaking, this was not true (Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984). He favored the idea of world language eclecticism and a focus on communicative competence and cultural awareness.

As it relates to teaching methods, he believed that the Comprehension Approach, Total Physical Response, and the Natural Method aligned with the nature of language learning and differentiated acquisition and learning (Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984). Communicative Language Teaching, the Silent Method, and Suggestopedia were believed to be based on the nature of language learning rather than the nature of the learner. From his understanding, they were also non-linear, and language was not presented in incremental segments. Hence, non-traditional methods gained attention because of their focus on proficiency and the ability to orally produce.

He was a firm believer in Total Physical Response (TPR) because it uses instructional strategies for reducing stress (Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984). TPR comes from James Asher and is based on the principle that oral comprehension must precede oral expression on the part of the learner which aligns with how children learn their first language (Lafayette, 1991b). Oral production must then be followed by physical movement therefore preparing students for natural speaking. Meaning is therefore created when the right side of the brain is activated. As a French
teacher, he noted that while other non-conventional methods are known in France, TPR was not. He felt this approach was so wonderful because it allowed for oral acquisition to happen quicker. Students needed to know the importance of oral comprehension before learning a language.

Moreover, Lafayette and Strasheim (1984) understood the Natural Approach to be like TPR. But, if one used the Natural Approach in the introductory courses, more communicative based approaches should be integrated in more advanced courses. Further, they fancied Suggestopedia because of its attempts to remove barriers to learning via suggestion, the classroom atmosphere, breathing exercises, and music. They also felt that it was more aligned with whole-brain teaching.

Adopting a non-traditional method into the standard sequence of languages requires careful research (Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984). The beginning levels should be devoted to listening comprehension as students learn better when they hear a command, see it, then respond to it or reproduce it themselves. This means that it is possible to teach many grammatical structures using imperatives (Lafayette, 1991a). Lafayette (1978a) developed what he called the CORE plus one model which provides students with individualized instruction as an approach for innovating language departments. He and a colleague (Borrás & Lafayette, 1994) conducted research on the usage of subtitles and the relationship and effects of subtitles and task level on the oral performance of fifth semester students. They found that subtitles increased student performance.

**Language Teachers and Best Practices.** Along with methods and approaches to language teaching, Lafayette and Strasheim, (1984) held strong views relating to language teachers and best practices. Because of the constant need for increasing enrollment, teaching usually focuses more on addressing the widest spectrum of abilities and interests. They believed
that creativity, as the ability to be different, was important. In language teaching this meant the
capacity to have students create utterances that expressed their needs and desires (Lafayette,
1973b). While teachers can lead the class creatively, this means nothing if the students still
cannot do anything in the target language. There should consequently be an atmosphere of target
language from day one. Best practices require students to ask what things mean using the target
language. The teacher likewise strives to not overcorrect students and not always having students
answer in complete sentences. Language usage in the classroom should reflect real life. No one
corrects someone exclusively in real-life and no one answers everything in a complete sentence.

The integration of songs is a best practice that should be viewed as an authentic learning
activity (Lafayette, 1973b). Teaching while integrating songs that align with what one is teaching
as it relates to grammar is useful because they serve as authentic aspects of language (Delière &
Lafayette, 1985). To teach using songs starts with a presentation of the general theme followed
by some activities to familiarize the student with the thematic vocabulary and set the mood.
Next, study the song in detail giving explanations of the linguistic and cultural elements. Then,
discuss how the songs fit into the daily life of the student.

Lafayette (1973b) also had some unique ideas related to teaching practices. First, he
believed that drills were not real language, but still could be beneficial if used creatively. Further,
cultural objectives should be tested as a way to get feedback on the effectiveness of instruction
(Lafayette, 1975). He also thought that subject matter courses could be taught completely in the
target language to students who had taken three semesters of a world language (Lafayette &
Buscaglia, 1985). And finally, in the overall scheme of education, there was not much
instructional emphasis placed on world languages because this is not an area of standardized
testing which is tied to accountability measures (Taylor & Lafayette, 2010).
Teaching Culture. Along with creativity in language teaching, Lafayette, also supposed the value of teaching culture. Teachers are usually hesitant to test and teach culture because it is not clear what students should be able to do with the information (Lafayette, 1975). He suggested that the teaching of culture plays a huge role in students learning of a language as well (Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984). Culture did not become widely taught until the 1950s and 60s with the growing emphasis on Audiolingual Method and communication and culture (Lafayette, 2003). Thus, in his time, the concept of teaching culture was relatively new.

Per his research, Lafayette (2003) ascertained that in language classrooms, culture can be taught as awareness, comparison, or other dependent learning. Awareness can happen through the usage of video clips and internet resources. Comparison is key because it has students learn culture by having them reflect on their own. Other independent learning approaches are supported through cooperative learning and using groups for searching purposes and shifts the class from being teacher-centered to learner-centered.

He acclaimed that there are three approaches to learning culture which include total immersion and learning by imitation, critical and analytical observation of recurring incidents, and guided observation of selected patterns in isolation followed by explanation (Lafayette, 1975). Guided observation of selected patterns was seen as the most plausible for language teachers through giving students documents and helping them to see patterns. Further there were 12 cultural options/strategies for teaching culture (see Lafayette, 1978b for more details). There were also four identified effective approaches: culture day, CORE plus one time, integrating language into culture, and integrating culture into language. He championed the usage of five identified effective techniques: audio-motor unit, time capsule, culture assimilator, cultural minidrama, and learning activity packages (Lafayette, 1978b).
Lafayette (2003) was a firm believer in the need for world language teachers to look to anthropology for understanding how to teach world cultures. He argued that within an anthropological framework culture moves from being behaviors and patterns to shared information or knowledge encoded in symbols. Hence, for teachers to best relay that information to students, they need to understand it from the anthropological perspective as well.

In terms of assessing cultural understanding, he thought that cross-cultural understanding should be tested based on knowledge or the ability to recognize cultural information (Lafayette, 1975). Per his view, understanding was defined as the ability to explain the cultural information and behavior and the ability to use it. But teachers should keep in mind that culture can only be tested based on what can realistically be performed in an educational setting.

**Leadership**

Unique to the research by Lafayette was his extensive efforts in addressing best practices in leadership within world language departments. The classification standard for research related to leadership was guided by the definition provided by Northouse (2022). He declared that “leadership is a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal” (p. 6).

**World language education in the United States of America.** World language education is the result of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (Taylor & Lafayette, 2010). Lafayette noted that the United States of America did not truly work to expand access to quality language programs until the passage of the Foreign Language Assistance Act of 2001. This due in part mainly to Title V Part D Subpart 9 which provided funding for world language study. Likewise, Title IX Part A Section 9101 of the No Child Left Act behind designated world languages as part of the core curriculum in K-12 schools (Taylor & Lafayette, 2010). In his last
article (Taylor & Lafayette, 2010), he worked to investigate if world language contributed to student performance on English, math, social studies, and science standardized tests. Through using a causal-comparative approach he compared the difference in performance on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and Louisiana Educational Assessment Program 21 tests among third, fourth, and fifth graders between the 1999-2002 school year, this was the high school graduating class of 2009. He concluded a positive correlation.

**World language education in Louisiana.** One main area of interest for Lafayette was the advances being made in Louisiana language education program leadership. World language teaching in elementary schools dates back to 1840 in Cincinnati with the teaching of German, but Louisiana was the first state to mandate world language education in K-12 schools (Lafayette, 1991a). During his time, Louisiana made progress with the establishment of a certification for teaching world languages in the elementary levels, but he believed that there was still more to be done (Lafayette, 1991a). While the rest of the United States of America was quitting world language study, during the 70s Louisiana saw growth in French education and overall language study because of the establishment of the Council for the Development of French in Louisiana (Lafayette, 1991a). In 1984, the Louisiana Board of Early and Secondary Education mandated that world languages be taught in fourth grade through eighth grade for all academically able students. It was optional in all other grades. (Taylor & Lafayette, 2010).

Beyond a unique focus on the national value of language education and the large-scale value that Louisiana had in serving as a nation-wide model of innovation, there were multiple other sub-areas of attention that Lafayette researched actively. His perspective on leadership was holistic and considered the relationship of students, teachers, and the school to the rest of society. Although there is some overlap, the following subsections seeks to address them.
**Student attrition.** Lafayette’s (1971) first research project started with understanding contributing factors to student attrition. In his work, he found that student aptitude, listening skills, and perceptions of teacher’s ability, and/or personality do not play a role in attrition. However, course difficulty, grading practices, the amount of work, and curriculum did. Further, in some cases, students do not take a language course offered in their school simply because they just do not have the room in their schedule.

**Enrollment and teacher job security.** Through their research, Lafayette and Strasheim (1984) discovered that because of the constant need for increasing enrollment, teachers usually focused more on addressing the widest spectrum of abilities and interests. In other words, teachers would provide for the needs of the majority population of students rather than all. However, they discovered that isolating teaching to one population was a disservice to everyone. Specifically, a contributing factor to the decrease in world language enrollment was what he called “teach only the best kids syndrome” (Lafayette, 1973a). This is the idea that instruction should align to the way that only the students who perform highest academically learn rather than adjusting for each individual student. Per his view, continuing students, or students who took level II courses and beyond, showed more interest in language learning not necessarily those who earned high marks (Lafayette, 1971). The students who stopped at two years were not sure if language learning, French in this case, was beneficial or not. Thus, their quitting language learning was indicative of external factors beyond the teacher’s control (Lafayette, 1971).

Additionally, he saw a clear connection between enrollment and teacher’s job security. He claimed that while teachers were focused on job security, things such as teacher tenure meant nothing if enrollment is down (Lafayette, 1973a). World language educators were at that point just recognizing the potential loss of job security as enrollment declined in languages and
budgets shrank. Lafayette was a strong believer however in the idea that in order to stop declines in enrollment teachers and program leaders must focus less on battling attrition and more on serving new and more diverse populations in order to achieve better language programs.

**Program setup.** Program structure was a strong area of debate for Lafayette. He was a firm believer in the idea that language courses are designed for students who plan to continue on to more advanced course levels rather than for all of them to succeed within one course (Lafayette, 1972). Therefore, there needed to be an established program for the non-college bound and academically un-prepared student. His rationale was that programs should be tailored to fit the student population rather than have the students fit an already established program.

Moreover, per his interpretation, world language study should be provided over multiple years and that alternative models of courses should be continuously considered (Lafayette, 1972; Taylor & Lafayette, 2010). The traditional sequence was considered as an area of concern that constrained diversification by furthering the idea that language study should be in a sequential order (I, II, III, IV+) and taken one after the other (Lafayette, 1972). Diversification of programs ideally starts in the intermediate levels through the addition of mini courses offered each semester (Lafayette, 1973a).

**Textbooks.** In keeping with the trend of enrollment, Lafayette and Strasheim (1984) found that textbook publishers felt they must produce materials that fit the widest range of students to keep enrollments high. With the exception of a few English as a Second Language textbooks, mostly all introductory textbooks published in the United States of America are grammar based. Typically, the grammar is grounded within communicative situations requiring the students to use it for means of interacting with others (Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984). However, both teachers and textbooks have no clear-cut methodology for teaching world
languages. He noted that a lot of educators have “can’t get away from the text”, “finish the book”, & “finish the unit” syndrome meaning that they are using the textbook as a crutch and more heavily focused on finishing the content of the unit and course than student learning and ability in the language (Lafayette, 1972). The issue here is that teacher’s greatest deterrent to creativity in the world language classroom is their attachment to textbooks (Lafayette, 1973b). He felt that textbooks were important, but teachers needed to do what was best for the students to learn which includes stepping away from them as needed.

**Student issues.** There were many issues Lafayette found as it related to students and their journey through the world language curriculum. Because he was very student-centered in his approach, he felt that there was a lot more programmatic changes and areas of influence where leaders could be focusing attention. As it related to program evaluation for the implementation of change, he believed learning environment, student comprehension, instructional time devoted to the teaching of grammar, a conscious shift from teacher-centered classroom to learner centered, and more time devoted to students’ interaction to be key areas of foci. Through directing attention on these issues, stronger programs could be built.

Lafayette understood the downfall of world languages to be that many teachers believed that only certain students could succeed. He argued that it was not that the students cannot succeed; however, it was that the course was created so that only certain students succeeded (Lafayette, 1972). His issue was that true student-centered programs use diverse approaches to teaching that integrate different teaching methods with different students. He maintained very strong views related to what approaches students needed to be successful in the classroom.

In their research, Lafayette and Buscaglia (1985) found that students gained a more positive attitude toward the language when they are taught in the language because they felt they
were using the language to do something important or relevant. When taught in the target language, students also grew in listening, speaking, and writing skills. It takes about a month for students to get accustomed to the new approach thus they should not be forced to speak as not everyone is willing and sometimes, they simply do not have anything to say (Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984). Having students talk when they are ready is more natural. Rather, students should be pushed to help and rely on each other.

As it concerns students’ beliefs on assessment, they only consider aspects of courses that are tested to be important. It would therefore be more beneficial to re-assess grammar throughout the semester (Lafayette, 1975; Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984). By recycling content from unit-to-unit students would have a lot of repetition which could also lead to better student success.

**Professional dispositions.** Just as with students, Lafayette felt there were some professional essentials of teachers that needed to be addressed for the betterment of language education. A prime example is that he thought language teachers should take time to teach about careers in languages as well (Lafayette, 1973a). Particularly, there needed to be events aimed at recruiting students and educating the public on the benefits of bilingualism. Further, displays of emotions were necessary in language teaching for students to understand the human nature of bilingualism (Lafayette, 1973b). Lastly, he argued that although a teacher is competent that does not mean they are creative. However, every teacher has the ability to be trained to be creative. Through having a creativity-driven classroom, students would have opportunities to engage in more meaningful communication.

**Teacher preparation.** Along with professional dispositions, Lafayette also had many arguments for how teachers should be trained. He was firm in his stance that teacher educators must prepare teacher candidates to be employable by training them for the eclectic nature of the
field (Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984). The implementation of global education in the classroom is possible only if the teachers themselves possess global knowledge and are properly prepared to teach about cultural and geographical similarities and difference from a non-political perspective (Lafayette, 1985). He noticed that in virtually all traditional teacher preparation programs there were special methods courses at both elementary and secondary levels, but a lesser number of general methods courses in addition to the special one (Lafayette, 1985). In his eyes, education theory and methods courses presented an excellent opportunity to establish an international atmosphere in teacher education. In considering the best means for internationalizing teacher education and boosting areas such as language education, the role of the methods instructors should be viewed as pivotal to the development of an international perspective among students in teacher education programs.

**Diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging (DEIB).** Lafayette advocated for efforts in what now would be referred to as DEIB work. He understood that world language students significantly outperform monolingual students in education thus access to language education is a benefit to all students (Taylor & Lafayette, 2010). The downfall of world languages is that many teachers believe that language education was only for a select few. His issue with this was students go through a learning experience thus they are reacting to a situation. If the situation is set up to fail them then they will fail. He favored the idea of using teaching practices that would reach each individual student (Lafayette, 1972). In reformulating programs to be student-centered they would then attract diverse groups of students with varying abilities who wanted to learn (Lafayette, 1973a; Lafayette & Strasheim, 1984). As America was in a post-civil rights era, programs were already very racially diverse for the time and therefore should have been tailored to fit the student population rather than have the students fit a model that was decades old.
Students need programs that will give them language skills for life. This includes both college and non-college bound Lafayette, (1972; Lafayette, 1973a).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the research of Robert C. Lafayette to gather a perspective on second language acquisition and effective practices in the teaching, leading, and sustaining of world language programs. The work of Lafayette is important because it provides a different view on decade long questions. While the majority of scholars in world languages come from a linguistics, culture, or literature background this does not directly equate to knowledge and expertise in general classroom teaching, learning, and program development and sustainment.

Lafayette was a trained teacher educator coming from curriculum and instruction. Thus, his perspective on language teaching is more deeply aligned with the day-to-day aspects of K-16 schooling throughout the United States of America. Although some scholars such as VanPatten (2015) would argue that linguistics faculty are education experts, they are not. Lafayette extends our understanding of language teaching into all aspects of the educational experience in a classroom including what we teach, how we teach it, and leading the language program to greater heights.

In response to the proposed research question, it was concluded that Lafayette’s research provides the overarching themes of curriculum, instruction, and leadership which are timeless in all areas of education. His work on curriculum echoes a sentiment of change. Language teachers need to break away from what has traditionally been done. Just as the students change and grow with society each school year so does the language curriculum. In opposition to the recommendation of ACTFL, there needs to be less emphasis on sequencing the language courses
and the necessity of passing one to move to the next. Instead, a focus on the learning of the language as just language is suggested. This ties directly into the need to ease textbook usage and focus more on teaching the language from a practical perspective that will interest the student.

Decreasing the emphasis on grammar and increasing emphasis on speaking when ready is key in curriculum design. For true student success the focus of language classrooms should be organically teaching the language. This mirrors the way students learned their first language. This approach considers the diversity of the learners and their needs and also allows for room to teach culture and the interconnected nature of language to culture. To compliment the academic environment of the language classroom, minicourses that cover specific themes in the language are beneficial. Likewise, although now a best practice, the creation of semester long courses is also beneficial to students because they provide more exposure.

In relation to instruction, the same response of changing from tradition and emphasis on diversity of the learner can be seen. Specifically, a detailed concurrent integration of Total Physical Response, the Comprehension Approach, and the Natural Method are all seen as beneficial to student success. As methods and approaches evolve it is also the teacher’s job to stay abreast to changes in the field and continue a focus on using non-traditional approaches. An emphasis on continuous curriculum development that is complementary to instructional practice and that allows for individualized instruction is also of concern. The integration of songs as authentic activities is ideal for high student achievement. Most importantly, a normalization of the teaching of culture throughout the semester in every course within the program.

Leadership is the most discreet of the three areas and the most important as it concerns the humanistic nature of education. Understanding reasons for student attrition in programs is important for leaders in order to maintain the program. Likewise, this ties directly into increasing
enrollment which is complementary to teacher job security. A reflection on the program setup, the type of textbook, and the way it is integrated into classroom teaching should also be an area of concern. Leaders should be in tune with student needs in their programs along with the defined professional dispositions of teachers. These go hand-in-hand. Lastly, teacher preparation should be a consideration. While not every teacher may come from the same background, there is always further room to train them to be more efficient in the classroom. Likewise, a focus on diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging will provide the students with a safe space to truly learn the language and enjoy doing so. There is no such thing as one model of the ideal student in such classrooms. By connecting all these areas together, world language programs can grow and thrive as a pillar of success in any school.

Limitations

The nature of this study is unique in its approach to re-envisioning the contemporary world language program through previously established research. However, there are certain limitations that must be addressed. First, the research analyzed is not the complete works of Lafayette. The items cited are only what could be found (see Reference list for complete list). Thus, the sample presented is not a full representation of his ideas. Likewise, possible bias on the part of the researcher in the interpretation of each work plays a role in the way the information is reported and synthesized.

Suggestions for Further Research

To advance this study, future research should find and analyze all the missing works of Lafayette (See Appendix). Likewise, dividing his work into the various themes and comparing them with other scholars from similar backgrounds, second language acquisition, and cognitive psychology, would provide a richer understanding of curriculum, instruction, and leadership in
world languages. Lastly, an integration of education and linguistics-based ideas would best serve language teachers. Such work would be on par with scholarship (Henshaw & Hawkins, 2022) currently gaining attention in the field.

Conclusion

World languages, along with all other fields in the Liberal Arts and Humanities, has reached a tipping point where it must be able to respond to societal questions of its importance in the technology driven 21st century. This article focused on previous research as a reference point for responding to issues of the present and future. As Amadou Hampâté Bâ stated “Un vieillard qui meurt, c’est une bibliothèque qui brûle” [The death of an elder is like the burning of a library]. This phrase is very true as it relates to the life of Robert C. Lafayette and his contributions to the field of world language education. The findings of this study imply that best practices in the field as suggested by ACTFL are in-part original ideas in his research.

As suggested by Fullan (2020), change is about people, therefore for things to change the people involved must have some say so. The research of Lafayette provides teachers, leaders, and stakeholders a student-centered approach to areas of endless reflexivity and change in world languages. Curriculum will always be concerned with students and their needs at that time in the classroom. As student populations change yearly, so should curricula. Instruction as the delivery of the curriculum and the core of teacher-student interaction is always in a state of transformation, particularly as it concerns technology integration and maximizing student success. Both curriculum and instruction relate directly to leadership. Departmental leadership is most important because it lays the foundation of teacher success, student success, program efficiency, and program longevity. The analysis presented here is not timebound. Rather, it is a building block for thinking, understanding, guiding how one can improve the learning experience
of students and boost their capacity to learn a second language fluently. It is through being a reflective practitioner that educators advance themselves, the mission of their school, and importance of their field.
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### Table 1

*Retrieved Research of Robert C. Lafayette*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Area of Interest</th>
<th>Sub-categories</th>
<th>Type of Publication</th>
<th>Single-authored</th>
<th>Co-authored</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70s</td>
<td>(1971). An investigation of causes leading to early attrition in foreign language study.</td>
<td>Leadership; Attrition</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1972). Diversification: The key to student-centered programs.</td>
<td>Leadership; Curriculum; Instruction</td>
<td>Curriculum; DEI; Leadership; Methodology; Students; Teacher Syndromes;</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1973a). Job Security and student enrollment: A synonym drill.</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Curriculum; DEI; Leadership; Professional Dispositions; Teacher Syndromes;</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1973b). Creativity in the foreign language classroom.</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Professional Dispositions; Teaching Language; Teacher Syndromes</td>
<td>Conference Paper</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1975a). Evaluating Cultural Learnings</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Culture; Curriculum; Students; Teaching Language; Teacher Syndromes</td>
<td>Conference Paper</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1978). Teaching culture: strategies and techniques.</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>ERIC/working paper</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80s</td>
<td>(1984). The standard sequence and the non-traditional methodologies.</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Curriculum; DEI; Leadership; Methodology; Students; Teaching Language;</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Keywords</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985a</td>
<td>La Clef des chants : thèmes culturels et techniques pédagogiques pour l’enseignement de la civilisation par la chanson.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction Teaching Language Article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985b</td>
<td>Students learn language via a civilization course—A comparison of second language classroom environments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction Students; Teaching Language; Article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985c</td>
<td>Education Theory and Methods: International Teacher Education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum Teacher Preparation ERIC/working paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90s</td>
<td>Total Physical Response: “Un apprentissage non conventionnel (Total physical response) An unconventional way to learn”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction Methodology Article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991b</td>
<td>Etats-Unis : Où va l’enseignement précoce.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Leadership Article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Effects of multimedia courseware subtitling on the speaking performance of college students of French.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instruction Teaching Language Article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Culture in second language learning and teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum Culture Book Chapter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Academic achievement through FLES: A case for promoting greater access to foreign language study among young learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Leadership; Students; Teaching Language Article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>