

CHAPTER 11

“PERFORMING GOOFINESS” IN TEACHER EDUCATION FOR EMERGENT BILINGUAL STUDENTS

Mary Carol Combs

Abstract

This chapter explores an approach to instruction in pre-service classes called “goofiness pedagogy.” Embedded in teaching and learning theories, goofiness pedagogy is designed to model creative teaching to help emergent bilingual learners academically, linguistically, and socially. Currently in Arizona, highly restrictive language policies limit curricular and pedagogical choices for students acquiring English. As a result, pre-service teachers are often reluctant to work with them, and worried that their own creativity will be constrained. This chapter thus discusses a multi-year study of goofiness pedagogy – theatrical drama, play, and performance – that helps pre-service teachers develop an alternative vision of exceptional teaching for and with emergent bilingual learners. Data sources include student and author reflections on the practice of performed goofiness in Structured English Immersion classes at the University of Arizona, video-taped performances of students engaged

Research on Preparing Preservice Teachers to Work Effectively with Emergent Bilinguals
Advances in Research on Teaching, Volume 21, 287–312
Copyright © 2014 by Emerald Group Publishing Limited
All rights of reproduction in any form reserved
ISSN: 1479-3687/doi:10.1108/S1479-368720140000021010

in drama and improvisation, and analysis of student written artifacts. Findings indicate that while some pre-teachers hesitate to participate in “performed goofiness,” the majority believe that theatrical activities encourage them to try out innovative teaching strategies, take risks, make mistakes, and analyze those mistakes in a supportive community of practice. Equally important, pre-service teachers begin to understand that learning in general, and language learning in particular, are social pursuits and that teachers should create social spaces in their own classrooms to support the academic and language development of emergent bilingual students. Goofiness pedagogy also has transformed the author’s own teaching practices, and consequently represents a “pedagogy of hope” within a rigid state context.

Keywords: Performed goofiness; pre-service teachers; restrictive language policies; teacher risk-taking; drama in teaching

I’m a senior in college now, and I have been through more teachers than I can remember. The ones who made an everlasting impression on me are the teachers who made me feel comfortable in my own skin by making complete fools of themselves. They showed me that you are never too old to embrace humility and learn from it. I want the children I teach to recognize what these teachers showed me. Humility is strength and when embraced instead of feared, it puts the world at your fingertips. (Jessica Juarez (“Jay Jay”))

When Jay Jay sent me this comment about the Structured English Immersion (SEI) methods class she took with me recently, my first reaction was: Is that how I came across – as a complete (and old) fool? On the other hand, she seems to recognize her own inner silliness as a potential tool for good teaching.

My teaching in this course *was* unusual, some would even say eccentric. But the word I use most often to describe my style is “goofy,” so my teaching incorporated a kind of elaborate and intentional “goofiness” that I tried to perform at least once in every class. I say *perform* because the kind of dramatic techniques I use take practice, experimentation, risk and, as Jay Jay rightly noted, a large degree of humility. I have been actively performing goofiness activities in my pre-service classes for four years. Even after considerable trial and error, I’m still practicing and learning how far I can push my pre-service students out of their comfort zones; essentially, how to

help them “get over themselves” in order to teach content creatively, even “outrageously” (Progrow, 2009).

In this chapter, I define goofiness pedagogy and what it means to perform goofiness, how this instructional tool is embedded in theories of learning and teaching, and how it can potentially help emergent bilingual students socially, academically, and linguistically. In this chapter, I use the labels “English language learner” and “emergent bilingual” interchangeably. I am mindful of the privileging of *English* in “English language learner,” as well as the more positive endorsement of the potential for the development of bilingualism in “emergent bilingual.” However, I live in a state whose legislators seem determined to prevent even superficial bilingualism among this population of students. The use of the term “emergent bilingual” is hopeful, but “English language learner” is probably more realistic, at least in Arizona.

I have implemented the goofiness activities described here in my teacher preparation courses since 2010, and while the reactions to them from pre-service teachers are mostly enthusiastic, my ideas about this kind of teaching are still evolving. Between 2010 and the present, I have undertaken a multi-year self-study of my own teaching practice with pre-service teachers. I developed and implemented explicitly “goofy” content and language focused lessons in my SEI classes in part to explore how far I could push myself and my students into performance. Primarily however, I wanted to see whether drama and performed goofiness helped pre-service teachers develop a vision of exceptional teaching for and with emergent bilingual learners. This chapter thus proposes instructional settings that teachers can create and makes the case for multiple linguistic and social benefits for students who are acquiring English as a second language. I end the chapter with suggestions for how pre-service teachers can think about and begin to design lessons that incorporate goofiness.

Context Is Everything (But It Doesn’t Have To Dominate)

My explorations into the goofiness paradigm originated from an ideological dilemma that I and other English as a second language and bilingual teacher educators in Arizona experience. The dilemma is whether to significantly alter our pre-service education programs in order to integrate ELL curriculum and pedagogy derived from seriously flawed state language and education policies, or whether to defy state law and promote the continued

use of effective teaching practices for emergent bilingual students. Contrary to research in second language acquisition that supports the use of students' first language in their acquisition of academic content and English, Arizona has adopted a rigid English only, skills-based approach. All English language learners in the state, with few exceptions, are segregated for four hours each day into a euphemistically named "English language development" (ELD) block. This block consists almost exclusively of grammar, vocabulary, and reading instruction. The teaching of content areas like math, science, social studies, and language arts – which all students need in order to pass state achievement tests and which are routinely provided to non-ELL students – is openly discouraged by state education officials (see Fig. 1). To be sure, some ELD teachers manage to incorporate content subjects into their language instruction in innovative ways. Their efforts to provide an equitable education to English learners, in spite of top-down, a theoretical policy mandates, should be supported and affirmed.

The rationale for this dubious program rests largely in a fallacy: the best and quickest way for students to learn English is to immerse them in it for extended period of time. This time on task principle of language acquisition advances three general assumptions: first, that immersion in English is more effective than other alternatives, second, that immersion classrooms will enable English language learners to acquire the language in one year, and third, that young children are ideally suited for immersion because they are better at learning languages than older children or adults (Combs,



Fig. 1. What English Language Development Is NOT. Source: Arizona Department of Education (2009).

2012). While ostensibly logical, these assumptions have been consistently disproved by research studies in second language acquisition (see, e.g., Collier, 1987, 1988, 1995; Cummins, 1992, 1996; Hakuta, Butler, & Witt, 2000; Hawkins, 2005; Kasper & Roever, 2005; Krashen, 1996; Krashen, Rolstad, & MacSwan, 2007; Martinez-Wenzl, Pérez, & Gándara, 2012; Wong Fillmore & Snow, 2002).

Since 2009, when Arizona officials forced all school districts in the state to implement the ELD block, the growing number of research studies and evaluations about the program has been uniformly negative. English language learners are not acquiring English in one year, as required by state law, and because they have not received instruction in other subject areas, by the time they are reclassified and transferred to mainstream classrooms, they are academically behind their English-speaking peers. Finally, lengthy segregation of students into special language blocks has affected their self-esteem (Blum & Johnson, 2012; Combs & Nicholas, 2012; DaSilva, Combs, & Moll, 2012; Florez, 2012; Gándara & Hopkins, 2010; Gándara & Orfield, 2012; Heineke & Cameron, 2013; Johnson, 2012; Leckie, Kaplan, & Rubinstein-Avila, 2013; Mackinney & Rios-Aguilar, 2012; Rios-Aguilar, González, & Moll, 2012; Rios-Aguilar, González, & Sabetghadam, 2012).

Researchers have not disputed the need to teach grammar and vocabulary development to emergent bilingual students. Rather, they emphasize the importance of embedding linguistic features of English in meaningful context (Goldenberg & Coleman, 2010; Saunders & Goldenberg, 2010). The question is whether teaching grammar and vocabulary alone is sufficient preparation to prepare students for regular classrooms. Most serious ELL practitioners, fortified with learning theory and social justice principles, would answer that question with a resounding no.

Purpose of the Project

Given the top-down and contested nature of Arizona language policies, teachers of emergent bilingual students are often uncertain about what they can and cannot do in an ELD classroom, for example, whether teachers are permitted to use students' first language, whether or how to teach content within the rigid parameters of the program, or indeed whether they can stray from the strict time designations for teaching oral English, grammar, reading, vocabulary, and writing. My pre-service teachers also wonder how they can possibly make the direct teaching of these subjects engaging

for students, and whether their own creativity, albeit developing, will be constrained.

Because Arizona's policy mandates for the education of emergent bilingual students are clearly intended to restrict the curricular and pedagogical choices of ELD or SEI teachers, I have sought ways in my teacher preparation classes to counter the trepidation some students express about working with English learners. I incorporate theatrical and improvised dramatic performances as a way to model the kinds of creative possibilities teachers can use with students acquiring English as a second language.

Although initially my goofiness activities were designed to model ways to engage K-12 emergent bilingual learners even under oppressive circumstances, the activities consistently yielded a happy residual effect as well — considerable levity and fun in my SEI classes. Over time, these kinds of activities have become a principal focus in my pre-service SEI classes. Indeed, the students' final project in the class is to teach a sheltered lesson in a content area in which students incorporate numerous features of goofiness pedagogy. This endeavor is related to my continuing research interest in locating and promoting "pedagogies of hope" (Freire, 2007) within the rigid constraints of Arizona language policies.

Participants: Pre-Service Teachers In SEI Classes

I incorporate goofiness projects in both undergraduate and graduate pre-service SEI methods classes required by the state for certification and graduation. At the University of Arizona, undergraduate pre-service teachers typically major in elementary education, while graduate pre-service teachers study different content areas for secondary teaching. Undergraduate students enroll in SEI classes at different stages in their program; for some it is the first teacher education class they take. Others take the class immediately before they begin student teaching and or during their student teaching placements. Students typically enroll in these classes on campus or at school sites. The demographics of the teacher education program in the College of Education mirror that of other institutions: our students are mostly white, middle class, and female. In the 2014 spring semester a total of 790 students were enrolled in the College of Education's teacher preparation program. Of this number, 706 students were female, and 84 were male; 524 students described themselves as white, 103 as mixed race,

53 as Hispanic/Latino, 67 as Mexican American/Chicano, 15 as African American, 10 as Asian (the remaining students either did not indicate ethnicity or checked the “other” category).

These pre-service teachers overwhelmingly student-teach in the Tucson, Arizona, metropolitan area in K-12 schools in which students of color predominate. According to [Milem, Bryan, Sesate, and Montaña \(2013\)](#), in Pima County, where the University of Arizona is located, white students comprise only 39 percent of the K-12 population compared to nearly 48 percent of Latino students. The remaining percentages include Native American, African American, and Asian American students. With few exceptions, growing numbers of emergent bilingual students are present in nearly every Tucson school and student teachers will encounter and work with them. If pre-service teachers are placed in ELD classrooms, 100 percent of their students will be emergent bilinguals. Even if pre-service teachers leave the area for other school districts in Arizona, they will encounter English language learners: statewide, Arizona schools serve approximately 166,000 of these students, or about 15 percent of all K-12 students in the state ([Batalova & McHugh, 2010](#)). This figure is contested. The Arizona Department of Education reports that the number of English language learners declined significantly, from 162,136 in 2004 to 75,970 in 2012. The department reported a 51 percent decrease among Latino ELLs and an 89 percent decrease in Indigenous ELLs ([Milem et al., 2013](#)). The validity of the state’s ELL proficiency test – the Arizona English Language Learner Assessment (AZELLA) – was challenged by the U.S. Office for Civil Rights and the Department of Justice because the test’s cut scores for student reclassification as fluent had been manipulated to reclassify English learners as proficient when they had reached only an intermediate level of proficiency as determined by the state’s own ELL performance standards ([Florez, 2012](#)). In addition, a change in the Home Language Survey, used by schools to identify students for English proficiency testing, resulted in a serious undercount of ELLs in Arizona ([Goldenberg & Rutherford-Quach, 2012](#)). [Milem et al. \(2013\)](#) argue that these developments “created an environment that made it more difficult for ELL students to be eligible to receive services and easier to be reclassified and transitioned out of the ELL program” (p. 19).

Whether or not our pre-service teachers decide to pursue teaching positions at schools serving emergent bilingual students, the sociocultural, historical, and linguistic information provided in the SEI courses gives pre-service teachers a deeper understanding of the social context of education for emergent bilingual students and their communities. The theoretical

basis for goofiness pedagogy and its practical application in K-12 classrooms can thus benefit *all* students.

Methodology

In the fall of 2010, I began a systematic self-study of my teaching practices with pre-service teachers in SEI classes. As a teacher educator seeking ways to improve my own practice, I wanted to “walk the talk” by bringing together my own understanding of good pedagogy with emergent bilingual students and the actions I undertook in pre-service classes to model this pedagogy (Hamilton & Pinnegar, 2000, p. 239). If I believed that implementing drama and goofiness was a useful tool to develop students’ language and content knowledge, I had to make it an important focus in my teacher education courses.

Known in the literature as S-STEP – self-study of teacher education practices – this methodology is grounded in a study of “personal practice in the space between self and others in the practice” (Pinnegar, Hamilton, & Fitzgerald, 2010, p. 1). I wanted to examine my own practice and to collaborate with my students in this practice. Thus, my approach was consciously introspective and interactive (Dinkelman, 2003; Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009). The data for this study comprised personal critical reflection on the practice of performed goofiness across undergraduate and graduate pre-service teacher education programs and in the SEI courses I taught, student reflections and reactions to goofiness pedagogy, video-taped performances of me and my students engaged in drama, and analysis of written artifacts. My first set of self-study research questions considered my own goofiness practice, that is, how did I operationalize goofiness pedagogy? How “edgy” or “goofy” was I prepared to be in making connections between performance and content instruction? Did goofiness pedagogy improve my instruction with future teachers of emergent bilingual students? Subsequent questions in the study focused on how I would determine whether students were responding positively to performance activities, and how I would handle pre-service teachers who were reluctant to participate. I also provided students with several questions at the end of the semester, to which they could answer anonymously:

1. Was it easy or difficult for you to participate in the drama games we did in class? If it was difficult, please explain why. If it was not, explain why not.

2. How comfortable do you feel implementing drama and goofiness in your own classrooms?
3. Are there benefits for teaching this way for yourself and for your students?
4. Have you ever taught a dramatic or “goofy” lesson? Would you like to? About what subject?

Students’ answers to these questions, which contained both praise and critique, have helped me refine my ideas and implementation of performed goofiness activities. I have also kept a reflective journal of notes about student reactions to the variety of goofiness activities I conduct. Various colleagues have video-taped me introducing students to performed goofiness as an academic construct and leading them in drama and goofiness activities. The videos present a unique opportunity for analysis and self-critique. Recently, I have collected written artifacts from students, including collaborative ideas about goofiness activities, scripts and informal dialogue for roleplaying, simulations and games related to content subjects, as well as photographs of students performing individually or in groups. Throughout the duration of my self-study, I have conducted a literature review of the use of drama and improvisations in K-16 classrooms, in second language classrooms, and with emergent bilingual students.

What Is Performed Goofiness?

What I call performed goofiness could just as easily be described with labels used by other educators: “captivating instruction” (Bontjes, 2013), “outrageous teaching” (Progrow, 2009), “performance pedagogy” (Cahnmann-Taylor & Souto-Manning, 2010), “dialogic drama” (Edmiston, 2014), or “theater game workshops” (Spolin, 1986). The term *goofiness* signals the playfulness inherent in this approach. Goofiness teaching is performative because it does not come naturally to most teachers. Performing goofiness requires us to overtly assume an alternate persona for a brief period of time. For some pre-service teachers, this persona initially feels peculiar because it requires physical exertion, for example, exaggerating or distorting body positions and hand gestures, or raising their voices in dramatic ways. For others, the alternate persona may be an extension of their own personalities and thus manifest more easily (Bontjes, 2013). Because goofiness teaching is expressive and dramatic, it involves risk and emotion, and must be practiced, revised, and ultimately performed.

Etymology of the word *goofy*. The word *goofy* implies a degree of silliness, to be sure, but in a cheerful way. An internet search of the word turns up mostly positive associations: wacky, nutty, zany, mildly ludicrous, harmlessly eccentric, and silly in a funny or pleasant way (Dictionary.com; Merriam-Webster.com). The etymology of *goofy* is more obscure. The Oxford English Dictionary reports that the word was probably borrowed from the Middle French *goffe*, meaning awkward or stupid. *Goffe*, and later *goff*, meant a fool, dolt, or foolish clown. One of the earliest appearances of *goofy* in the North American popular press occurred in the national weekly *Collier's* in February 1921, in which a man was reported to have a “goofy grin.” Dashiell Hammett was among the first to use the noun *goofiness* in his detective novel *Dain Curse*, published in 1930. Hammett wrote, “Evidence of goofiness is easily found: the more you dig into yourself, the more you turn up” (Oxford English Dictionary Online, 2013). The Disney character Goofy first appeared in 1932 as a clumsy, not too smart, but good-natured talking dog. The Walt Disney Archives describes Goofy this way: “Goofy is good-natured. Though he can be a bit clumsy and trips himself up from time to time, he never loses his willingness to try his best at anything” (mickey.disney.com, n.d.).

Why do we like goofy people? When most of us recall our own schooling experiences, we typically think of the teachers we had in binary categories – the ones who frustrated or disciplined us, and the ones who challenged or made us laugh. When I ask my students to describe a favorite teacher, they invariably put the teacher’s ability to engage or entertain them at the top of the list. Their favorite teachers are “funny, humorous, wild, eccentric, original, creative” and, in fact, “goofy.” My own favorite teacher was my high school world history teacher, who taught history as an extended narrative on the often bizarre, heroic, and tragic exploits of individuals and nations. Her voice would rise and fall depending on the courage or folly of these exploits, culminating with a kind of shuffle, slap on the knee, and loudly pitched rhetorical question, “Can you BELIEVE that?”

Performed “Goofiness”: Embedded in Multiple Disciplines

Drama and improvisation in K-16 classrooms. There is an extensive literature on drama and improvisation in K-16 education classrooms. Spolin’s (1986) classic *Theater Games for the Classroom* is designed for classroom teachers as a supplement to the general curriculum. Spolin’s

approach to drama teaching begins with the premise that theater games are rooted in play. As such they are highly social and collaborative: students and teachers meet in theater workshop spaces as fellow players in creative and intellectual games. Because children's worlds are controlled by adults, Spolin writes, classroom theater games are among the few places outside of play "where children can contribute to the world in which they find themselves" (1986, p. 3).

Cahnmann-Taylor and Souto-Manning (2010) argue that bringing theater into classrooms has the potential to break down barriers to social change. Using a professional development approach that brings together theories of critical pedagogy from Paulo Freire (1970) and teaching strategies from Augusto Boal's *Theater of the Oppressed* (1979), Cahnmann-Taylor and Souto-Manning feature theatrical exercises that help teachers use their political agency to bring about social change. The process of change is not one-sided, however. If teachers are to create positive change in their students' lives, they have to begin with themselves; hence, theater exercises provide teachers with "opportunities to rehearse alternative, edgier personas and to feel they've got a supporting cast behind them" (2010, p. 5).

Bontjes (2013) carries the character and cast analogy even further by suggesting that teachers need to think like entertainers: "Entertaining is the *key* to education. You cannot educate a student whose attention you do not hold. You cannot educate a student whom you do not *entertain!*" (p. 5, emphasis in original). Bontjes recommends that teachers adopt a character who is everything they are not ... a character that has all of "your strengths but more so and one that has none of your weaknesses ... the character is you but better" (p. 13).

Progrow (2009) draws from cognitive theory, neuroscience, and imagination and learning theory to advance the case for "outrageous teaching," or content area pedagogy that incorporates humor and dramatic technique and inventive storylines as a way of connecting to students and helping them retain content material. He describes outrageous lessons taught in math, English, and social studies by several of his pre-service teachers, analyzing strong and weak features from each lesson. In addition to captivating students' attention, these pre-service teachers themselves were transformed by the realization that they were capable of exuberant teaching.

Similarly, Wright (2001) argues that teacher preparation programs must move beyond merely teaching *about* drama and improvisation to teaching *how* to incorporate it into their practice teaching. Teachers must learn how to combine teaching strategies with drama and thus "think drama on their feet" (p. 206). She concludes that teacher education programs should

include demonstrations of drama in methods classes, opportunities to participate with other pre-service teachers in dramatic enactments and theater games, and finally, activities that help teachers develop, practice, and teach drama lessons (p. 209).

Drama, improvisation, and games in the second language classroom.

Role-playing and language games also have been important components of second language classrooms. These activities provide extended opportunities for second language learners to develop oral communication as well as listening, reading, and writing in second languages. Because drama and improvisation activities invariably require students to adapt an alternative persona, students are more willing to take risks, and indeed, are often less inhibited and less aware of making grammatical mistakes (Ernst-Slavit & Wenger, 1998). Language games can be a principal focus of a lesson, or an extension activity to supplement more conventional teaching about the grammatical features or vocabulary of the second language (Marsland, 1998; Pollard & Hess, 1997; Wright, Betteridge, & Buckby, 2006). English as a second language and foreign language teachers organize dramatic or humorous scenarios as spaces where students collaboratively use language for real as well as imagined purposes (Chappell & Faltis, 2013). These scenarios engage student's emotions, build their vocabulary and reinforce content knowledge while allowing them to explore complex issues they encounter in multiple texts (Medina, 2004). For older emergent bilingual youth, language play gives them permission to act silly and may help them overcome reluctance to perform in front of their peers.

Drama and improvisation as an extension of sheltered instruction.

In the early 1980s linguist and second language researcher Steven Krashen (1982) theorized that adults have two distinct ways of acquiring a second language. The first way is to actually *acquire* the language in ways that children acquire their first language – as a natural and subconscious process. The second way to develop competence in a second language is to *learn* it, which implies a more conscious knowledge of the linguistic rules (the grammar) of the language, knowing when to apply these rules and how to talk about them. Krashen's acquisition-learning distinction is part of a larger conceptualization of second language acquisition theory he calls the Input Hypothesis. Krashen argues that language *acquisition* does not require conscious study of grammatical rules or tedious drills. However, for language acquisition to happen naturally, teachers must use instructional methods that supply "comprehensible input in low anxiety situations, containing messages that students really want to hear" (p. 7). Comprehensible

input – messages that are understandable to second language learners – allow learners to move from proficiency stage i to proficiency stage $i+1$. This means that teachers should teach the second language using structures just beyond the students’ level of understanding (Krashen, 1982).

The pedagogical question for second language teachers, then, is how to make the $i+1$ approach comprehensible so that learners do in fact make progress. Curtain (1986, 1991) conceptualized a teaching approach based in large part on Krashen’s Input Hypothesis. This approach, called “sheltered instruction” focused on meaning rather than form, avoided overt error correction, used simplified speech and controlled vocabulary, and context clues to convey meaning, conversational interaction important to students, and not forcing students to speak before they felt ready.

Conventional sheltered strategies include increased wait time, slow but natural levels of speech, clear enunciation, short, simple sentences, repetition and paraphrasing, controlled vocabulary and idioms, visual reinforcement, demonstrations, hands-on experiences, and frequent comprehension checks (Echevarría & Graves, 2011; Echevarría, Vogt, & Short, 2013; Levine & McCloskey, 2013). Less conventional sheltered strategies are those which teach language and content through exaggerated gestures and body language, improvisation and drama, costumes, wigs, hats, and masks related to academic content lessons (Combs, Betts, & Fisher, 2013; Reyes, 2013).

I view collaborative classroom drama and improvisation as an extension of good sheltered instruction. When pre-service teachers participate in theater games, they begin to understand how the language development of emergent bilingual students is linked to social interaction. Although still novices, pre-service teachers learn to create fun, stress-free activities that allow their own students to express themselves verbally or to interpret and perform passages from texts. Pre-service teachers thus see the potential that these performances have to help emergent bilingual students internalize English linguistic patterns and develop sociolinguistic competence. Even the more reluctant participants come to see the benefits of risk-tasking by emergent bilingual students when they take risks themselves. Drama activities connected to particular content areas can also help develop academic language and concepts related to these areas.

Sociocultural Theory and Goofiness Pedagogy

One of the principal tenets of sociocultural theory is that learning is a socially situated activity. This idea is embodied in Lev Vygotsky’s well known theory of the zone of proximal development (ZPD), a kind of

metaphorical space or activity in which a child develops linguistically or cognitively through problem solving with adult guidance or collaboration with peers. Vygotsky (1978) conceptualized the ZPD as the difference between what individuals can accomplish when acting alone and what they might accomplish when acting in collaboration with others. Vygotsky was a keen observer of children engaged in play activities; he argued that play created a zone of proximal development in which a child “always behaves beyond his average age, above his daily behavior ... and as though he were a head taller than himself” (1978, p. 102). Cazden (1981) applied Vygotsky’s ZPD to classroom contexts in which teachers assist children in development of classroom discourse. She observed that child discourse under guidance from a teacher was often more advanced than what the child could produce independently. Cazden called this phenomenon “performance without competence,” concluding that assisted performance contributed to subsequent development (1981, p. 7).

I would argue a similar analogy can be made that emergent bilingual learners develop language during drama play. Under adult guidance in drama activities children are capable of more advanced discourse than what they may be able to produce on their own. Assisted performance has the potential to facilitate the development of language and new ways to engage the world. Performance gives students permission to experiment and take risks with language, and to make mistakes without embarrassment or repercussion. In organized and spontaneous play, including semi-structured dramatic play, emergent bilingual learners create imaginary situations, switch between roles, and engage in social interaction with others. This dramatic play, similar to Vygotsky’s ZPD, represents a space where learners can perform above their average age and be a head taller than themselves. Goofiness pedagogy also has the potential to create what Lantolf (2000) calls the “collaborative construction of opportunities” in which people who work collaboratively on tasks and projects co-construct contexts in which expertise emerges as a feature of the group (p. 17).

What Does Performed Goofiness Look Like in Pre-Service Teacher Education Classes?

Getting students ready to perform goofiness. Simply asking pre-service teachers to perform goofiness in a theater game does not mean they all approach the task easily. If students are shy or embarrassed by displays of emotion, their participation, whether scripted or improvised, will be

half-hearted. That is why I model the kind of goofiness that I want students to practice. I never ask my pre-service teachers to participate in drama activities that I would not willingly undertake myself. If I expect students to take risks, which for many of them mean emoting in unaccustomed ways, I have to model emotion, even if I look pretty silly.

We often begin by practicing exaggerated facial expressions and body language. First in small groups and then as a whole class I provide random prompts like “angry” or “sad” or “euphoric.” Or students will pantomime a routine action that others have to identify, for example, drinking a hot cup of tea, reading a scary book, cracking and frying an egg, or lighting a candle. Students perform these emotions and actions as a way to practice visual scaffolding for the emergent bilingual students in their classrooms. We then move to theater games that require verbal and movement improvisation.

“Making you laugh” and the “industrial machine”. Two activities I use in this introductory phase are often used in conventional drama classes. The first leverages the emotions students have already practiced in small group as a way to make others laugh. Three students sit on chairs at the front of the classroom, and a classmate performs different facial expressions and gestures as a way of getting the seated participants to laugh. The first two students who laugh have to get up and leave; the one who has not laughed is the winner. The second activity is the “industrial machine,” where one student becomes the central part of a machine, moving her arms and legs in a machine-like pattern and making a sound related to the part. Another student attaches himself to the machine as an additional part, moving in tandem with the first student and performing a different sound. Eventually, up to six or seven students constitute an entire moving and whirring machine. Both activities are designed to introduce students into comic performance.

Performed goofiness as a warm-Up activity. I have occasionally deviated from gentle guidance into theater games, though when this happens students are typically used to my eccentricities. A dramatic introduction to a particular content lesson can be unexpected, startling, but nearly always memorable. For example, in a sheltered science lesson on plate tectonics and the human cost of earthquakes, I acted the part of a distraught earthquake victim; I wore ragged clothes, a dusty wig, and ran into the classroom screaming. In a sheltered social studies lesson on evolution and intelligent design, my teaching assistant and I performed a dialogue

between Charles Darwin and a Catholic priest to model that science and faith did not have to be in conflict. In a lesson on music and cultural icons, I dressed up as Jimi Hendrix; my teaching assistant was a flower child (we wore bell bottoms, tied-dyed shirts, love beads, and granny glasses). We entered the classroom with a boom box blasting Hendrix's anthem of the 1960s – *Purple Haze*. In a sheltered lesson on the planets, we wore huge alien glasses and Styrofoam antennae to simulate extra-terrestrial life.

Students enjoy these simple performances in three ways. First, the performances create a dramatic tension or playful mood in the class and focus students' attention on the lessons. Subsequent de-briefing of the humor, cultural references, or "shock effect" allows students the opportunity to react (both positively and negatively) to what they have witnessed. Second, the dramatic activities can be riveting and connect the performance to the content subjects being taught. Finally, as noted above, when students see me taking and modeling both playfulness and dramatic creativity, they feel more comfortable engaging in performance themselves.

Performed goofiness as "expressive microbursts". According to Progrow (2009), a common method of classroom management is to use dramatic techniques to capture students' initial attention or to refocus them after a noisy activity. Often these refocusing techniques are performed as "expressive microbursts," or "exaggerated tonal or facial expressions or gestures used by teachers to convey the importance of something that is happening or that has just happened" (Progrow, 2009, p. 42). Expressive microbursts can be dramatic gestures of facial expressions that praise or dissuade students, but they can also give emphasis to a word or a key idea related to a content subject. They can also be sounds; in order to grab students' attention, I often use a vuvuzela, which is a long, brightly colored plastic horn used by South African soccer fans during the 2010 World Cup soccer matches. Expressive microbursts tend to be brief, occurring within a single moment, but they can also be extended. When modeling a vocabulary and geographical literacy lesson on the Sonoran Desert and desert animals in Spanish, for instance, I sometimes lead my pre-service teachers around the classroom in a conga line. We chant the new vocabulary in unison while kicking out our legs and moving our hips.

Performed goofiness as authentic assessment. Drama and performed goofiness can be used as a way to assess learning. Teachers can organize

imaginative and kinesthetic activities to review and evaluate how much students recall about a subject. In my SEI methods courses students have an opportunity to show what they have learned about different topics in several ways. One assessment is the “speed dating” approach to processing new or reviewed content. Students line up facing one another. I give them a prompt, for example, to review demographic shifts, “Where in the U.S. has the ELL population grown the most in recent years?” or “Which three U.S. states have the highest numbers of English language learners?” They have one minute to respond and discuss the prompt with their counterpart. After signaling that time’s up with my vuvuzela or a cued YouTube music video, students rotate so they are facing a different person. I provide another prompt; students discuss it and so it goes. At the end of the review, the parallel line becomes a dance line that students move through in pairs, dancing to the music video.

Another assessment activity that students enjoy involves PowerPoint images of individuals or places related to a content area. For example, in a middle school social studies lesson on U.S. presidents, images of several presidents are flashed on the screen. Three or four students stand with their backs to the screen facing the rest of the class. Students in the audience – who can see the images – give their peers clues about the identity of the presidents. The standing students then must guess the identity of the individual based on clues. This activity is designed to model different ways to assess whether emergent bilingual students have learned the content taught.

In a graduate SEI methods class, we reviewed principles of second language acquisition and sociocultural theory by staging a “dating game” based on the 1970s television show with that name. Students dressed up in a variety of costumes, wigs, and hats. Then at the front of the room three contestants sat in a row. The date then asked each of them prepared questions about the different theories we had studied. The date then made his or her choice based on the accuracy or eloquence of the answers to review questions about second language acquisition or sociocultural theory.

Performed goofiness as an entire lesson. While I enjoy incorporating drama games in every class I teach, I am not opposed to conventional instruction, like the common lecture and discussion format. Indeed, teachers of emergent bilingual students need to expose students to all kinds of instruction because they will encounter different approaches as they move through the grade levels. There have been occasions when my entire SEI class (between 2 and 2½ hours) has focused on drama and creative

performance, but has incorporated conventional lecture as well. I offer two examples, both modeled for a secondary English class.

Planet personal advertisements. The first lesson is an integrated astronomy and English lesson on the planets in our solar system, the Greek and Roman names given to them, and a number of commercial products whose names also have been taken from Greek and Roman mythology. In order to introduce the lesson, I ask students to close their eyes and imagine lifting off from earth and shooting into space. As they move into the earth's upper atmosphere and eventually into orbit, I ask them to describe what they see "outside of their spaceship's viewing window." As the ship moves past the planets and the sun, students – still with their eyes closed – describe the moons and gas rings they see. Their descriptions may include an alien or two, or even another spaceship. When they finally open their eyes, I am wearing an alien mask and antennae! We then divide up into nine groups and I assign a planet to each group (including Pluto, which has been downgraded to a "planetoid") and distribute pictures and astronomical information about each planet to the appropriate group.

After reviewing the information as well as the Greek and Roman origins of the names, I tell students that their planet is lonely and needs visitors. We then look at examples of personal advertisements from local newspapers and national magazines (I sometimes have to edit them for language and appropriate content). Modeling how the pre-service teachers might work with emergent bilingual students, we deconstruct some of the abbreviations found in the ads, for example: ISO (in search of), LTR (long-term relationship), S (single), SOH (sense of humor), NS (non-smoker), WAA (will answer all), etc. Subsequently, I give each table a list of astronomical "personal" abbreviations, which group members can use in their personal planet ads: CAS (crust and surface), DFTS (distance from the sun), EAP (enormous atmospheric pressure), EO (elliptical planet), GG (gas giant), HF (huge fireball), IR (infrared radiation), SD (sonic disturbances), and others. Students then get to work and when they finish the personal advertisement, perform it for the whole class.

Teaching about bravado and boasting in shakespeare's Romeo and Juliet through Reggaetón. Nearly all of the secondary English pre-service teachers in my SEI classes have to teach Shakespeare's tragedy *Romeo and Juliet*. First, the study of Shakespeare is required by the Arizona state language arts standards for the secondary grades and, second, the themes in *Romeo and Juliet* are universal even in contemporary times. Nonetheless, novice

teachers worry about how to connect the literary and academic concepts in the play to the lived experiences of 9th and 10th graders. Elizabethan English is challenging for native speakers of English and nearly impenetrable for students acquiring English. In addition, teachers need to clarify or explain Shakespeare’s metaphorical language and his historical references. I developed a lesson that focused on the Shakespearean themes of rivalry and bravado in *Romeo and Juliet* by comparing the conflict between the Montagues and Capulets to the famous rivalry between Puerto Rican reggaetón artists Daddy Yankee and Don Omar. Secondary goals were to model the teaching of academic vocabulary in context and to provide an example of how teachers might use Spanish translations of the vocabulary to provide additional scaffolding to emergent bilingual youth (I wanted to show pre-service teachers that using a few lesson-related Spanish phrases would neither violate state language policies nor jeopardize their teaching certificates). After I asked students to imagine that they were students at one of Tucson’s urban high schools, we began by previewing academic concepts in English and Spanish. We then viewed several photographs of Daddy Yankee and Don Omar from various internet sites, discussing the genesis of their rivalry (envy, historical distrust, and perceived insult), and that the resulting feud had produced a number of collaborative, brilliant, and humorous call and response “dis” tracks. We returned to *Romeo and Juliet*, Act II, Scene IV which features the spirited exchange between Benvolio and Mercutio (Romeo’s friends) about Tybalt (Juliet’s cousin), in which Mercutio masterfully insults Tybalt: “More than Prince of Cats, I can tell you. O’ he’s the courageous captain of compliments ... The pox of such antic, lipping, affecting fantasticoes – these new tuners of accent!” (Shakespeare, 1969). We find examples of bravado and boasting in Shakespeare’s passage and then compare them to excerpts from Daddy Yankee’s song *El Jefe* and *Tira’era pa Daddy Yankee* by Don Omar. We listen to both reggaetón tracks on YouTube, identifying examples of bravado and boasting on a handout of the lyrics; because most of my pre-service teachers do not speak or understand Spanish, I provide translations. Once again we return to *Romeo and Juliet*, this time to Act III and the duel between Mercutio and Tybalt. Finally, the students create a kind of T Chart comparing an excerpt from *Romeo and Juliet* to the *Tiradera* between Daddy Yankee and Don Omar. We conclude the lesson with aerobic dance and Zumba moves to Daddy Yankee’s track *El Jefe* (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VXR0lVOdZ1Y&feature=related>). After the lesson we examine the lesson through theoretical and practical lenses. What were the sheltered strategies used? Was goofiness pedagogy evident in the lesson?

Does a comparison between Shakespeare and popular cultural icons make sense? Are references to drugs and the use of profanity too risky to use in a high school English class? What other comparisons could teachers use? And so on.

Analysis

Engaging in goofiness activities has had some observable benefits in my SEI classrooms. One of the most tangible is the way it has transformed my own teaching. Incorporating drama and performance has allowed me to leverage my own goofiness –however natural or performed – and has inspired opportunities for me to be creative. Goofiness pedagogy has reanimated teaching for me. Teaching pre-service teachers is a joyful experience when we engage in academic silliness together, and I look forward to every class. Because I often write about the difficult and depressing political climate in which emergent bilingual learners are educated in Arizona, goofiness pedagogy has become a pedagogy of hope in my own practice. While I lament the ideological restrictions against bilingual education in our state and consider the forced segregation of English language learners in multi-hour grammar blocks a form of educational malpractice, I can at least show ELL pre-teachers another vision for teaching for this population.

Goofiness pedagogy has also benefited many of the pre-service teachers in my SEI classrooms. Goofiness activities create a less stressful classroom environment and lower students' affective filters (Krashen, 1982). The activities help students get to know one another, laugh together, try out innovative teaching strategies, take risks, make mistakes, and analyze those mistakes in a supportive community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). Pre-service teachers are engaged in a situated experience which is social, dynamic, and at times spontaneous. As such, they begin to understand that learning in general and language learning in particular are social pursuits. Pre-service teachers learn to create social spaces for language and content development in ways that can ultimately support emergent bilingual students.

Some students have found participation in drama and goofiness activities to be challenging. Each semester a few pre-service teachers express embarrassment about assuming alternative personas. They would not ask their own students to engage in drama or performance because they did

not want the students to be uncomfortable. As shy or inhibited individuals themselves, they understood the goal of goofiness pedagogy but questioned the wisdom of this approach with other shy or inhibited young people. Others questioned their ability to incorporate drama into more advanced content classes.

Getting There (but Not Quite There yet)

Over the years I have practiced goofiness pedagogy, pre-service teachers for the most part seem excited about the prospect of experimenting with drama and performance, but are uncertain about how to use it with their own students. Some of them stated a willingness to participate in performed goofiness activities only because they knew and trusted other members of their teaching cohort. This perspective is exemplified in the following comment by a secondary education teacher: “[Performing goofiness] was easy for me, but I feel that much of it was because I have known everyone in the program for months now. I don’t warm up to people quickly and I believe that I would have had trouble with this earlier.”

Another common sentiment among graduate pre-service teachers in particular was genuine interest in goofiness pedagogy, but uncertainty about how much to implement in their classroom: “I’m not entirely sure I’ll ever be able to do full justice to a performed goofiness activity in my own class, again because I’m not entirely comfortable with it myself. Maybe that’s something I’ll be able to work up to as I teach more and feel more at ease in my classroom. In the meantime, I would like to do it here and there, and over time perhaps progress to activities like those from class.” [Table 1](#) provides a sample of student comments about goofiness pedagogy, taken from different mid and end-of-semester reflections.

Practical Implications And Recommendations

If teachers and teacher-educators themselves are uncomfortable with drama, they will be far less likely to use it with students. Reluctance to stray from the familiar into the unfamiliar can be a strong impediment, as is the fear that most novice teachers have about looking silly to students, or worse, incompetent. These fears are understandable. I had them too when I was a new teacher just starting out. My recommendation for any

Table 1. Comments about “Performed Goofiness.”

What You Liked about PG	What You Did Not Like about PG (or Suggestions for Improvement)
I thought the goofiness activities were very creative and informative.	I wanted more instruction on how to create the activities you showed us in class.
I liked the engaging, interactive activities we did.	It was hard to relate some of the more simple lessons to a higher level class that is more conceptual.
I really enjoyed the roleplays.	Don't spend quite so much time on roleplays of activities.
I loved the goofiness factor. I love learning to be silly.	I didn't clearly see the connections between learning how to teach [in a] Structured English Immersion classroom and some of the learning activities we did.
I do see some definite benefits with activities like [performed goofiness] if only because it lowers everyone's affective filters enough that we're all contributing. This would be especially beneficial in a class where students are reluctant to participate such as ELLs.	I am not a fan of performed goofiness. As an educator I understand the purpose behind it, but ... I feel that it alienates those in the class that maybe shy; I understand that part of the purpose is to get students out of their comfort zones, but for me this went too far.
[Drama and goofiness] turns class into something that many will enjoy and it holds their attention.	I am nervous to use too much. I have a very deadpan personality and I feel that if I used this with students out of the blue that it would not work well. In terms of having my students use this, I'm very careful about how adventurous I get in student teaching.
I could see myself using this with younger students (and actually did a lot of goofy activities when I worked with young kids). I also think that it could be useful in language classes when simulating real life roleplays.	I'm naturally a shy person, and so activities like we did in class are always a bit more difficult for me to get involved in, only because I'm not a big fan of having the attention focused on me. However, I think there's something to be said about all of the activities being done with multiple people, as it feels like there is a sense of safety in numbers.

Source: From Pre-service Teachers in Foundations and Methods of SEI.

teachers or teacher-educators wishing to experiment with goofiness pedagogy is to start small. Brief and exaggerated facial expressions or an “expressive microburst” here and there can disrupt more conventional routines, surprising students and redirecting their attention from off-task behaviors. If the activities are different, creative, and fun, students will respond

positively. Another recommendation for the reluctant but interested teacher is to invite a more animated colleague or guest speaker into the class to engage in performance pedagogy related to different content subjects. If the students are excited teachers can try out short, then longer dramatic or goofy activities.

If teachers need ideas about different activities to implement in their classrooms, there is no shortage of articles or books about teaching and performance. I recommend that teachers explore these texts, trying out ideas that appeal, and revising or reworking activities that need work. Finally, emergent bilingual students acquiring English need opportunities to play with the language in a way that allows them to take risks, make mistakes and perform “a head taller than themselves” (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 102). I believe that goofiness pedagogy provides one way for students to do this.

To conclude, goofiness pedagogy has invigorated my own work with pre-teachers and has helped me implement more meaningful SEI classes. The goofiness and performance activities provide pre-teachers them with a vision of good instruction with and for emergent bilingual students. Once pre-service teachers experience the pleasure of performing with peers in teacher education classes, they will be less reluctant to try it out themselves. That is my hope.

References

- Arizona Department of Education. (2009). *Administrator's model implementation training*. PowerPoint presentation. Retrieved from <https://www.ade.az.gov/oelas>
- Batalova, J., & McHugh, M. (2010). *Number and growth of students in U.S. schools in need of English instruction*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Blum, A., & Johnson, E. J. (2012). Reading repression: Textualizing the linguistic marginalization of nonnative English-speaking teachers in Arizona. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 11(3), 167–184.
- Boal, A. (1979). *Theatre of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Theatre Communications Group.
- Bontjes, C. (2013). *Create captivating classrooms*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Cahnmann-Taylor, M., & Souto-Manning, M. (2010). *Teachers act up! Creating multicultural learning communities through theater*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Cazden, C. B. (1981). Performance before competence: Assistance to child discourse in the zone of proximal development. *The Quarterly Newsletter of the Laboratory of Comparative Human Cognition*, 3(1), 5–8.
- Chappell, S. V., & Faltis, C. J. (2013). *Arts and emergent bilingual youth: Building culturally responsive, critical and creative education in school and community contexts*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Collier, V. (1987). Age and rate of acquisition of second language for academic purposes. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 617–641.
- Collier, V. (1988). *The effect of age on acquisition of a second language for school*. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. ERIC Number: ED296580. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?q=The+effect+of+age+on+acquisition+of+a+second+language+for+school&id=ED296580>. Accessed on January 2, 2014.
- Collier, V. (1995). *Promoting academic success for ESL students: Understanding second language acquisition for school*. Elizabeth, NJ: New Jersey Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages-Bilingual Educators.
- Combs, M. C. (2012). Everything on its head: How Arizona's structured English immersion policy re-invents theory and practice. In M. B. Arias & C. Faltis (Eds.), *Implementing educational language policy in Arizona: Legal, historical and current practices in SEI* (pp. 59–85). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Combs, M. C., Betts, J. D., & Fisher, P. (2013). Acted and enacted lives: Language play, theater, and language development at the border. In S. V. Chappell & C. J. Faltis (Eds.), *The arts and emergent bilingual youth* (pp. 63–67). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Combs, M. C., & Nicholas, S. E. (2012). The effect of Arizona language policies on Arizona indigenous students. *Language Policy*, 11(1), 101–118.
- Cummins, J. (1992). Bilingual education and English immersion: The Ramírez report in theoretical perspective. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16(1–2), 91–104.
- Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Ontario, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Curtain, H. A. (1986). Integrating language and content instruction. *ERIC/CLL News Bulletin*, 9(2), 1, 10–11.
- Curtain, H. A. (1991). Methods in elementary school foreign language teaching. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(4), 323–329.
- DaSilva, I. A. C., Combs, M. C., & Moll, L. C. (2012). In the arid zone: Drying out educational resources for English language learners through policy and practice. *Urban Education*, 47(2), 495–514.
- Dictionary.com. *goof*. Retrieved from <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/goof>. Accessed on January, 20, 2014.
- Dinkelman, T. (2003). Self-study in teacher education: A means and ends tool for promoting reflective teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54, 6–18.
- Disney Mickey. (n.d.). *Goofy*. Retrieved from <http://mickey.disney.com/goofy>. Accessed on March 30, 2014.
- Echevarría, J., & Graves, A. (2011). *Sheltered content instruction* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Echevarría, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. (2013). *Making content comprehensible for English languages* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Edmiston, B. (2014). *Transforming teaching and learning with active and dramatic approaches*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ernst-Slavit, G., & Wenger, K. J. (1998). Using creative drama in the elementary ESL classroom. *TESOL Journal*, 7(4), 30–33.
- Florez, I. R. (2012). Examining the validity of the Arizona English language learners assessment cut scores. *Language Policy*, 11(1), 33–45.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Seabury Press.
- Gándara, P., & Hopkins, M. (2010). *Forbidden language*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

- Gándara, P., & Orfield, G. (2012). Why Arizona matters: The historical, legal, and political contexts of Arizona’s instructional policies and U.S. linguistic hegemony. *Language Policy, 11*(1), 7–19.
- Goldenberg, C., & Coleman, R. (2010). *Promoting academic achievement among English learners: A guide to the research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Goldenberg, C., & Rutherford-Quach, S. (2012). The Arizona home language survey: The under-identification of students for English language services. *Language Policy, 11*(1), 21–30.
- Hakuta, K., Butler, Y. G., & Witt, D. (2000). *How long does it take for English learners to attain proficiency?* Santa Barbara, CA: University of California, Linguistic Minority Research Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.stanford.edu/~hakuta/Publications/%282000%29%20-%20HOW%20LONG%20DOES%20IT%20TAKE%20ENGLISH%20LEARNERS%20TO%20ATTAIN%20PR.pdf>. Accessed on January 2, 2014.
- Hamilton, M. L., & Pinnegar, S. (2000). On the threshold of a new century: Trustworthiness, integrity, and self-study in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(3), 234–240.
- Hawkins, M. (2005). ESL in elementary education. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 25–43). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Heineke, A. J., & Cameron, Q. (2013). Closing the classroom door and the achievement gap: Teach for America alumni teachers’ appropriation of Arizona language policy. *Education and Urban Society, 45*(4), 483–505.
- Johnson, E. J. (2012). Arbitrating repression: Language policy and education in Arizona. *Language and Education, 26*(1), 53–76.
- Kasper, G., & Roever (2005). Pragmatics in second language learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 317–334). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Krashen, S. (1996). *Under attack: The case against bilingual education*. Culver City, CA: Language Education Associates.
- Krashen, S., Rolstad, K., & MacSwan, J. (2007). *Review of “Research summary and bibliography for Structured English Immersion programs” of the Arizona English Language Learners Task Force*. Retrieved from http://www.elladvocates.org/documents/AZ/Krashen_Rolstad_MacSwan_review.pdf
- Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.). (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leckie, A. G., Kaplan, S. E., & Rubinstein-Avila, E. (2013). The need for speed: A critical discourse analysis of the reclassification of English language learners in Arizona. *Language Policy, 12*(2), 159–176.
- Levine, L. N., & McCloskey, M. L. (2013). *Teaching English and language and content in mainstream classes* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Mackinney, E., & Rios-Aguilar, C. (2012). Negotiating between restrictive language policies and complex teaching conditions: A case study of Arizona’s teachers of English learners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 35*(3), 350–367.
- Marsland, B. (1998). *Lessons from nothing: Activities for language teaching with limited time and resources*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Martinez-Wenzl, M., Pérez, K. C., & Gándara, P. (2012). Is Arizona's approach to educating its ELS superior to other forms of instruction. *Teachers College Record*, *114*, 1–32.
- Medina, C. L. (2004). Drama wor(l)ds: Explorations of Latina/o realistic fiction. *Language Arts*, *81*(4), 272–282.
- Merriam-Webster.com. *goofy*. Retrieved from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/goofy>. Accessed on January 20, 2014.
- Milem, J. F., Bryan, W. P., Sesate, D. B., & Montañó, S. (2013). *Arizona minority student progress report, 2013*. Tucson, AZ: Arizona Minority Education Policy Analysis Center.
- Oxford English Dictionary Online. (2013). *goff*, n.2. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/79712>. Accessed on January 20, 2014.
- Pinnegar, S. E., & Hamilton, M. L. (2009). *Self-study of practice as a genre of qualitative research: Theory, methodology, and practice*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Pinnegar, S. E., Hamilton, M. L., & Fitzgerald, L. (2010). Guidance in being and becoming: Self-study of practice researchers. In L. Erickson, J. Young, & S. Pinnegar (Eds.), *Proceedings of the eighth international conference on self-studies of teacher education practices: Navigating the public and the private: Negotiating the diverse landscapes of teacher education* (pp. 203–206). Herstmonceaux Castle, UK: Self-Study of Teacher Education Practices SIG.
- Pollard, L., & Hess, N. (1997). *Zero prep: Ready-to-go activities for the language classroom*. Burlingame, CA: Alta Book Center Publishers.
- Progrow, S. (2009). *Teaching content outrageously*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Reyes, S. A. (2013). *Engage the creative arts*. Portland, OR: DiversityLearningK-12.
- Rios-Aguilar, C., Gonzalez, C. M. S., & Moll, L. C. (2012). A study of Arizona's teachers of English language learners. *Teachers College Record*, *114*, 9.
- Rios-Aguilar, C., Gonzalez, C. M. S., & Sabetghadam, S. (2012). Evaluating the impact of restrictive language policies: The Arizona 4-hour English language development block. *Language Policy*, *11*(1), 47–80.
- Saunders, W., & Goldenberg, C. (2010). *Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education.
- Shakespeare, W. (1969). *Romeo and Juliet [1597]*. New York, NY: Scholastic, Inc.
- Spolin, V. (1986). *Theater games for the classroom*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wong Fillmore, L., & Snow, C. E. (2002). What teachers need to know about language. In C. T. Adger, C. E. Snow, & D. Christian (Eds.), *What teachers need to know about language* (pp. 7–53). McHenry, IL: Delta Systems.
- Wright, A., Betteridge, D., & Buckby, M. (2006). *Games for language learners* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, L. (2001). Preparing teachers to put drama in the classroom. *Theory into Practice*, *24*(3), 205–210.