

# TEACHING CLASSICAL LANGUAGES

AN ONLINE JOURNAL OF THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION  
OF THE MIDDLE WEST AND SOUTH

---

## ARTICLES IN THIS ISSUE:

### **Implementing IPAs: One Department's Odyssey**

Evelyn Beckman and Richard Green

### **Visualizing Vocabulary: Student-Driven Visual Vocabularies**

Christopher Bungard

### **Why Learn Latin?**

### **Motivation for Learning a Classical Language**

Joshua W. Katz, Kimberly A. Noels, and  
Amanda R. Fitzner

### **The Thomas Project: Evaluating a Web-Based Latin Research Project for Learners at Multiple Levels**

Elizabeth Manwell

**ISSUE 11.1**  
**SPRING 2020**



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Remembering Keely Lake: A Memorial John Gruber-Miller	IV
Implementing IPAs: One Department's Odyssey Evelyn Beckman and Richard Green	1
Visualizing Vocabulary: Student-Driven Visual Vocabularies Christopher Bungard	51
Why Learn Latin? Motivation for Learning a Classical Language Joshua W. Katz, Kimberly A. Noels, and Amanda R. Fitzner	89
The Thomas Project: Evaluating a Web-Based Latin Research Project for Learners at Multiple Levels Elizabeth Manwell	131

Cover design by Sharon Cole

Photo used in cover design created by [Vinicius "amnx" Amano](#) on Unsplash

**EDITOR**

Yasuko Taoka (Wayne State College) [tcleditor@camws.org](mailto:tcleditor@camws.org)

**EDITORIAL ASSISTANT**

Sharon Cole (Wayne State College) [tclassistant@camws.org](mailto:tclassistant@camws.org)

**TCL EDITORIAL BOARD**

Peter Anderson, Grand Valley State University

Rebecca Harrison, Truman State University

Caroline Kelly, Mitchell Community College, North Carolina

Amy Sommer Rosevear, Cherry Creek High School, Denver, Colorado

Wilfred Major, Louisiana State University

Bartolo Natoli, Randolph-Macon College

Robert Patrick, Parkview High School, Gwinnett County, Georgia

Cynthia White, University of Arizona

**TEACHING CLASSICAL LANGUAGES MISSION STATEMENT**

*Teaching Classical Languages* (ISSN 2160-2220) is the only peer-reviewed electronic journal dedicated to the teaching and learning of Latin and ancient Greek. It addresses the interests of all Latin and Greek teachers, graduate students, coordinators, and administrators. *Teaching Classical Languages* welcomes articles offering innovative practice and methods, advocating new theoretical approaches, or reporting on empirical research in teaching and learning Latin and Greek. As an electronic journal, *Teaching Classical Languages* has a unique global outreach. It offers authors and readers a multimedia format that more fully illustrates the topics discussed, and provides hypermedia links to related information and websites. Articles not only contribute to successful Latin and Greek pedagogy, but draw on relevant literature in language education, applied linguistics, and second language acquisition for an ongoing dialogue with modern language educators.

*Teaching Classical Languages* welcomes articles offering innovative practice and methods, advocating new theoretical approaches, or reporting on empirical research in teaching and learning Latin and Greek.

ISSN 2160-2220.

Guidelines for submission may be found at

<http://www.tcl.camws.org/guidelines.pdf>.



## **Keely Lake, In Memoriam 1971-2020**

**by John Gruber-Miller**

It came suddenly and unexpectedly. In mid-January, I received word that TCL Editorial Assistant Keely Lake had passed away. In the last few weeks before her death, we were exchanging typical end of the fall semester correspondence. Keely was concerned to finish grading her students in her six online classes. We were conferring about correcting typos, reviewing formatting, attending to tables and footnotes. She would mention taking a break to bake cookies or grading some more in between copyediting. She was bugging me to send in my Letter from the Editor. And she was wondering what images to use for the TCL cover. As she responded to an author's corrections, she would send a quick email, "Done." Everything seemed so normal, so predictable, so Keely.

I met Keely when I was a newly tenured faculty member at Cornell College and she was a grad student at the University of Iowa. In those days, she was part of a gang of grad students that I came to know well. In Fall 2000, she came and taught two classes for us at Cornell College, Classical Mythology and an upper-level Latin course, *The Age of Cicero*. Already in these courses, it was easy to find signs of her resourcefulness and flexibility. The myth course was the first time that Keely had led and designed an entire course in translation. She also had to adjust to Cornell's unique calendar, called One-Course-At-A-Time (OCAAT), in which faculty teach and students enroll in one course at a time in month-long terms. Finally, she had to cope with a student with a rather severe case of ADD. Despite all the challenges, she succeeded in making the course work. I remember her standing at my office door where we would talk about how her courses were going and how to respond to specific student needs. In both courses, as I wrote in my letter of recommendation, "she designed the assignments, especially the final research paper, around her students' interests and abilities." And I added in my conclusion something that no one who knew her ever doubted: "If you have a position that requires good teaching and commitment to students, please consider Keely Lake." That's an understatement.

A hallmark of Keely that I greatly admired was her ability to seamlessly blend her passion for the ancient world, her commitment to her students as both students and as people, and her engagement with how the classics could respond to challenges we face in the modern world. The most memorable was listening to Keely at lunch at a classics conference explain how she had designed a course around the issue of refugees in the *Aeneid*. At the time, the Syrian refugee crisis was just unfolding. She knew her students at Wayland Academy came from all across the globe, and while they were not refugees themselves, they could understand what it meant to straddle two very different cultural paradigms. Afterward, she generously shared the specific readings on refugees and exile in the ancient and modern world that inspired her and her students. These same readings helped me re-think and re-frame how I would teach my upcoming Cicero course by focusing on Cicero's exile in 58-57 BCE.

Besides being a consummate teacher who could build her teaching around her students' needs and interests and contemporary issues, Keely was also a consummate reflective teacher. She knew how to bridge methodological and pedagogical divides. She knew how to bridge methodological and pedagogical divides. As someone who was trained under a grammar-translation approach, she was always eager to read authentic texts with her students, building on a solid understanding of Latin vocabulary and syntax. Nonetheless, she was always open to new ideas and new ways of teaching. And because of her openness and genuine interest in becoming a better teacher, she was able to reach out to others and build common ground, and see the value of other viewpoints.

Keely's perspective was always that of the big tent, and that is why I invited her to serve on the TCL Editorial Board in 2014. I wanted someone who was curious and open-minded—a truly reflective pedagogue. And I wanted someone who had contacts and who could recommend readers from all across the country and with different methodologies and perspectives. Needless to say, Keely offered that and more. Whenever the Editorial Board got together at CAMWS or SCS, Keely was in attendance with ideas and suggestions for improving the journal and suggesting new directions. She was without fail ready to respond to my queries, suggest referees, and raise important issues for the journal to attend to. And when I learned that Keely's predecessor as Editorial Assistant, Meghan Yamanishi, needed to resign upon the arrival of a new child and a new full-time job, it was Keely who quickly came to mind. At that same time, Keely was transitioning from Wayland Academy to moving home to South Dakota to be with her father and was looking for work. And thus began a new phase in our relationship.

Did I say that Keely had contacts and colleagues all across the country? It may come as no surprise that Keely may have been the classicist who bridged more organizations and working groups within our profession than just about anyone else. Many knew Keely through her service on so many committees and organizations. In reflecting on the organizations that Keely served, it becomes apparent that she felt a deep and genuine call not just to service, but also to advocacy. She wanted to share her love for the ancient world with diverse constituencies: Latin students (AP Latin), high school teachers (Vergilian Society, CAMWS, ACL), colleagues in other languages (WAFLT). Mentoring students and fellow teachers was her passion. She felt a deep calling to support teachers and their students as chair of the CAMWS Committee for the Promotion of Latin, chair of the National Committee for Latin and Greek, and delegate to the Joint National Committee for Languages. And she was honored by many of these same organizations: an *Ovatio* from CAMWS, WAFLT Distinguished Language Educator, and ACL Merita Award. Since her death, CAMWS has renamed the Travel Grants for School Groups after her and the ACL has instituted a new award, the Keely Lake Award for Advocacy. A call to service and advocacy. That is why she was so beloved by so many organizations and so many friends and colleagues.

Genuine, authentic, passionate, engaging, inspiring, caring, humble, cheerful, visionary. These are just a few of Keely's qualities. We will all miss her welcoming smile and thoughtful words at meetings, gatherings, and meals shared together. But we will treasure the gifts she gave to each of us through her friendship, service, mentoring, and advocacy for Latin and classical studies. *Requiescat in pace.*





## **Implementing IPAs: One Department's Odyssey**

**EVELYN BECKMAN AND RICHARD GREEN**

**BULLIS SCHOOL**

### **ABSTRACT**

Integrated Performance Assessments (IPAs) allow students to show what they know via the three modes of communication: Interpretive, Interpersonal, and Presentational. This is an account of one foreign language department's multi-year journey in refining its assessments and transitioning to the use of IPAs throughout the year, including in lieu of final exams. This paper will provide an account of the work that one foreign language department has been doing in recent years to improve the way students are assessed by adopting IPAs, with specific examples provided from Latin classes. Examples given will focus primarily on Interpretive Reading, Interpersonal Writing, and Presentational Writing. This paper addresses the reasoning behind choosing IPAs, detailed information about what they are, and the results the department has had so far. Lastly, this paper discusses how the department has changed the way classes are taught and assessed, with specific attention given to the Latin classroom.

### **1 – LATIN . . . LATIN NEVER CHANGES**

Change can be difficult for many reasons, but it can also bring about significant positive growth in our students and ourselves as educators. In recent years, our foreign language department found itself wanting to change how we assess students in order to capture more accurately what our students know and can do with their respective languages. The authors of this article are the two Upper School (grades 9-12) Latin teachers who are members of a foreign language department comprised of Chinese, French, Latin, and Spanish teachers at a K-12 independent school on the trimester system. In order to graduate, our students must take at least two years of the same foreign language in the Upper School and are free to take whichever of our four foreign languages they would like. Overall, as a department, we are continually looking to improve how we teach and are willing to adapt if we feel it is in the best interest of our students and program. As such, we decided as a department with the support of our administration that Integrated Performance Assessments (IPAs) are the best way to assess our students' progress in our

respective languages and have moved forward in implementing and improving our IPAs each year. In this article, we will explain how we brought about these significant changes by implementing IPAs as a department in our Upper School, with specific focus on how we have used them in our Latin classes.

The impetus for our decision to completely change our major assessments (final exams, unit tests) was that despite our best intentions as Latin teachers, the assessments we used previously only evaluated our students' reading ability in Latin. Also, their grammar and linguistic skills were tested in isolation, with little-to-no language comprehension required on the part of the student. In our Latin classes, we would cover a Latin reading by requiring students to translate the text before we would then go over it aloud with students in class, telling them what the proper English translation was. Because we wanted to hold students accountable for each of the readings we covered, on the subsequent assessment, students would translate an excerpt from a seen passage (i.e., the Latin text we had already covered in class) into English. If we are honest with ourselves, many of our students were simply memorizing the English translation and regurgitating it on the test. Other sections of tests would require them to answer some grammar, syntax, and possibly some culture questions pertinent to that reading. We found that such questions would only serve to separate those students who shared our love of grammar from those students who did not. The latter would lose points on that section because they just memorized the English translation and usually never noted when we went over the Latin in class those particular grammar items. Lastly, our tests would include noun, adjective, and verb charts to check for student memorization of forms. Such tasks were disjointed at times and only pertained to those skills in isolation. Final exams, which our school requires us to give our students once per year, were extended versions of these sorts of tests.

As one can imagine, these tasks were inflexible and did not allow students to show what they know and can do with the language. The emphasis was on errors students would make. Unfortunately, the result was that students were often discouraged by their test scores because their scores did not reflect what language they did know. To compensate for this, we found that our students (frequently with a tutor) would cram and never really understand the Latin text during or after we covered it in class. Students were not motivated to develop an understanding of what the Latin vocabulary words meant, because they were too focused on memorizing the English translation of the Latin we had covered. Many of

our students could decline and conjugate like professionals, but they could not actually read any Latin, and especially not Latin passages they had not translated previously. In essence, we found that our assessments and teaching methods were only beneficial to our few students who loved and craved grammar charts and were easily able to memorize English translations of Latin. The worst part of all this is that most of our students were unhappy, felt unsuccessful, and would rapidly lose their love of the Latin language. We felt we were making little to no actual progress with the majority of our students and wanted to change our assessments to increase students' accessibility to the language we love.

## 2 - MUTATIS MUTANDIS

Our decision to transition into using Integrated Performance Assessments was facilitated by work that our modern language colleagues had been doing around their assessments of student performance. The idea of using IPAs had been introduced to us by Sara-Elizabeth Cottrell of [musicuentos.com](http://musicuentos.com). In addition, we had recently purchased the ACTFL manual [Implementing Integrated Performance Assessment](#) for use as a department. We were also fortunate to have some local professional development opportunities through [The Center for Transformative Teaching and Learning](#), which inspired us to think differently about how to help our students. An IPA uses three tasks, each addressing the three modes of communication: Interpretive (Reading/Listening), Interpersonal (Writing/Speaking), and Presentational (Writing/Speaking), and each of these three tasks align with a particular unit or theme. IPAs are performance-based and should be used with rubrics that rate student performance. Coinciding with all the research we were doing on IPAs, the [American Classical League](#) released its [Revised Standards for Classical Language Learning](#). The revised document gives attention to the three modes of communication and is further support to us Latin teachers as we took a look at the widespread changes we wanted to make to our curriculum and assessments. We began to see that IPA tasks could work as assessments for our entire department, not just our modern languages but also in our Latin classes if we were willing to rethink and revise our curriculum.

IPAs increasingly seemed to be not only a viable method of assessment but also one that afforded us the flexibility to take and leave those portions which seemed well- or ill-suited to what our students were doing with the language and our student population. Our confidence in that decision increased as we sought out further resources around what

IPAs could be; we made particular use of [CARLA at the University of Minnesota](#), the [Ohio Department of Education's World Languages Model Curriculum](#), and our colleague [Maris Hawkins'](#) implementation of IPAs in her classroom. We concluded after our research that using IPAs to assess students would allow us to measure what our students can do with the language more accurately. Once we decided to move forward using IPAs as a department, we identified two specific goals for how we would use them. We wanted to use IPAs, and the IPA model, to rework and replace the assessments, large and small, which we were using in class. We also wanted to use IPAs as a replacement for end-of-year final exams. It was also necessary for us to develop analytics and rubrics for each level of language. We worked together as a department to create these rubrics for each level. For implementation in our Latin classes, we adapted the Interpretive Reading task rubric, in particular, to fit more closely with what we focus on when reading in class with our students (later explanation on this is in section 3). Our foreign language teachers use the analytic sheets to score student performance and for grade conversion, per the grading curve we created and use (Appendix B). Teachers score student performance for each category within each IPA task using the descriptions within the rubrics we developed (Appendix C).

In the end, we decided to move forward with IPAs beginning with our level III classes while we reworked our Latin I class to incorporate a more Comprehensible Input (CI)-based approach to instruction. We also decided to adopt Ørberg's *Lingua Latina per se Illustrata* as the textbook in our Latin I and II classes because of its many merits, not the least of which is the amount of input it gives students in the target language. Other textbooks could be used, of course, but we decided that *Lingua Latina* would be best for our students. We viewed this shift to a more CI-friendly teaching method to be necessary to the long-term viability of the IPA model as we worked to try to incorporate all modes of communication. Therefore, our implementation sequence proceeded thus:

- In our first year (2016-2017), we implemented IPAs in our Latin III and Honors Latin III classes.
- In the subsequent year (2017-2018), we added IPAs to our Latin IV class and also decided to accelerate our implementation by adding IPA tasks in our Latin II classes.
- Near the end of the 2017-2018 school year, we accelerated our implementation even further and added an IPA to Latin I in the spring in lieu of a final exam.

The initial implementation was very limited in its scope. Since our program had been modeled around a more “traditional” grammar-translation approach, we felt that implementing Interpretive Reading would be a natural first step. We then added Presentational Writing, and Interpersonal Writing came last. While we were working with our Latin III classes to implement this initial round of IPAs, we were also introducing IPA-style tasks to all levels of Latin in order to start preparing students, and ourselves, to begin working in this new paradigm. This also served our long-term goal of increasing the amount of comprehensible input our students were receiving in order to furnish them with the language they would need to start producing later.

The 2018-2019 school year marked our third year of implementation, and all foreign language classes in our Upper School, apart from Advanced Placement (AP), use IPA tasks as their primary mode of assessment. In other words, we no longer give tests or exams in our classes. We do still give students small and frequent quizzes, and students utilize the same skills they would use to be successful in our Interpretive, Interpersonal, and Presentational tasks. As most of these small quizzes are formative, we often grade for completion and do not apply a full rubric as on a larger assessment. We look at these small quizzes (each worth only a handful of points) as motivating students to be accountable for their learning while helping them to check to see if they are on the right track leading up to IPA tasks.

In the Upper School, we give IPA tasks to students that align with the content and activities students have been doing in class. Students feel less nervous about these assessments since they have found that they cannot study (or cram!) for them. At this point, our IPA tasks are announced ahead of time to students, though we would eventually like to move to unannounced IPA tasks. Our students know that if they consistently attend class and participate in class activities, they will do fine on any IPA task they are given. Thus, student anxiety has lessened, which has been better for their well-being. We should note that we feel that, for each unit, it is not necessary to have students complete IPA tasks for all three modes of communication. For instance, for a given unit, perhaps it is only appropriate to assess students using an Interpretive Reading and a Presentational Writing task for that particular unit. The teacher is given the discretion to make that choice. However, for an IPA that is given in place of a final exam, our department requires all three modes are addressed for that assessment. The amount of IPA tasks we have given each trimester in

Latin II, III, and IV is four or five, with Interpretive Reading being the most frequent task we give. In Latin I, Interpretive Reading is by far the most common. Those students only are given Interpretive Reading for the first half of the year until they are comfortable enough producing the language to complete simple Presentational Writing tasks later in the year. Currently, we do not have plans to implement IPAs in the AP classes given the nature of the AP curriculum, although that may change in the future.

Regarding the logistics of giving a full and formal IPA which assesses all three modes, we like to devote four class days to it. On the first day, students complete the Interpretive Reading task. The next day, we debrief the previous day's Interpretive Reading to make sure students comprehend what they read. We also use that day to discuss possible answers for the comprehension questions on that task. For a question that requires students to infer, for instance, there could be a few possible correct answers, as student responses are plausible and coincide with the Latin they have cited to support their answer. On the third day, students complete an Interpersonal Writing task. Then on the fourth day students complete a Presentational Writing task. We have found this order works best, because students are getting more input by doing the Interpretive Reading task first. In addition, the Interpersonal Writing task coming before the Presentational Writing gives students practice producing and negotiating the language in a comprehensible way (Interpersonal task) before they are required to produce Latin that is not only comprehensible but accurate.

As far as grading is concerned, we have found that the Interpretive Reading task takes the longest to grade because, on some questions, there are many possible answers that students could provide if they back it up with appropriate Latin. The Interpersonal Writing task does not take as long to grade, but doing so does require us to carefully read over the transcript of their conversation from [Backchannel Chat](#) (see more information about this tool in section 3 under Interpersonal) and track each student's contribution to the conversation. We need to consider student responses mindfully. Are they just repeating what someone else has already said? Are they contributing something new to the conversation? Are they furthering the conversation by responding and then asking appropriate questions? There is nuance in student conversations, and care needs to be taken when reading through and scoring points. Lastly, Presentational Writing takes us the least amount of time to grade and can be the most enjoyable to grade, especially as students inject their creativity and humor in their writing.

### 3 - THE TASKS

#### *The Interpretive Task*

The following paragraph is our department's statement on the Interpretive task. The first statement is taken directly from ACTFL (Adair-Hauck 43), and the second is our own department's goal statement.

The Interpretive task requires the appropriate interpretation of meanings, including cultural, that occur in written and spoken form (read, heard, or viewed) where there is no recourse to the active negotiation of meaning with the writer or speaker.

The goal of this task is to demonstrate **comprehension**, not to produce language. Thus, comprehension is typically assessed in English (i.e., English questions requiring an English response), particularly at the lower levels of each language.

The matter of how we should ask questions and require students to answer questions (i.e., English or target language) was a matter of considerable debate within our department. Some members of our department insisted we should ask questions in the target language and/or require students to respond in the target language. In the end, we determined that because the goal of the Interpretive task is to **demonstrate comprehension**, we would ask in English and allow students to respond in English, so it would be obvious what students can comprehend from a text written in the target language.

Questions on Interpretive tasks require them to:

- Identify Key Words
- Identify Main Ideas
- Identify Supporting Details
- Identify Organizational Features
- Guess Meaning from Context
- Infer
- Identify Authorial Perspective
- Identify Cultural Perspective and Norms

*\*\*NOTA BENE: Within our department, we do not cover each of the above-bulleted items in a*

*single Interpretive task. An average Interpretive task might include four to six of these elements depending on the text assessed and teacher discretion. Therefore, our Interpretive rubric in its base form is the oddest, because it has eight possible sections which reflect ACTFL's manual [Implementing Integrated Performance Assessment](#) (Adair-Hauck 259).*

In our Latin classes, we conduct Interpretive Reading tasks on which students are given a Latin text and must answer English questions with English answers. It is imperative to note that the Latin texts on our Interpretive Reading tasks are not the same Latin readings we have done in class. After all, we did not want our students to memorize and regurgitate as they had done in the past on our assessments. The texts given on our Interpretive Reading tasks do, however, contain familiar vocabulary compared to Latin we have read as a class. The supplementary resources for Ørberg's *Lingua Latina per se Illustrata* have texts that can easily be used or adapted to meet our needs. Likewise, we will often compose a story using familiar vocabulary for an Interpretive Reading task using our students as characters within the story, in order to make the assessed text both compelling and comprehensible for the students in the class. Students enjoy reading fictional stories about themselves, and overall, we have found that this helped strengthen our rapport with students. The rubrics that we have used with our Latin classes are found in Appendix C. We have chosen to assess Word Recognition, Grammar Recognition, Main Idea Detection, Supporting Detail Detection, and Making Inferences.

### *The Interpersonal Task*

The following paragraph is our department's statement on the Interpersonal task. The first statement is taken directly from ACTFL (Adair-Hauck 43), and the second is our own department's goal statement.

The Interpersonal task requires the active negotiation of meaning among individuals. Participants observe and monitor one another to see how their intentions and meanings are being communicated. Adjustments and clarifications can be made accordingly. Participants need to initiate, maintain, and at some levels sustain the conversation.



The goal of this task is to successfully (and spontaneously) **negotiate meaning**. Effective communication and understanding are the goals of this task, and the correct use of language is secondary.

For the Interpersonal task, students are given a prompt or questions to discuss and must have a spontaneous (i.e., not practiced beforehand) conversation. We assess students based on:

- Task Completion
- Comprehensibility (by a sympathetic reader/listener)
- Quality of Interaction (i.e. ability to sustain and further the conversation)
- Vocabulary
- Language Control (use and accuracy of language structures)

As a department, we have found it best practice to make sure that we have some way of recording what our students have produced during the Interpersonal task. This will help students to see what they need to improve and helps the teacher with scoring each student using the rubric. Our modern language colleagues have their students complete Interpersonal Speaking tasks, and they use various tools for audio or video recording to capture those student conversations. We Latin teachers have decided that our students will complete Interpersonal Writing tasks. At our school, each student has a laptop computer. For Interpersonal Writing tasks, our students are required to communicate in Latin using an online chatroom created by us using Backchannel Chat, which has both free and paid versions. We like using the Classroom tier of Backchannel Chat because it has many features that we like including the ability to save transcripts of the Latin conversation our students have. For each Interpersonal Writing task, we divide them into small groups of 3-4 students and give them two or three prompts (our prompts are written in English and Latin) for them to discuss together virtually. They are given five to ten minutes to respond and carry on a conversation in the chatroom with each other. We want them to respond to the prompt but then further the conversation by asking and responding to each other's questions and responses. We are able to save transcripts of these conversations for use in grading and for later discussions with students both individually and as a class about how to improve their ability to conduct a conversation in Latin.

*The Presentational Task*

The following paragraph is our department's statement on the Presentational task. The first statement is taken directly from ACTFL (Adair-Hauck 43), and the second is our own department's goal statement.

For the Presentational task, students create verbal and/or written messages in a manner that facilitates interpretation by an audience of listeners, readers, or viewers where no direct opportunity for the active negotiation of meaning exists.

The goal of this task is to **convey content and meaning successfully**. Correct and appropriate use of the target language is a primary goal.

For the Presentational task, students in our department are given a speaking/writing prompt, and students are assessed based on:

- Task Completion
- Comprehensibility
- Level of Discourse
- Vocabulary
- Language Control (use and accuracy of language structures)

In the Latin classroom, we have our students complete Presentational Writing tasks. We give them a prompt (our prompts are written in English and Latin) for them to write about, and they are given a class period (our classes are fifty minutes long) to write their response. They write and edit their responses before turning it in to us.

#### **4 - HOW DID THINGS CHANGE?**

Our shift to using IPAs as the primary mode of assessment in our Latin classes and across our entire department necessitated a great many changes from ourselves, our colleagues, and from our institution. The first, and most significant, challenge and change was in the idea that we no longer wanted to give final summative exams that were bound to a two to three hour exam period. This was a seismic shift for us on an institutional level,

and we believe that a major part of why we were successful in convincing our institution to allow us to make this shift has to do with the depth that the IPA allows. A “final exam” lasting two to three hours can incorporate reading, writing, and possibly some listening and speaking in a formulaic way, such as the AP manages to do, but a full IPA requires much more time to implement and allows students time to process what they are reading or hearing before sharing their thoughts in speech or writing. It also helped us that IPAs systematically utilize a broad array of skills, which can work to support our students with particular learning needs who might not perform their best on a more traditional exam emphasizing perhaps only one or two modes of communication.

Another large change came in our program’s relation to students and parents. The nature of a classroom centered around comprehensible input, and assessments using IPAs instead of more traditional tests, makes studying, in the stereotypical sense, rather difficult. It has also been the case that we assign significantly less homework now in our Latin classes than we used to. While the initial student reaction to these changes was exceedingly positive, it has also caused us to hear about more anxiety and concern from students and parents when assessments do come around. A common question we receive – “How can my child study for this upcoming test?” – is much more difficult to answer when we assess with IPAs. Another concern, primarily brought to us by parents, is around the idea of “rigor” and how our classes, which rarely if ever assign homework and do not necessarily have students making flashcards or drilling verb tenses, are shepherding students along the path to developing facility with the language. In both cases, we have found that having examples of student work on hand to show students and parents has been essential to allaying fears around study habits and rigor. Our emphasis, as mentioned elsewhere, is that if students are present and participating in the classroom regularly, and if we are doing our part as teachers to plan appropriate IPA tasks, the language will come with time and facility will develop with practice. Showing parents the work that their children have done with an unseen story or a creative writing task goes a long way to allaying concerns around rigor, and keeping journals of student work and incorporating reflection helps diminish student anxiety around assessment.

We have changed much about how we teach and lesson plan for our classes. There are many great resources online that fellow teachers have shared. We are grateful for the following resources: [Keith Toda’s Totally Comprehensible Latin](#), [Lance Piantaggini’s](#)

[blog](#), [John Piazza's blog](#), [Latin Best Practices: Comprehensible Input Resources](#), [Rachel Ash's and Miriam Patrick's Pomegranate Beginnings](#), [Maris Hawkins' blog](#), and [Ellie Arnold's Latin Toolbox](#). We also routinely look to the following Latin teaching Facebook pages: [Latin Best Practices: The Next Generation in Comprehensible Input](#) and [Teaching Latin for Acquisition](#). Apart from adopting *Lingua Latina Per Se Illustrata, Pars I: Familia Romana* in our Latin I and II classes, we have also begun incorporating Latin novellas and utilizing tiered readings of ancient authors in our upper-level classes. It is important that we lesson plan with intention and have our students doing activities that give them more input and allow them to practice producing the language in appropriate ways. We have chosen in our Latin classes to assess students formally on the following: Interpretive Reading, Interpersonal Writing, and Presentational Writing. One can see those analytic and rubric sheets provided in Appendices B and C.

Here is a list of IPA tasks with a sampling of class activities we do with students to providing students practice using the language:

**Interpretive Reading:**

- Students read a Latin text and answer various types of English comprehension questions (fill-in-the-blank; true or false; short answer) in English, while also citing the corresponding Latin

**Interpretive Listening:**

- Students listen to teacher-narrated Latin recordings on [EdPuzzle](#) with English comprehension questions embedded
- Students watch videos by Magister Craft on YouTube to highlight historical or cultural themes
- Students participate in MovieTalks led by the teacher which reinforce familiar vocabulary and to invite students to contribute when they feel comfortable

**Interpersonal Writing:**

- In small assigned groups students compose Latin responding to prompts given by the teacher using [Backchannel Chat](#)

**Interpersonal Speaking:**

- Students participate in informal discussions in class (e.g., [Discipulus Illustris](#))

**Presentational Writing**

- Students practice composing Latin during free/timed writes in class with occasional peer editing
- Students generate drawings and comic strips labeled in Latin (speech/

thought bubbles and captions), which can then be used as additional sources of input

It is worth noting that, while we have chosen not to assess students on their Interpretive Listening or Interpersonal Speaking, we still think it is worthwhile to provide students with as numerous opportunities to be exposed to Latin. Hearing and speaking Latin, in addition to the reading and writing which our IPA tasks assess, can also provide students with more input and practice with output.

## 5 - NEXT STEPS

After all of the work that has gone into developing, launching, and updating IPAs in our classes year by year, we have noted several successes and also some areas where we have identified improvements that we could make in the future.

Firstly, almost immediately upon implementing IPAs and the concomitant classroom changes, we noticed that student engagement improved, and their feedback reflected pride and satisfaction with how they were doing in Latin. All the students at our school complete the same course survey anonymously for each of their classes the Upper School. While the questions on the survey do not pertain specifically to Latin class or our assessments, students have provided feedback about how they are assessed on these surveys. After implementing IPAs in our Latin classes, we noticed the following positive trends in their feedback. In summation:

- Students comment on how completing IPA tasks has helped them see, in a more immediate and tangible way, how their proficiency in Latin is developing.
- Students feel that the in-class tasks directly connect to how they are assessed on IPA tasks.
- Students increasingly understand the importance of attending and actively participating in class.
- Students at all levels have shared feedback that being assessed with IPAs has made them feel less stressed around Latin as a class and more confident in their ability to succeed.

Overall, our student grades have slightly improved, which is indicative of us being more intentional regarding lesson planning and considering the activities we do with students in class to ensure that we are setting them up for success on any assessed tasks.

We have also noticed that there has been a dramatic reduction in the amount of concerned parent phone calls and emails regarding student grades and performance on assessments after we implemented IPAs. While some parents have noted that our new approach to teaching and assessing is different from their own experience learning a foreign language, when we show them their child's completed Interpretive Reading task or a sample of their child's writing from an Interpersonal or Presentational Writing task, they are pleasantly surprised by what their child is able to do with the language. After all, for the latter tasks that require Latin output, it is much more rigorous to produce Latin than it is to fill in declension or conjugation charts in isolation, for instance, and parents see the truth in that.

We should also note that we use the ACTFL Latin Interpretive Reading Assessment (ALIRA) as an external measurement of Interpretive Reading proficiency, and this year some of our students scored high enough to qualify for the [Global Seal of Biliteracy](#), much to the delight of our students, parents, administrators, and college counselors. We believe that the proficiency scores our students received this past year on the ALIRA are the most accurate they have ever been to our students' Interpretive Reading proficiency level and look forward to tracking our students' progress each year.

After reflecting as a department, we acknowledge that there are still ways we can do better. One area for improvement is how we should best handle students who need to take extended absences for unavoidable reasons. Since developing proficiency depends on classroom engagement and interaction, we need to explore ways to share similar opportunities for growth with students who cannot reliably be in class so said students do not fall inextricably behind. Another area for improvement that we have identified is to upgrade and enhance our rubrics for clarity and ease of use. They can be opaque and often unwieldy for our teachers to use. For some language levels, the rubrics have been inputted and integrated into the electronic gradebook of our school's learning management system (LMS). However, not all of them have been entered as of yet. In addition, our rubrics are potentially powerful tools, but it is not always clear that students are receiving valuable and immediate feedback from them. We want them to use the descriptions outlined on the rubric to reflect on their progress beyond the grade they received and want to encourage our students to think about this feedback more profoundly and how they can improve. We have considered creating a one-page, easy-to-use rubric that not only conveys to students what they can do and need to work on, but which also incorporates possible 'next steps', or stretch goals that students can aim at to further enhance their proficiency. This will

empower our students to use this feedback to continue to improve their reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills within the classes in our department.

Finally, and particularly apt for Latin, we have a goal of developing our students' Interpersonal Speaking skills so that conversations can be less teacher-directed and classroom-centered. In our mind, allowing the students to take more of a leadership role in their speaking to one another will not only encourage them to take more ownership of their learning but will also further develop their speaking proficiency and build community among Latin students. This can be challenging for students in the lower levels who need tons of input before they can be expected to start providing output, and we are sensitive to that fact.

In conclusion, it is our sincere hope that you the reader can benefit from reading our story and the changes we have made as a department. We realize that we are fortunate our school's administration trusts us and has worked with us to make these changes because they know we are striving for what is best for our students. Not all language teachers have the flexibility to make these changes, whatever the reason may be. Throughout this long process we have found that the hard work done has been worthwhile, and we are motivated to continue on our path. Perhaps what we have shared will inspire you to reflect upon what changes you should be making regarding how you assess students. We hope you will feel empowered to consider making changes that will enrich the student experience in your language classroom.

### WORKS CITED

Adair-Hauck, Bonnie, et al. *Implementing Integrated Performance Assessment*. American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 2015.

## APPENDIX A

### EXAMPLES OF LATIN IPA TASKS WITH PROMPTS

The following is a sampling of tasks and prompts that we gave to our students during the most recent school year. We have a diverse population of learners whose experience with the target language varies. Therefore, we crafted tasks that align closely with the readings and activities students have done in class. As one can imagine, there can be quite a difference in what our Latin I students can do as opposed to what our Latin IV students can do. We consider that when scoring students using the descriptors in our rubrics (see Appendix C).

#### Latin I

The Latin I IPA is administered near the end of the school year, in early May. By this time, we have read through Capitulum XI or XII in *Lingua Latina*. Below is an example of an IPA that was administered to Latin I students in 2019 and used a story from the *Colloquia Personarum*, an accompanying reader to *Lingua Latina*.

#### Latin I – INTERPRETIVE READING task: post-Capitulum XI

Iūlia et Syra in hortō ambulant cum Margarītā, cane Iūliae parvā et crassā. Sōl lūcet in caelō sine nūbibus. Iūlia laeta canit. Canis eam canere audit et caudam movet.

Ecce avis ante canem volat. Canis avem ante sē volāre videt et currit, sed avis iam procul ā cane est. Canis, quae avem capere vult neque potest, īrāta lātrat: “Baubau!”

Iūlia canem suam vocat: “Margarīta! Venī!” Canis cōnsistit et ad Iūliam, dominam suam, currit.

Syra: “Necesse nōn est canem vocāre, neque enim canis avēs capere potest.”

Iūlia: “Sed avēs canem timent.” Canis iam fessa iacet ad pedēs Iūliae. Syra canem crassam in herbā iacere videt eamque spīrāre audit.

Syra: “Canem tuam crassam nūlla avis timet.”

Iūlia: “Margarīta nōn est crassa!” Canis aspicit Iūliam et caudam movet.



Iūlia: “Sed cūr nōn canunt avēs? Quid timent?”

Syra: “Nōn canem fessam, sed avem feram timent.”

Iūlia: “Quam avem feram?”

Syra magnam avem quae suprā hortum volat digitō mōnstrat. “Ecce avis fera quae ā parvīs avibus timētur.” Iūlia caelum aspicit et magnam avem suprā sē volāre videt. Avīs magnīs ālīs sustinētur, neque Iūlia ālās movērī videt.

Iūlia: “Quae est illa avis?”

Syra: “Est aquila, quae cibum quaerit.”

Iūlia: “In caelō cibum reperīre nōn potest.”

Syra: “Nōn in caelō, sed in terrā cibum quaerit. Aquila enim bonōs oculōs habet et parva animālia procul vidēre potest. Aquila est avis fera, quae aliās avēs capit et est.”

Iūlia: “Avis improba est aquila!”

Syra: “Magna aquila etiam parvam puellam capere potest et ad nīdum suum portāre.”

Iūlia: “Quid? Mēne aquila portāre potest?”

Syra Iūliam aspicit: puella tam crassa est quam canis sua. Syra rīdet neque respondet. Iūlia eam rīdēre nōn videt, nam caelum aspicit neque iam aquilam videt.

Iūlia: “Iam abest aquila.”

Syra: “Est apud nīdum suum.”

Iūlia: “Ubi est nīdus aquilae?”

Syra: “Procul in monte est, quō nēmō potest ascendere. Puerī nīdum aquilae reperīre nōn pōssunt.”

Iūlia: “Sed aliōs nīdōs reperīre pōssunt. Ecce puerī quī nīdōs quaerunt in arboribus.” Iūlia Mārcum et Quīntum in umbrā inter arborēs errāre et nīdōs quaerere videt.

Iūlia et Syra in sole sunt. Syra vocat, “Venī in umbram, Iūlia!”

Iūlia canem, quae ad pedēs eius iacet, pede pulsat. “Age, curre, Margarita crassa!” Syra canem aspicit, et ridet. Etiam Iūlia ridet. Margarita ante Iūliam currit ad parvam arborem. Canis caudam movet et latrat, “Baubau!” Ecce! Avis perterrita ex arbore volat. Iūlia et Syra consistunt ante arborem, unde parvae vocēs audiuntur: “Pīpīpī, pīpīpī!”

Iūlia Syram interrogat, “Quid hoc est?”

Syra ramōs et folia arboris movet et inter ramōs parvum nīdum videt. Syra nīdum prope aspicit et respondet, “Ecce nīdus in quō quīnque pullī sunt. Aspice, Iūlia!”

Iūlia nīdum aspicit neque pullōs videt, quia nimis parva est. Iūlia, quae pullōs aspicere vult, imperat, “Impone mē in umerōs tuōs, Syra!”

Syra respondet, “Umerī meī te portāre nōn pōssunt.” Sed Iūlia iterum imperat, “Sustinē mē tantum!” Syra Iūliam ā terrā sustinet. Iam puella pullōs videt in nīdo. Pullī autem tacent neque iam pipiant. Iūlia clamat, “O, quam parvī sunt! Cur nōn pipiant neque sē movent?”

Syra respondet, “Quia perterritī sunt; tē enim vident.”

Sed Iūlia: “Pullī mē vidēre nōn pōssunt. Nōn enim oculōs aperiunt.”

Syra fessa puellam crassam in terrā ponit. Syra respondet, “Sed vocem tuam audiunt pullī – et mater pullōrum tē nōn solum audit, sed etiam videt. Audī: mater pipiat, quia ad nīdum suum venīre nōn audet.”

Auditur vox Marcī: “Venī, Quinte! In hāc arbore nīdus est.” Sed Syra imperat, “Discede ab arbore, Iūlia! Marcus alium nīdum videt, hunc nīdum reperīre nōn potest.” Iūlia et Syra cum cane ab arbore discedunt. Avis eās discedere videt et ad nīdum suum volat. Pullī, quī matrem suam venīre vident, rursus pipiant, “Pīpīpī!” Pullī cibum exspectant.

**I. Please give the Latin word or words that best convey the meaning of the English words below. Only use Latin from the story.**

1. Tail \_\_\_\_\_
2. Above \_\_\_\_\_
3. Finger \_\_\_\_\_
4. Wild/fierce \_\_\_\_\_
5. Large wings \_\_\_\_\_
6. From / out of \_\_\_\_\_
7. Order(s) \_\_\_\_\_
8. Leave / depart \_\_\_\_\_

**II. Please answer the following questions in English based on the story.**

1. Where is this story taking place and who is there?
2. Identify **two (2)** physical characteristics of Margarita.
3. Why does Margarita get angry and bark?
4. Why do the birds not fear Margarita?
5. Identify **two (2)** physical characteristics of the eagle.
6. What is the eagle doing when Syra and Iūlia see it?
7. Syra teases Iūlia a little about eagles. What does she say an eagle might do?
8. Does Syra actually think it could happen? Why or why not?

9. Why is there no danger of the boys, Marcus and Quintus, finding the eagle's nest?
10. What is the first clue that there is a nest in the tree near Iulia and Syra?
11. Why do the chicks stop singing? Be as specific as you can:
12. Where is the chicks' mother and what are the chicks waiting for?
13. Why is Syra tired by the end of the story?
14. Why do Syra and Iulia decide to leave this nest and go somewhere else?

**III. Please render the following phrases into the best English you can. Use context clues to assist you.**

1. *Syra magnam avem ... digitō mōnstrat.*

---

2. *Aquila ... parva animālia procul vidēre potest.*

---

3. *"Est apud nīdum suum."*

---

4. *Iūlia canem ... pede pulsat.*

---

5. *"Cur nōn pipiant neque sē movent?"*

---

**Latin I - INTERPERSONAL WRITING task: post-Capitulum XI**

In today's class you will show your Interpersonal Writing skills by responding to and discussing IN LATIN the following questions with your group. These questions pertain to the story you read in the Interpretive Reading:

- ***Qualis puella est Iulia? Estne bona an mala? Cur?***  
*(What sort of girl is Iulia? Is she good or bad? Why?)*
- ***Amatne Syra Iuliam? Cur an cur non? Da exempla ex fabula.***  
*(Does Syra love/care for Iulia? Why or why not? Give examples from the story.)*

**Latin I – PRESENTATIONAL WRITING task: post-Capitulum XI**

[Pastoral Landscape: The Roman Campagna, Claude Lorrain, licensed under Creative Commons 1.0, from the Metropolitan Museum of Art](#)

Look carefully at the picture above. Write a story about what is happening in the picture. Some things you might want to consider could be: Who are the characters? Where are they? How did they get here? What are they doing? How did this happen? What is going to happen next?

**Latin II**

Students ended the winter trimester by reading through Capitulum XVI in *Lingua Latina* and participated in class activities pertaining to that chapter. The following are the three IPA tasks which were administered to our 2019 Latin II classes:

**Latin II - INTERPRETIVE READING task: post-Capitulum XVI**

*Aeolus, god of the winds, sends a storm to attack the Trojan hero Aeneas' fleet.*

Aeolus\* est deus ventorum. Juno\*, regina deorum et hominum, ad Aeolum advenit. Juno Aeneam\* et Troianos\* nautas non amat. Ea navem Troianorum in mari mergere vult. Juno Aeolo imperat tempestatem facere. Itaque Aeolus, deus ventorum, altum montem pulsatur. Venti statim ex illo monte egrediuntur. Venti supra mare et terram flant. Mare turbidum fit. Venti a meridie et oriente flare incipiunt. Simul venti a septentrionibus et occidente flant.

Aeneas, heros Troianus, gubernator navis est. Is septentriones spectat et nubes atras procul supra mare oriri videt. Aeneas nautis inquit, "Non serenum est caelum. Ecce nubes atrae..."

Nautae perterriti sunt. Statim mare multo turbidum fit. Simul tempestas advenit cum tonitru et fulguribus. Nautae Neptunum invocant: "O Neptune! Serva nos!" Sed vox eorum vix auditur propter tonitrum. Quia nubes multae sunt, dies de oculis nautarum labitur. Atra nox mare complectitur.

Aeneas iam deum maris invocat: "Domine, serva nos! Tu non modo hominibus, sed etiam ventis et mari imperare potes! Iube mare tranquillum fieri! Serva nos!" Statim os eius aqua implet. Aeneas loqui conatur neque potest.

Neptunus Aeneam non audit. Magnus fluctus puppim et vela navis pulsatur. Aeneas hoc videns perterritus est. Is nautas fessos suos de nave labi et in

mare mergi videt. Multi nautae sub fluctibus eunt. Aeneas ipse pedibus stare non potest et quoque in aquam cadit.

Tum deus maris magnam tempestatem in mari esse videt. Erat iratus, quia Aeolus et Juno illam tempestatem faciunt. Neptunus submersas naves Troianorum aspiciens, deus mare tranquillum iterum facit. Aeneas et pauci nautae sunt fessi sed Libyam adeunt.

\*Aeolus, Aeoli, m.

\*Juno, Junonis, f.

\*Aeneas, Aeneae, m.

\*Troianus, -a, -um

Write down the Latin word that best expresses the meaning of each of the following English words:

1. sailors \_\_\_\_\_
2. blow \_\_\_\_\_
3. cloud \_\_\_\_\_
4. fall \_\_\_\_\_
5. command \_\_\_\_\_

True or False?

- Read each sentence and tell whether it is True or False.
- If the sentence is False, correct the English sentence to be True.
- **For each, make sure to cite the Latin.**

6. Juno likes Aeneas and the Trojans.

True or False?    Correction to make it True, if necessary    Latin citation

\_\_\_\_\_



7. The sailors are the ones who first notice the storm.

True or False?    Correction to make it True, if necessary    Latin citation

\_\_\_\_\_

8. All of the sailors survive the storm.

True or False?    Correction to make it True, if necessary    Latin citation

\_\_\_\_\_

Answer the following questions in English:

9. What does Juno order Aeolus to do? Cite the Latin.

10. Why does Aeolus beat the mountain? Cite the Latin.

11. In the reading, from what direction(s) do the winds blow? Cite the Latin.

12. Who is captain of the ship? Cite the Latin.

13. When Aeneas invokes Neptune, what does he say Neptune is able to command? Cite the Latin.

14. During the storm, describe what the sea looked like. Make sure to cite the corresponding Latin.

15. Does Neptune seem concerned about Aeneas and his ship? Explain why or why not and make sure to cite the corresponding Latin.

**Latin II - INTERPERSONAL WRITING task: post-Capitulum XVI**

In today's class you will show your Interpersonal Writing skills by responding to and discussing IN LATIN the following questions with your group. These questions pertain to what you read in *Capitulum XVI*:

- **Medus and Lydia are alive at the end of this chapter. Does this make you happy, sad, angry, etc? Why?**  
(*Medus et Lydia vivi sunt ad finem. Esne tu laetus/a, tristis, iratus/a, et cetera? Cur?*)
- **To what place do you want to take a trip? Why?**  
(*Quo iter facere vis? Cur?*)

**Latin II - PRESENTATIONAL WRITING task: post-Capitulum XVI**

For Presentational Writing, your goal is to accurately convey content and meaning. Therefore, make sure your writing is as grammatically correct as possible.

**For today's Presentational Writing, please do the following Latine:**

- **Write an alternate ending to this chapter.** (Scribe alterum finem capitulo.)

If you get stuck trying to remember a particular vocabulary word, try to circumlocute (talk around) or describe what you mean.

### Latin III

By the end of the winter trimester students had finished reading Rachel Ash's Latin novella *Camilla*. For their IPA, students were presented with an adapted version of the story of the heroine Atalanta, taken loosely from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and heavily adapted to roughly mimic the style of the novella *Camilla*.

### Latin III - INTERPRETIVE READING task: the story of Atalanta

#### Atalanta

Fortasse audivistis dē virgine quae celerius quam omnēs virī currere poterat? Illa fabula rumor nōn est – ego sum ista virgo. Nomen mihi est Atalanta, et haec fabula est mihi.

Vigintī annōs nata sum, sed familiam nōn habeo. Cur nōn? Pater mē nōn amāvit. Pater meus vir pessimus erat, et mē nōn amāvit quia tantum filiōs, nōn filiās, cupiēbat. Sed ego filia eram, et ille mē nōn amāvit. Ergo (miserabile dictu!) pater – pater meus – mē ipsam, parvam et novam infantem, in silvīs reliquit! In summō monte pater mē reliquit ut ego moriar, quia filius nōn fueram.

Sed nōn mortua sum. Ursa mē invēnit et curāvit. Habitābam cum ursā et eius familiā, et surgēbam. Cum puella eram, poteram animalia varia sequī et interficere. Poteram hastam iacere et arcum spiculaque gerere. Vestēs meae erant pellēs animalium quae ego ipsa interfēcī. Amicī meī erant ursae et cervī et tigrēs et leonēs. Cum adulescens eram, ego feminam pulcherrimam et fortissimam spectāvī. Haec femina ad mē advēnit et dixit, “Salvē, Atalanta. Sum Diana, dea venationis et lunae. Ego tē spectābam et tē admirābar. Tu mēcum venīre et mē servīre potes. Sed tu debes esse semper virgo. Placetne tibi?”

Laetissima respondī, “Certē!” Ego virōs nōn amō. Ego coniunx esse nolō. Ego maritum habēre nolō. Virī malī et stultī sunt. In silvīs cum Dianā semper remanēre volō. Per montēs et vallēs et silvās et flumina cum animalibus, amicīs meīs, currere volō.

Nunc virgo sum. Pulcherrima sum. Fortissima sum. De mē multī audivērunt. Ego sum notissima et fama mea ad caelum surgit. Multī virī ad mē adveniunt ut mē in matrimonium ducant. Fufae! Ego eōs nōn cupiō. Sed virī ā mē nōn abeunt! Ergo consilium capiō. Si vir celerior mē est, ille mē in matrimonium ducere potest. Sed.....si ego eum vincō, ille ā mē interficitur! Hahahae! Multa capita virōrum, in hastīs posita,

ante domum meam stant, quia ego celerior omnibus sum! Nemo mē vincere potest!!

### Meleager

Paratus sum. Ego paratus et confidens sum. Atalanta erit mea coniunx!

Atalanta...tam pulchra, tam ferox, tam celer...ego nōn sum celerior quam illa. Nemo celerior illā est. Sed hodiē victor erō!

Ut primum Atalantam spectāvī, eam ipsam amāvī et desiderāvī. Ego dē illā audīvī – quis nōn audīvit dē Atalantā? Celerior hastā...celerior spiculō...celerior ventō ipsō! Quomodō potest vir eam vincere? Ecce! Vir Atalantam vincere nōn potest, sed Atalanta deōs vincere nōn potest!

Ego iterum iterumque precābar et orābam ad Venerem, deam amoris, “O Venus, dea amoris et pulchritudinis, audī mē et adiuvā mē! Si Atalanta mea coniunx esse potest, ego tibi magnum et ornatum templum dedicābō! Adiuvā mē, o dea potentissima!”

Ego precatus sum et Venus mē audīvit. Ecce! Tria mala aurea ante meōs oculōs apparuerunt. Consilium capiō...

### Atalanta

Hic vir Meleager mē vincere nōn potest. Sed ille currere vult, ergo curramus...et post cursum, ego eum interficiam! Hahahae!

Currimus. Ille celer est, sed ego celerior. Nemo est celerior mē.

Quid? Ille vir aliquid iacit. Quid iacit Meleager? Meherculē! Est malum aureum! Cur malum aureum ille iacit? Nesciō.....sed illud malum est pulchrum. Id volō. Id cupiō. Ego malum aureum capiō, et tum ego vincam et Meleagrum interficiam.

Quid?? Ego currebam ante eum et Meleager alium malum aureum iacit! Hoc malum est pulchrius quam primum. Anxia sum, sed illud malum cupiō. Debeō currere quam celerrimē, sed nemo est celerior mē!

QUID??? Tertium malum aureum ā Meleagrō iacitur! Et hoc tertium malum est pulcherrimum! Ecce...malum lucet sicut sol! Nōn debeō illud malum sequī...necesse est mihi vincere et Meleagrum interficere...sed malum est pulchrum...pulcherrimum...

MINIME! MELEAGER VICTOR EST! Hic vir mē vicit. Ego victa sum et nunc debeō in matrimonium ducī. Sed...fortasse errābam. Fortasse hic vir bonus est. Ille est intelligens...et pulcher...et celer...nōn celerior quam ego! Sed fortasse ego illum amāre possim...

Respond to the following questions **in English** unless the question specifically asks you to write Latin.

1. Why does Atalanta not want a husband?
2. Under what conditions would Atalanta marry a man?
3. How does Meleager defeat Atalanta?
4. Why does Atalanta lose to Meleager?
5. Choose an adjective (or a short phrase) to describe Atalanta and one to describe Meleager. Explain why you chose each, using evidence from the text. You do NOT have to quote the Latin, just explain in English.

**Latin III - INTERPERSONAL WRITING task: the story of Atalanta**

In today's class you will show your Interpersonal Writing skills by responding to and discussing IN LATIN the following questions with your group. These questions pertain to what you read in *Perseus et Medusa*:

- **Tuā opinione, estne aequum ut Atalanta viros tam vehementer spernat? Cur an cur non?** *In your opinion, is it fair/reasonable that Atalanta so fiercely dislikes men? Why or why not?*
- **Putasne Dianam futuram esse iratam ut Meleager Atalantam in matrimonium ducat? Cur an cur non?** *Do you think that Diana will be angry that Meleager is going to marry Atalanta? Why or why not?*
- **Si tu deum/deam servire debeas, quem deum/am servias et cur? Quid ā deō/ā exspectas et quid deō/deae das?** *If you had to serve a god/goddess, which god/dess would you serve and why? What would you expect from the god/dess and what would you offer the god/dess?*

**Latin III - PRESENTATIONAL WRITING task: the story of Atalanta**

For this Presentational Writing task, please continue the story of Atalanta and Meleager. You may choose to set your story immediately after the events of the race that you read about, or you may choose to start your story at some later point in time. What has happened to Atalanta and Meleager after the events of the race? What is their life like now, and how have they changed (if at all) from who they were before?

**Latin IV**

In Latin IV we finished the 2018-19 year by reading Andrew Olimpi's *Perseus et Medusa* novella, which are reflected in the IPA tasks shown below which were given to our students at the end of the spring trimester. The Interpretive Reading passage uses the Latin names of students in the Latin IV class to make the story more compelling.

**Latin IV - INTERPRETIVE READING task: post-*Perseus et Medusa* novella**

Est Dies Veneris, et post scholam Maximus domum suum redire vult. Maximus in Virginia habitat. Amicus Maximi est Stolo. Maximus Stolinem ad domum suam invitat. Stolo consentit, et duo pueri ad Flumen Potomacum ambulare incipiunt.

Maximus ducit, et Stolo sequitur. Cum duo pueri prope Flumen Potomacum sunt, subito Stolo clamat, "Maxime, aliquid in flumine video! Ecce - navis est. Aliquis navem agit, et lente adit."

Navis antiqua ad eos adit. Quidam vir navem agit, pueros spectans et non subridens. Vir pueris non placet.

Vir manum extendit et inquit, "Duos nummos." Maximus et Stolo valde confusi sunt. Maximus respondet, "Quid?"

Vir iterum inquit, "Duos nummos. Sum Praetextatus. Vos trans flumen ferre possum. Duos nummos volo. Duos pueros, duos nummos!"

Maximus intelligit et inquit, "Ecce, duos nummos!" Maximus manum extendit. Ecce - nummi sunt in manu eius. Maximus pecuniam habet! Tres dies abhinc soror eius (ei nomen est Ella) Maximo pecuniam dedit. Ella

soror optima est!

Praetextatus nummos accipit, eos magna cum cura inspiciens. Tandem, vir satisfactus est, et nummi in sacculo Praetextati ponuntur.

Praetextatus inquit, “Multas gratias vobis ago, pueri. Ascendite in navem meam.” Maximus et Stolo in navem ascendunt. Lente navis per Flumen Potomacum movet. Stantes in navi Maximus et Stolo ad Virginiam lente iter faciunt.

Praetextatus rogat, “O pueri, cur vos ad Virginiam hodie adeunt? Non multi homines ad Virginiam adire volunt!”

Stolo ridet, sed Maximus iratus respondet, “In Virginia cum familia habito! Virginia est optima!”

Vir putat de quo Maximus dixerit, navem per flumen ad Virginiam agens. Tandem navis tangit terram Virginiae. Praetextatus inquit, “Esne tu tristis, puer? Omnes sciunt tristes homines in Virginia habitare.”

Maximus adhuc iratus e nave exiens respondet, “Minime, tristis non sum, Praetextate!”

“Eris,” Praetextatus inquit.

Stolo e nave exit et nunc valde anxius est. Stolo Maximum lente sequitur.

I. Write down the Latin word that best expresses the meaning of each of the following English words:

1. coins \_\_\_\_\_
2. follows \_\_\_\_\_
3. ship \_\_\_\_\_
4. slowly \_\_\_\_\_
5. driving/steering \_\_\_\_\_

II. Answer the following questions in English:

6. What does Maximus want to do after school? Be as detailed as possible. Cite the Latin.
7. In their friendship, who seems to be more in charge: Maximus or Stolo? Explain your reasoning. Cite the Latin.
8. What does Praetextatus demand? Cite the Latin.
9. What conflict arises between Maximus and Praetextatus? Explain. Cite the Latin.
10. How does Stolo feel at the end of the story? Why do you think he feels that way? Cite the Latin.

**Latin IV - INTERPERSONAL WRITING task: post-*Perseus et Medusa* novella**

In today's class you will show your Interpersonal Writing skills by responding to and discussing IN LATIN the following questions with your group. These questions pertain to what you read in *Perseus et Medusa*:

- **Grandpa Acrisius was killed by Perseus at the end of the story. Did you like Acrisius' death? Why or why not?**  
(*Avus Acrisius interfectus est a Perseo ad finem fabulae. Placetne tibi mors Acrisii? Cur an cur non?*)
- **Who was your favorite character and why?**  
(*Quae persona tibi placet? Cur?*)



**Latin IV - PRESENTATIONAL WRITING task: post-*Perseus et Medusa* novella**

For Presentational Writing, your goal is to accurately convey content and meaning. Therefore, make sure your writing is as grammatically correct as possible.

If you get stuck trying to remember a particular vocabulary word, try to circumlocute (talk around) or describe what you mean.

- **Imagine that you are writing a third *Perseus* book. Write an explanation of what would happen in that third book. Feel free to use humor, if you would like.**

**APPENDIX B****IPA TASK ANALYTIC SHEETS**

These are the analytic sheets our Latin teachers use for scoring student performance on each task, as well as the grade curve. A more detailed breakdown of each category with accompanying descriptions is included on the IPA rubric sheets in Appendix C.

**INTERPRETIVE READING TASK - Analytic sheets for Latin I-IV**

<b>Word Recognition</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Grammar Recognition</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Main Idea Detection</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Supporting Detail Detection</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Making Inferences</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ / 20

Score	Percent	Rating	Score	Percent	Rating
20	100	EE	8	68.8	DNME
19.5	98.7	EE	7.5	67.5	DNME
19	97.4	EE	7	66.2	DNME
18.5	96.1	EE	6.5	64.9	DNME
18	94.8	EE	6	63.6	DNME
17.5	93.5	EE	5.5	62.3	DNME
17	92.2	EE	5	61	DNME
16.5	90.9	EE	4.5	59.7	DNME
16	89.6	ME	4	58.4	DNME
15.5	88.3	ME	3.5	57.1	DNME
15	87	ME	3	55.8	DNME
14.5	85.7	ME	2.5	54.5	DNME
14	84.4	ME	2	53.2	DNME
13.5	83.1	ME	1.5	51.9	DNME
13	81.8	ME	1	50.6	DNME
12.5	80.5	ME	0.5	49.3	DNME
12	79.2	AME			
11.5	77.9	AME			
11	76.6	AME			
10.5	75.3	AME			
10	74	AME			
9.5	72.7	AME			
9	71.4	AME			
8.5	70.1	AME			

**EE = Exceeds Expectations**

**ME = Meets Expectations**

**AME = Almost Meets Expectations**

**DNME = Does Not Meet Expectations**

**Grade: \_\_\_\_\_**

Please note that we use the same Interpretive Reading analytic sheet for all levels of Latin. The difference between levels is the text used for tasks at each level. See Appendix A for examples.

**INTERPERSONAL WRITING TASK****Analytic sheet for Latin I-IV**

<b>Task Completion</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Comprehensibility</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Quality of Interaction</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Vocabulary</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Language Control</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ / 20

Score	Percent	Rating	Score	Percent	Rating
20	100	EE	8	68.8	DNME
19.5	98.7	EE	7.5	67.5	DNME
19	97.4	EE	7	66.2	DNME
18.5	96.1	EE	6.5	64.9	DNME
18	94.8	EE	6	63.6	DNME
17.5	93.5	EE	5.5	62.3	DNME
17	92.2	EE	5	61	DNME
16.5	90.9	EE	4.5	59.7	DNME
16	89.6	ME	4	58.4	DNME
15.5	88.3	ME	3.5	57.1	DNME
15	87	ME	3	55.8	DNME
14.5	85.7	ME	2.5	54.5	DNME
14	84.4	ME	2	53.2	DNME
13.5	83.1	ME	1.5	51.9	DNME
13	81.8	ME	1	50.6	DNME
12.5	80.5	ME	0.5	49.3	DNME
12	79.2	AME			
11.5	77.9	AME			
11	76.6	AME			
10.5	75.3	AME			
10	74	AME			
9.5	72.7	AME			
9	71.4	AME			
8.5	70.1	AME			

**EE = Exceeds Expectations**

**ME = Meets Expectations**

**AME = Almost Meets Expectations**

**DNME = Does Not Meet Expectations**

**Grade: \_\_\_\_\_**

**PRESENTATIONAL WRITING TASK****Analytic sheet for Latin I-IV**

<b>Task Completion</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Comprehensibility</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Level of Discourse</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Vocabulary</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Language Control</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>4</b>

Score: \_\_\_\_\_ / 20

Score	Percent	Rating	Score	Percent	Rating
20	100	EE	8	68.8	DNME
19.5	98.7	EE	7.5	67.5	DNME
19	97.4	EE	7	66.2	DNME
18.5	96.1	EE	6.5	64.9	DNME
18	94.8	EE	6	63.6	DNME
17.5	93.5	EE	5.5	62.3	DNME
17	92.2	EE	5	61	DNME
16.5	90.9	EE	4.5	59.7	DNME
16	89.6	ME	4	58.4	DNME
15.5	88.3	ME	3.5	57.1	DNME
15	87	ME	3	55.8	DNME
14.5	85.7	ME	2.5	54.5	DNME
14	84.4	ME	2	53.2	DNME
13.5	83.1	ME	1.5	51.9	DNME
13	81.8	ME	1	50.6	DNME
12.5	80.5	ME	0.5	49.3	DNME
12	79.2	AME			
11.5	77.9	AME			
11	76.6	AME			
10.5	75.3	AME			
10	74	AME			
9.5	72.7	AME			
9	71.4	AME			
8.5	70.1	AME			

**EE = Exceeds Expectations**

**ME = Meets Expectations**

**AME = Almost Meets Expectations**

**DNME = Does Not Meet Expectations**

**Grade: \_\_\_\_\_**

## APPENDIX C

### IPA TASK RUBRIC SHEETS

These IPA tasks rubric sheets provide more student performance detail than the analytic sheets in Appendix B.

#### **Latin I-IV – INTERPRETIVE READING Task Rubric**

##### Word Recognition

1. Identifies a few key words appropriately within the context of the text
2. Identifies half of key words appropriately within the context of the text
3. Identifies majority of key words appropriately within context of the text
4. Identifies all key words appropriately within context of the text

##### Grammar Recognition

1. Identifies a few grammar concepts appropriately within the context of the text
2. Identifies half of grammar concepts appropriately within the context of the text
3. Identifies majority of grammar concepts appropriately within context of the text
4. Identifies nearly all or all grammar concepts appropriately within context of the text

##### Main Idea Detection

1. May identify some ideas from the text but they do not represent the main idea(s)
2. Identifies some part of the main idea(s) of the text
3. Identifies key parts of the main idea(s) of the text but misses some elements
4. Identifies the complete main idea(s) of the text

##### Supporting Detail Detection

1. Identifies a few supporting details in the text but may be unable to provide information from the text to explain these details
2. Identifies some supporting details in the text and may provide limited information from the text to explain these details. Or identifies the



majority of supporting details but is unable to provide information from the text to explain these details.

3. Identifies the majority of supporting details in the text and provides information from the text to explain some of these details.
4. Identifies all supporting details in the text and accurately provides information from the text to explain these details.

#### Guessing Meaning From Context and Making Inferences (Reading ‘between the lines’)

1. Inferences of meaning of unfamiliar words and phrases are largely inaccurate or lacking.  
Inferences and interpretations of the text’s meaning are largely incomplete and/or not plausible.
2. Infers meaning of unfamiliar words or phrases in the text. Most of the inferences are plausible although many are not accurate. Makes a few plausible inferences regarding the text’s meaning.
3. Infers meaning of unfamiliar words or phrases in the text. Most of the inferences are plausible although some may not be accurate. Infers and interprets the text’s meaning in a partially complete and/or partially plausible manner.
4. Infers meaning of unfamiliar words or phrases in the text. Inferences are accurate. Infers and interprets the text’s meaning in a highly plausible manner.

#### **Latin I-IV – INTERPERSONAL WRITING Task Rubric**

##### Task Completion

1. Content is minimal and/or frequently inappropriate; ideas are repetitive and/or irrelevant
  - Content may be unrelated to the task
2. Content somewhat adequate and mostly appropriate; ideas expressed with very little elaboration or detail
  - Content is relevant but lacks appropriate detail
3. Content adequate and appropriate; ideas developed with some elaboration and detail
  - Content has sufficient information or detail based on learned material
4. Content rich; ideas developed with elaboration and detail
  - Content includes much information related to the task

### Comprehensibility

1. Text barely comprehensible
  - Text is almost impossible to understand, even for a sympathetic reader
  - Errors of vocabulary, grammar, and/or spelling may be impossible to decipher
  - A sympathetic reader is required to “figure out” what the student is trying to say
- . Text somewhat comprehensible, requiring interpretation on the part of the reader
  - A sympathetic reader should be able to “figure out” parts of the text
  - Some parts of the text may be barely understandable, with frequent or significant errors that impede comprehensibility
- . Text comprehensible, requiring minimal interpretation on the part of the reader
  - A reader may have to pause briefly in order to understand the text fully
  - Ideas should flow and show organization
- . Text readily comprehensible, requiring no interpretation on the part of the reader
  - A reader should be able to understand all of the text with very brief pauses
  - Text should flow in such a way that the reader and readily understand it

### Quality of Interaction

1. Minimal engagement in the interaction; little ability to sustain the conversation
  - Interaction may be disjointed
  - Student does not comprehend the message and/or is unable to ask for clarification
  - Student gives minimal responses
  - Student rarely elicits further information
- . Some engagement in the interaction; some ability to sustain the conversation
  - Interaction may be somewhat disjointed
  - Student mostly comprehends the message and/or is able to ask for

- clarification
  - Student responds adequately
  - Student occasionally elicits further information
- . Consistent engagement in the interaction; ability to sustain the conversation
  - Interaction flows naturally most of the time
  - Student comprehends the message
  - Student gives adequate responses
  - Student elicits further information
- . Consistent engagement in the interaction; ability to sustain and advance the conversation
  - Interaction flows naturally
  - Student readily comprehends the message
  - Student gives elaborate responses
  - Student elicits further information

### Vocabulary

1. Inadequate and/or inaccurate use of vocabulary
  - Student uses a limited variety of vocabulary
  - Student may frequently repeat words or expressions
  - Vocabulary may be used inappropriately or out of context
  - Response may include very few words
- . Somewhat inadequate and/or inaccurate use of vocabulary and too basic for this level
  - Student uses appropriate but basic vocabulary
  - Some vocabulary may be used inappropriately
  - Response may lack quantity of descriptive words
  - Some attempts may be made to include less commonly used vocabulary
- . Adequate and accurate use of vocabulary for this level
  - Student uses varied and generally appropriate vocabulary
  - Most vocabulary is used accurately and appropriately
  - Attempts are made to include less commonly used vocabulary
- . Elaborate use of vocabulary with some idiomatic expressions
  - Student accurately uses varied and appropriate vocabulary and idiomatic language
  - Frequent attempts are made to include less commonly used vocabulary

### Language Control

1. Little or no control of grammar, syntax, and usage
  - Basic language structures are used correctly approximately half of the time
- Limited control of grammar, syntax, and usage
  - Basic language structures are used correctly about three quarters of the time
- Some control of grammar, syntax, and usage
  - Basic language structures are used correctly most of the time, not all of the time
- General control of grammar, syntax, and usage
  - Basic language structures are used correctly most of the time, not all of the time, and advanced language structures are used with some success

### **Latin I-IV – PRESENTATIONAL WRITING Task Rubric**

#### Task Completion

*Task Completion is a big picture domain, which reflects the communication of the message. Consequently, it is affected by:*

- Level of Discourse – minimal sophistication may inhibit communication
- Vocabulary – inadequate and/or inaccurate vocabulary may produce undeveloped content
- Language Control – inadequate and/or inaccurate use of basic language structures may produce undeveloped content

Each rating for this domain has particular characteristics:

- 1 Minimal completion of the task and/or content undeveloped
  - Response is mostly relevant but lacks appropriate details
  - A required portion of the task may be missing
  - Response is underdeveloped
- 2 Partial completion of the task; ideas somewhat developed
  - Response is relevant and some ideas are developed with appropriate details

- A minor portion of the task may be missing
  - Response shows minimal organization and cohesion
- 3 Completion of the task; ideas adequately developed
- Response directly relates to the task as given
  - Response has minimal information or detail based on learned material
  - Response shows some organization and cohesion
  - Response illustrates some originality and details
- 4 Superior completion of the task; ideas well developed and well organized
- Response includes much information related to the task
  - Response has sufficient information or detail based on learned material
  - Response shows organization and cohesion
  - Response illustrates originality, details and/or an unexpected feature that captures interest and attention

### Comprehensibility

*The Comprehensibility domain covers the big picture and measures the degree to which the sympathetic reader needs to interpret the student's response. It is affected by:*

- Level of Discourse – the use of appropriate cohesive devices facilitates comprehensibility
- Vocabulary – inaccurate use of vocabulary and spelling which requires interpretation hinders comprehension
- Language Control – errors in basic language structures may hinder comprehensibility when they require interpretation

Each rating for this domain has particular characteristics:

- 1 Text barely comprehensible
- Text is almost impossible to understand, even by a sympathetic reader
  - Errors in vocabulary, grammar and/or spelling may be impossible to decipher

- Text requires reader to “figure out” what the student is trying to say
- 2 Text somewhat comprehensible, requiring interpretation on the part of the reader
- A sympathetic reader should be able to “figure out” parts of the text
  - Multiple errors in vocabulary, grammar, and/or spelling hinder comprehension
  - Some parts of the text may still be incomprehensible
- 3 Text comprehensible, requiring minimal interpretation on the part of the reader
- A sympathetic reader may have the pause briefly in order to understand the text fully
  - Some errors in vocabulary, grammar, and/or spelling may hinder comprehension
  - Ideas should flow and show some organization
- 4 Text readily comprehensible, requiring no interpretation on the part of the reader
- A sympathetic reader should be able to understand all of the text with very brief pauses
  - Few errors in vocabulary, grammar, and/or spelling do not hinder comprehension
  - Text should flow in such a way that the reader can readily understand it

**\*\*NOTA BENE:**

- Short responses cannot receive a score higher than a 3 because they lack sufficient evidence

Level of Discourse

*This domain measures the degree of linguistic sophistication used to communicate ideas (not what is said, but how it is said). Students are creating with the language using a variety of discrete sentences.*

Each rating for this domain has particular characteristics:

- 1 Sentences are disjointed and/or repetitive; little cohesive vocabulary
  - Sentences have no variety of vocabulary
  - Sentences are disconnected and show no relation to each other
- 2 Variety of discrete sentences; some cohesive vocabulary
  - Sentences have a limited variety of vocabulary
  - Sentences are somewhat disconnected or show little relation to each other; few to no cohesive devices used
- 3 Discourse of satisfactory length; variety of vocabulary
  - Sentences have adequate variety of vocabulary
  - Sentences are generally connected and/or show relation to each other; few cohesive devices used
- 4 Discourse of appropriate length; wide variety of vocabulary
  - Sentences have a wide variety of vocabulary
  - Sentences are ordered logically; some cohesive devices used

### Vocabulary

*Vocabulary reflects the accuracy, variety, and quantity of the language produced. Since this is a summative assessment, students should incorporate vocabulary learned previously. If students choose simplified vocabulary in an attempt to avoid errors, the result is often an accurate but inadequate use of vocabulary. Errors in spelling not related to the language structures (i.e. not verb endings, adjective agreement, etc.) will be considered vocabulary errors.*

Each rating for this domain has particular characteristics:

- 1 Inadequate and/or inaccurate use of vocabulary
  - Response lacks variety of vocabulary
  - Students may frequently repeat words or expressions
  - Vocabulary may be used inappropriately or out of context
  - Response may include insufficient words

- 2      Somewhat inadequate and/or inaccurate use of vocabulary and too basic for this level
  - Students use minimal variety of vocabulary
  - Some vocabulary may be used inappropriately
  - Response may lack quantity of descriptive words
  - Some attempts may be made to include less commonly used vocabulary
- 3      Adequate and accurate use of vocabulary for this level
  - Students use a variety of vocabulary
  - Most vocabulary is used accurately and appropriately
  - Attempts are made to use less commonly used vocabulary
- 4      Rich use of vocabulary, which may include some idiomatic expressions
  - Students accurately use a rich variety of vocabulary and some idiomatic expressions
  - Frequent attempts are made to include less commonly used vocabulary

#### Language Control

*Language Control measures the use and accuracy of basic and advanced language structures. Since this is a summative assessment, students are asked to demonstrate the skills acquired over their whole language experience. Composition of verbs in various tenses may be appropriate, depending on the level. Errors in spelling due to a lack of control of language structures (i.e. verb endings, adjective agreement, etc.) will be considered errors in language control.*

Each rating for this domain has particular characteristics:

- 1      Emerging use of basic language structures
  - Basic language structures are used correctly less than half of the time
- 2      Emerging control of basic language structures
  - Basic language structures are used correctly about half of the time



- 3 Control of basic language structures
  - Basic language structures are used correctly most of the time
- 4 Control of basic language structures with use of some advanced language structures
  - Basic and advanced language structures are used correctly mostly, if not all, of the time



## Visualizing Vocabulary: Student-Driven Visual Vocabularies<sup>1</sup>

CHRISTOPHER BUNGARD  
BUTLER UNIVERSITY

### ABSTRACT

This article explores the use of visual vocabularies created by students on Padlet as a tool for enhancing students' engagement with Greek and Latin vocabulary. Given that vocabulary may be undervalued by instructors in favor of more complicated grammatical concepts, this article claims the necessary focus that instructors should put on vocabulary exercises. Informed by research in cognitive psychology on dual coding (i.e., encoding information in memory both visually and lexically), this article also argues that instructors can enhance student retention of Greek and Latin vocabulary through the use of visually rich, student-driven visual vocabularies. By providing students with vocabulary lists of frequently used Greek or Latin words and asking students to find images that illustrate the meaning of those words, instructors enliven the learning process for students, helping students to make meaningful connections with these words in the target language. Using visual vocabularies, instructors help students move towards a greater level of language fluency, processing lexical entries more in terms of concepts and images.

As a child, I remember very vividly flipping through Richard Scarry's *Best Word Book Ever*. As an emergent reader, this book helped me decode the textual squiggles into meaningful words, and my commitment to finding Gold Bug on each of the visually rich pages kept me immersed in this subtle interplay between words as lexical items and representative of concepts.<sup>2</sup> By "meaningful" here, I mean both the simple sense of what the letters represent in the real world, but also a sense of the word as it relates to a real, lived experience, i.e., a word that I might have wanted to use in expressing myself through writing. Herein lies one of the key challenges for us as instructors in encouraging our students to take the study of Latin or Greek vocabulary as seriously as they should – the need to convince students of the relevance of these words

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank members of the Ergastulum who read early versions of this article and provided tremendous feedback. I would also like to thank the anonymous reviewers from TCL who pointed me to new platforms to explore for the creation of visual vocabularies, and finally, I would like to thank the members of the Indiana Classical Conference. They provided feedback along the way for the assignment in response to two presentations at their annual meetings.

<sup>2</sup> Books like Brown's *Goodnight, Moon* can achieve a similar effect where emergent readers can point to the graphic depictions of the keyword highlighted on each page.

for real communication. When delivering new words to students, we generally provide students with a simple listing of words in the target language across from their English meanings. While this provides an ample tool for decoding the lexical meaning of these words, they may potentially be less meaningful because they lack the rich visualization we experience when thinking about these same words in our native language.

While the approach outlined in this article can work at whatever level of instruction, I am particularly interested here in vocabulary instruction at the intermediate and advanced levels, where instruction shifts more and more toward reading selections of continuous text. With example sentences that are common in introductory texts, all the needed information is neatly contained in a small space, and students can simply discard that information when moving on to the next, unrelated sentence that illustrates the same key grammatical concept. With continuous text, students are trying to follow a narrative. They need to pull out key bits of information from one sentence and carry that forward in order to think about the larger point that the author is trying to make. I have found that students get so focused on looking up each word that they jettison the information provided by endings, making up a meaning for the sentence based on the definitions of the words that they have looked up. The bandwidth for thinking about Latin gets taken up by vocabulary, leaving little energy for thinking about the way that authors create meaningful expressions.<sup>3</sup> As a result, they are not well positioned to think about the key information from the first sentence that they need to carry forward as the thought progresses. If students know their vocabulary well, they do not need to devote working memory space towards thinking about the meaning of those words.<sup>4</sup> They will be in a better position to think about the key information being presented in a sentence and, by extension, be better able to follow a continuous

---

<sup>3</sup> Cognitive psychologists debate how much information can be retained in working memory. Cowan and his colleagues (see Cowan 2010 for a review) have shown that humans can typically retain four items at most, but others (see Jonides et al. 2008 particularly) suggest that we can only focus on one item at a time. Miller (2011) suggests that instructors really need to think about the nature of the information and the kind of interaction it requires of learners in order to assess students' cognitive capacity adequately. From a comprehensible input standpoint, Nation (2001) suggests that "lower vocabulary size means that: there are more words to guess; there is less comprehensible context to support the guesses and learners bring less background knowledge to the texts they read." (248)

<sup>4</sup> See Martin and He (2004) and Potter and Lombardi (1990) in particular.

narrative.<sup>5</sup> Utilizing engaging visuals as part of the vocabulary learning process provides students with a more enriching learning experience that also has positive impacts on vocabulary retention.<sup>6</sup>

To this end, I have made use of [Padlet](#) to create a space where students can create engaging visual vocabularies and subsequently think about Greek and Latin vocabulary in more meaningful and stimulating ways.<sup>7</sup> Through a more vibrant community of learners, my students have shown signs of greater interest in studying vocabulary as a truly essential part of improving their language abilities. The study of vocabulary has transformed from something I largely left for students to do outside of class to a vital part of our work in class.

### **POWER OF THE IMAGE: STUDIES ON VISUAL MEMORY AND PROCESSING**

While the transition from the beginning to intermediate level is a perennial point of tension for Greek and Latin teachers, a significant part of the problem, from my

---

5 Researchers in second-language learning have highlighted the great importance of vocabulary acquisition. Muccigrosso, Coady, and Huckin's (1997) volume of review articles provides a useful starting point. Laufer (1997) argues that vocabulary mastery is the single greatest predictor of reading success, suggesting minimal reading competence happens when the reader understands roughly 95% of the words in a text (23-24). Research suggests that words that are known are not processed in working memory, but sent directly to other components of memory (see Martin and He 2004) or incorporated smoothly into overall sentence structure (see Potter and Lombardi 1990) without the need to review the meaning of a particular word.

6 Nation (2001) argues that "vocabulary learning from extensive reading is very fragile. If the small amount of learning of a word is not soon reinforced by another meeting, then that learning will be lost." Intentional vocabulary instruction, especially that utilizing visuals, provides one means for reinforcing this learning. On using visuals, see particularly Yeh and Wang (2003), Jones (2004), and Carpenter and Olson (2011).

7 [Padlet](#) provides an online bulletin board where contributors can post text, images, and links to websites asynchronously. Once a board has been created, instructors simply need to provide students a link to add their own material. As of this writing, students do not need to sign up for a Padlet account in order to modify the boards, an aspect of the site that makes it more attractive given the inundation students face when using multiple online tools for educational purposes that each require their own login. This being said, the site has unfortunately undergone an update that greatly limits the free use of the site to 3 boards with a 10mb file limit per post. The site does offer subscription services specifically for educators with more advanced features, including an option that can be used across an entire school.

perspective, is that we teachers send the wrong message when we fail to continue to assess students on vocabulary. As Eyraud, Giles, Koenig, and Stoller suggest about language learning in general, “Most vocabulary growth takes place through incidental learning, that is, through exposure to comprehensible language in reading, listening discussions, bulletin board displays, videos, and so forth” (2).<sup>8</sup> While we may assume that students will continue working to acquire words that they do not know as they read complete texts, there are two real problems here. First and easiest to remedy, students may look at the lack of assessments of vocabulary as a sign that it is no longer essential as it was when they were at the beginning level. Low stakes quizzes are an easy way to remind students that vocabulary is an important aspect of their continued development.

Secondly, students may have difficulty prioritizing words that they should focus on first. While it is the case that students do learn vocabulary incidentally through reading, it is equally important to keep in mind, as Nation has argued, the need for direct vocabulary learning as the two processes are complementary.<sup>9</sup> While intermediate and advanced textbooks usually provide a glossary in the back that covers words in the text that one does not expect students to have mastered at the beginning level, there is no sense of what words occur more frequently since these lists are typically a simple, alphabetical listing. As Major (2008 ) notes, in their native language, English speakers typically have a vocabulary of 10,000 to 15,000 words but only use a subset of this vocabulary in any given conversation. Even then, they are likely to use certain words with much greater frequency than others, and it would behoove students learning English to focus on those words most commonly used in conversations first. The same is true for students of Greek and Latin.<sup>10</sup>

Instructors can help by providing students with keywords from each week’s reading. While instructors might simply choose words that they feel appear often, it would be better for instructors to draw lists informed by work such as the Dickinson College Core Vocabularies or Major’s “Core Greek Vocabulary for the First Two Years of Greek.”<sup>11</sup>

---

8 In their study, Laufer and Sim (1985) found that vocabulary was a more pressing need for foreign language learners than knowledge of the subject matter or a language’s syntactic structure.

9 See Nation (2001), especially Chapter 7.

10 In a study on vocabulary acquisition through listening activities, Elley (1989) found a positive correlation between vocabulary acquisition and the importance of the words to the plot of the story.

11 The Dickinson College Core Vocabularies can be found at <http://dcc.dickinson.edu/vocab/core-vocabulary> and Major’s list in Major (2008). Major’s list focuses on Greek words that make up 80%

For students who plan to continue in the languages beyond college language requirement courses, studying words with greater transferable value would be of particular value. Using a tool such as [Logeion](#) or [The Bridge](#), which give both a sense of the word frequency in the entire Greek and/or Latin corpus as well as the frequency within a given author, instructors can similarly compose thoughtful vocabulary lists that have in view the grand scope of the program's language curriculum.<sup>12</sup> Students who have achieved familiarity with the words on lists such as these are then in a position to push into less commonly used words in either language.

However, vocabulary lists have their limitations. Taken out of context from the ancient text, they are not very dynamic, and apart from people with an innate curiosity about words, these lists seem less likely to appear to students as something worth investing any more than a minimal amount of time looking over.<sup>13</sup> Vocabulary acquisition, as Nation argues, is a cumulative process, necessitating multiple encounters with any word (296). As such, language teachers need to help students find reasons to engage with keywords again and again. By helping students see the living language beneath the words written on the page, we can help students take these lists of "meaningless" Greek or Latin words and turn them into "meaningful" ones. We want students to be able to move words from short-term working memory (an item they encountered as part of a class assignment) into their long-term memory. When students can recall vocabulary from long-term memory, they are in a better position to see these words akin to ones they know in their native language, i.e., words that actual people use to communicate their desires, fears, anxieties, or hopes.<sup>14</sup> We

---

of the lemmata found in surviving Greek texts. Greek is surprisingly small in terms of its core vocabulary that makes up 80% of text, fewer than 1100 lemmata compared to 2200-2300 in English. The Dickinson College Latin vocabulary is informed by Delatte, et al. (1981) and Diederich (1939). Their Greek vocabulary builds upon Major's work as well as information from the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. For a fuller listing of Latin vocabulary lists from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century onwards, see Muccigrosso (2004).

12 Haverford's *The Bridge* includes vocabulary lists for popular textbooks as well as the AP sections of certain authors. It does, though, lack lists for some authors (e.g., Plautus and Terence).

13 As language instructors, we can make the mistake of thinking that our students are naturally as intrigued about every aspect of a language as we tend to be. Patrick (2015) suggests, "When we [Latin instructors] limit our classes to those who share our interests we enhance the false notion that Latin cannot be learned by the average person. This practice has kept our programs small." (109)

14 This should be our ultimate goal for students in our language classes. As Gruber-Miller (2018) suggests, "Language learning is not just about grammar and vocabulary, reading and translating, or practicing forms, but it is about communicating meaning." (21) Patrick (2015) outlines one process for helping students see Latin as a system of sharing meaning using the principles of comprehensible

humans are notoriously fond of engaging with our world through both visual and verbal representations, and increased familiarity with a concept or process, as Mayer and Sims have found, enables people to easily create visual representations from a simple verbal narration.<sup>15</sup>

Our understanding of the world becomes richer through our ability to move back and forth between visual and verbal ways to conceptualize it, and we can see this through differences in the translation process for bilingual speakers. Researchers have found an interesting split in the verbal and visual representation process for bilingual speakers translating from their native language (L1) to their second language (L2) and vice versa. Kroll and Stewart have shown that the process from L2 to L1 is primarily a lexical process, (e.g., looking at a Latin word, and then picking the right English word to go with it), whereas from L1 to L2 translation is primarily done conceptually (e.g., envisioning an object and thinking about the word in the other language that represents the same idea) (Kroll and Stewart, 1994). Adapting Kroll and Stewart's model, Yoshii suggests that images stand alongside languages in relation to concepts as an additional cue for language learners (Yoshii, 2006). So in trying to decipher a word in L2, one might rely upon a lexical link with L1 (as in Kroll and Stewart's model), or they may be able to rely upon the link between image and concept without the aid of L1. This second step, though, depends on the learner having established a strong enough link between concept and L2 word for the image to provide a substantial enough cue. Thus, for early-stage learners, in Yoshii's model, learners will more readily navigate L2 words through an equivalent translation into L1 along with a visual representation. This suggests that the ability to navigate concepts in the back and forth, between visual and verbal, represents a higher level of comfort and fluency with a language.

I would argue that we can see this a bit when we think of very common words in Latin or Greek versus less commonly used words. Words such as *rosa*, *nauta*, and *gladius* will probably generate an image in a student's head much more readily than words such

input in order to connect Latin vocabulary to students' lives. As this article will show, having students create visual vocabularies provides another pathway for the same process.

<sup>15</sup> Mayer and Sims (1994), 391. Looking at the scanned brains of language learners studying German vocabulary, Fliessbach, Weis, Klaver, Elger, and Weber (2006) found increased activity in the area of the brain associated with processing visual content, especially with words representing concrete items which suggest that an image-based section of the brain might be involved in processing vocabulary.



as *perna*, *picus*, or *ericius* (ham, woodpecker, and hedgehog, respectively). Technical terms for parts of ships or chariots may be uneasily visualized for students in Greek, Latin, or English, barring firsthand experience. While a student may learn that the Greek word σκαλμός means [thole pin](#), they are unlikely to have any sense of what that looks like unless they have experience in rowing. The students can see the letters that makeup either the Greek or Latin word – and the English word for that matter – but the meaning stops there.<sup>16</sup>

We, as instructors, play a crucial role at this stage of the learning process in order to help students begin to think about Greek and Latin words through the richness of visuals combined with lexical /representations. Presenting Greek or Latin vocabulary through compelling stories along with visuals, teachers can help students develop more meaningful representations of technical terms. If students have unexpected experiences with a lesser-known word (e.g., someone with a pet hedgehog), instructors should encourage students to apply that expertise to recurring classroom assignments (e.g., the adventures of the adorable *ericius*). Over time, instructors can help students shift responsibility for developing these picture links on to the students in order to capitalize on what Carpenter and Olson refer to as the “picture superiority effect.”<sup>17</sup> When pictures and words are used in conjunction with one another, the dual encoding effect is doubled, as Snodgrass, Wasser, and Finkelstein have shown.<sup>18</sup> That is, the words are encoded both as lexical text and conceptual image at the same time that the picture is encoded both conceptually and as lexical text. Such encoding does help student learning and retention of words.<sup>19</sup> As Nation has suggested,

---

16 I am focusing on concrete nouns here for the sake of simplicity. Abstract nouns, while more difficult to visually illustrate, are visualizable if we think about the various depictions of goddesses such as Nike and Dike or, to bring the idea into a modern setting, the various emotions of Pixar’s *Inside Out*. Verbs follow a similar trajectory from more physical, concrete actions (e.g., lifting, running, pulling, etc.) to more abstract (e.g., contemplating). Adjectives are fairly visualizable, but conjunctions and adverbs are notoriously more difficult to illustrate visually. With these, context is more helpful, and so a brief narrative description accompanying the visuals may be needed. The emergence of GIFs provides the possibility of a wordless narrative.

17 Studying recall of items, both lexical and pictorial, Carpenter and Olson (2012) have found that, in instances of free recall, students were able to remember significantly more items from the pictorial list (92).

18 Snodgrass, Wasser, and Finkelstein (1974), 32. See also the foundational work for dual coding by Paivio (1969, 1971, and 1986).

19 Lado, Baldwin, and Lobo (1967) had students who had completed 6 credits of college Spanish study a list of 100 infrequent Spanish words with English translation and pictures. These students were able to recognize 95% and recall 65% of the words after one meeting with the word.

“A suitable picture is an instantiation of the word and this may result in a deeper type of processing than a first language translation which does not encourage the learner to imagine a real instance of the meanings of the word.” (305) I would argue that it is possible for us to leverage images to better help our students make Greek and Latin vocabulary more meaningful to them, and by extension, to help them retain words better.<sup>20</sup>

Before getting into a more detailed description of the assignment and student learning results, one word of caution is warranted here. When deciding how to implement technology into the classroom, instructors need to weigh the benefits of the technology against the learning curve for using said technology.<sup>21</sup> [Padlet](#) is a straightforward platform for students to use. Example Vocabulary Boards can be found [here](#) and [here](#).<sup>22</sup> With a simple click, students can add a new sticky note to the board. Another click allows them to upload a photo from their computer or link to a GIF, and they can simply cut and paste the Greek or Latin word as it appears on the course vocabulary list to complete their post. Through this process, students can create visual vocabularies driven by their imaginations and interests, adding their own sense of how the Greek or Latin word has meaning in the students’ world. The ability to contribute asynchronously also allows students to contribute to the collective learning of the class at their convenience.<sup>23</sup> Altogether, Padlet provides an easy entry into the creation of a rich arena for meaningful visual vocabularies.<sup>24</sup>

---

20 Chochola and Sprague’s (2017) Latin picture dictionary may be a useful tool for students. As I will argue in the rest of this article, student-driven visual vocabularies have the added benefit of students injecting their personal sense of meaning into the Greek or Latin words.

21 Here I am trying to keep in mind the warnings of researchers such as Thrush and Thrush (1984) who highlight the problems that emerge when “programs are developed from a practical or technical bias and lack sufficient educational planning.” (23)

22 These boards come from an intermediate Latin course on Caesar and a combined intermediate-advanced level course on Cicero. As I reuse the boards by deleting previous posts whenever I teach the courses, the contents will vary.

23 Given the asynchronous quality of this tool, it may be of particular use for instructors teaching to distance students or teaching online courses. It provides a visually rich and ever-changing opportunity for students to continually engage with the material and the thoughts of their classmates. That being said, instructors may need to ask students to choose new images if the connection between the image or GIF and the Greek or Latin word is less apparent to those unfamiliar with a particular aspect of popular culture.

24 For those wishing to avoid the use of technology, a similar effect can be achieved through the use of hand-drawn images or printed pictures that students would bring to class, but doing so would lack the easy reviewability of the visual vocabularies generated on a site like Padlet.

### SEEING THE WORDS: EVOLUTION OF THE VOCABULARY BOARD

For the past five years, I have used some version of this visual vocabulary assignment in my intermediate and advanced level Latin courses. Before delving into the particulars of the assignment, some brief words about the dynamics of my courses are warranted. At my institution (a private, predominately-white, master's comprehensive school with an emphasis on the liberal arts), only students majoring in a field within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the College of Communications are required to take any language courses. Students must complete at least two courses at the intermediate level or higher. While they can test out of the beginning level courses, they cannot test out of the language requirement. As such, the vast majority of students (typically 66% or more) in the beginning and intermediate levels are neither majors nor minors in the language. Some of these students are in these courses because they had Latin (less so Greek) in high school or had always wanted to take an ancient language but could not because their high school did not offer any. Others are there as part of the usual mix of students looking to take a non-speaking language or those with aspirations of medical or law school. Some will decide to declare a minor or major as a result of their time in these courses, but most will end their study of Greek or Latin after the second semester of the intermediate level.

In the initial iteration of the assignment in my intermediate Latin course on Caesar, I simply created two boards on Padlet that were organized thematically (e.g., Roman army terms and verbs of movement).<sup>25</sup> I asked students to post Latin words that they felt would be useful to learn as we came across them in the reading. The students also needed to provide an image illustrating the meaning of the Latin word. At this stage, I had given the students very little instruction about the nature of the images they would use or how to find them. Participation was entirely voluntary, and I did not provide students with vocabulary lists for study. As a result of the voluntary participation and the lack of focused contributions, the usefulness of these boards was relatively low. It became apparent that I needed to provide students with greater motivation to engage with this kind of assignment actively.

---

25 In talking about the use of word walls in class, Eyraud, Giles, Koenig, and Stoller (2000) emphasize the importance of vocabulary words chosen because of the need for students to use them in the comprehension of "a reading, a chart or graph, a video, a lecture, a bulletin board display, or a guest speaker." (10)

The next year, I made regular contributions to these boards a part of the course's participation grade. Students were asked to select a word that they did not know and found interesting or useful. This significantly improved the number of contributions to the Vocabulary Boards connected to each week's readings, but the caprice of individual students still drove the word selection. There was great variability among the posts in terms of whether one might find the words on a list like the Dickinson College Core Vocabulary. Additionally, since the students did not have a collective sense of what words were important to study, they were not always sure what they should focus on in the image for thinking about the meaning of the Latin word.<sup>26</sup> For example, Figure 1 adequately illustrates Roman *galeae*.



Figure 1 © Jonathan Zarecki

But there is so much going on in the picture (the swords, daggers, siege equipment, standard, etc.) that students might not accurately focus their attention on the helmets of the two soldiers pictured here. Figure 2 provides a clearer illustration of the word, though such specificity is not always possible depending on the nature of the word.

---

26 Nation (2001) usefully observes the double-edged nature of pictures for vocabulary learning: "An advantage of using actions, objects, pictures or diagrams is that learners see an instance of the meaning and this is likely to be remembered ... Because objects and pictures contain a lot of detail, it may be necessary to present several examples so that learners can determine the essential features of the concept or accompany the object or picture with focusing information."



*Figure 2* © Christopher Bungard, Roman legionary helmet from the Butler Ancient Mediterranean Cultures and Archaeology Lab

Starting the following year, I began to use the Vocabulary Boards as a supplement to vocabulary lists provided to students for each week's readings (see Appendix A for an example from a combined intermediate-advanced Latin course on Catullus), and I plan to continue doing so for reasons outlined in the next section of this article. I encouraged the students first to look over the traditional, text-only vocabulary list (typically about 20 items per week).<sup>27</sup> I wanted the students first to familiarize themselves with the keywords for each week. After they had done that, they then would post one to three words (depending on the total number of students in the course) to the Vocabulary Board on Padlet. Ideally, this forces the student to think about the nature of the image that they have chosen carefully to illustrate the idea inherent in the Latin term best. It also should help students, who use the Vocabulary Board as a review tool for regular vocabulary quizzes, have a stronger sense of where to focus their attention in thinking about the meaning of the Latin term illustrated through the image.

Moving forward, I plan to dedicate more time early in the semester to talk about the process of image selection. I want the students to be thoughtful in their choice of images, not simply choosing whatever comes up first in a Google image search. I also want the students to avoid images that contain text with the English definition of the word, a

problem more likely to come up if students are using memes or GIFs. Given the prevalence of the GIF in students' social media life, I am disinclined to restrict their use on the boards precisely because I want the students to see this study tool as a way to think about Latin and Greek as living languages. To avoid copyright issues, I will require that students restrict themselves to the use of images in the public domain or that are part of the Creative Commons license. Icons may be of great use, especially for nouns, and there are several platforms that provide free icons.<sup>28</sup> Google image searches currently provide a filter that limits results to images labeled for reuse in a noncommercial setting. I also plan to suggest that students may create their own images if they so choose to post to the boards.

Within my classes, I have developed a predictable routine to help students get the most out of these boards. For a Monday, Wednesday, Friday course, I post a list of vocabulary for the following week tied to reading assignments on Wednesdays. As part of their assignment for Friday classes, students need to select one to three unique word(s) to post to the boards. At the start of class on Friday, we open up the board on the screen in the classroom, and we begin our review of the words students posted. It is possible, given the number of students in class, that not all words may be used that week, and students understand that they are still responsible for learning all of the words from the vocabulary list for their weekly quiz, which we do on Mondays. The students will then encounter words from the weekly list in the readings throughout the week, including the day of the quiz. Because I am interested in students learning high-frequency words, word-selection is driven primarily by the 20 or so words that will appear more frequently in a particular author or Latin in general, rather than a roughly even distribution of words appearing in each day's readings.

It is essential for students, as I will discuss in more detail below, to have time to begin with the lexical list and reinforce their understanding of the words through the visuals of the Vocabulary Board. As noted in the discussion above about *galeae*, students may, if they simply start with the board, connect the meaning of the Greek or Latin word with the wrong element of the picture or, in the case of more abstract concepts, completely misunderstand the meaning that the original poster had attached to the visuals.

---

<sup>28</sup> In particular, I am thinking about the [Noun Project](#) and [FlatIcon](#).

The 5-minute, weekly quiz is similarly a crucial part of this process.<sup>29</sup> Students need to encounter words through multiple repetitions in order for them to stick in memory. As Nation has argued, “If too much time has passed between the previous meeting and the present encounter with the word, then the present encounter is effectively not a repetition but is like a first encounter.” (67) When students have begun their study of the vocabulary through the lexical list (Wednesday), reinforced it through the Vocabulary Board (Friday), and shown their ability to identify the meaning of the word on the quiz (Monday), they should be ready to encounter the words in the passages for the week’s readings. Ideally, they are spending less time looking up words as they work through the passages.<sup>30</sup> This should help the students devote more mental energy to thinking about the way that the author builds meaning in the passage, taking in information left to right instead of juggling the meanings of a bunch of words that they just looked up in order to slog through the passage.<sup>31</sup>

### **POWER OF THE IMAGE: IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING**

To assess the impact of the Vocabulary Boards in Greek and Latin courses, students, who were enrolled in intermediate and advanced levels of Latin courses in Fall 2016, Spring 2017, Fall 2017, and Spring 2019, voluntarily filled out surveys. I sent out the initial surveys approximately 5 weeks into the Fall 2016 and 2017 semesters with subsequent

29 See Nation (2001), especially Chapter 10, for useful suggestions on best practices for testing vocabulary. Of importance here is Nation’s assertion of the need for the testing format to test the kind of use of vocabulary students will be expected to perform (372). Students who will be using vocabulary primarily for reading purposes should not be asked to create sentences with vocabulary words. In a course where students regularly will be producing Latin or Greek sentences, such a vocabulary test would be very appropriate.

30 This progression also follows Nation’s (2001, 72-74) three components for effective vocabulary learning – (1) an activity designed to help students notice a word for learning (i.e., the vocabulary list); (2) an activity to encourage retrieval (i.e., review of the Vocabulary Board as a way to reinforce the initial encounter); and (3) an activity to encourage generation (i.e., exposing students to the word in a different format, here pictures).

31 As instructors, we may heed the advice of colleagues in the modern languages who have long wrestled with the importance of comprehensible input as advocated by Krashen (1980 and 1985) and those who have followed him such as Long (1980, 1983, 1985) or more recently Asher (2009) and Ray and Seely (2008). Patrick (2015) provides a list of comprehensible input principles directly tailored to the concerns of Greek or Latin instruction. Patrick suggests a lower vocabulary threshold for reading fluency than Laufer, putting the crucial percentage at 90% of the words in a passage.

rounds sent out about the 10<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> weeks of Fall 2016 and the 7<sup>th</sup> week of Spring 2017. Only one round of follow up surveys was sent in Fall 2017 around the 15<sup>th</sup> week. Due to some technical issues, surveys were only sent out in the Spring of the 2018-2019 school year. Unfortunately, the enrollments in these courses were generally small (about 15 students in Intermediate Latin and 5 in Advanced Latin in any given semester), and survey response rates were somewhat hit and miss. Only one student completed enough surveys to provide complete longitudinal data. Thus, the results from these surveys are largely limited in usefulness to qualitative markers of the impact of the boards.

Students were asked to rank the size of their English vocabulary on a 5-point scale. Student reports on this item did not change significantly throughout the various surveys, and so I report only the results from the initial surveys. These results are summarized below.

**Figure 3**

Size of English Vocabulary		5	4	3	2	1
<b>Fall 2016</b>						
	Intermediate Latin	4	7	0	0	0
	Advanced Latin	1	2	0	0	0
<b>Fall 2017</b>						
	Intermediate Latin	2	4	0	1	0
	Advanced Latin	2	2	0	0	0
<b>Fall 2019</b>						
	Intermediate Latin	0	4	1	0	0

Based on these results, students in Latin courses show clear confidence in the perceived size of their English vocabulary with the vast majority reporting 4s or 5s, and this makes sense given the somewhat self-selecting nature of Latin students, especially as many are in the language as part of a career trajectory that will take them to medical and law schools.

In contrast to high confidence in the size of their English vocabulary, these same groups of students reported modest confidence in their mastery of Latin vocabulary (again on a 5-point scale), as summarized in the table below.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Numbers may vary within a given class due to varying response rates. Since only one student provided enough responses for any kind of longitudinal analysis, I am more interested in general trends within the data.



**Figure 4**

<b>Confidence in Latin Vocabulary</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Intermediate Latin</b>					
Fall 2016 - Initial	0	0	4	5	0
Fall 2016 – Follow Up 1	0	0	4	5	0
Fall 2016 – Follow Up 2	0	0	3	1	1
Spring 2017 – Follow Up 3	0	2	2	0	1
Fall 2017 – Initial	0	0	2	0	1
Fall 2017 – Follow Up	0	0	3	1	2
Spring 2019 - Initial	0	0	1	3	1
<b>Advanced Latin</b>					
Fall 2016 - Initial	0	0	2	0	1
Fall 2016 – Follow Up 1	0	0	2	0	1
Fall 2016 – Follow Up 2	0	0	1	0	0
Spring 2017 – Follow Up 3	0	0	0	1	0
Fall 2017 – Initial	0	1	3	1	0
Fall 2017 – Follow Up	0	0	2	0	0
<b>Totals:</b>	0	3	29	17	8

Students' level of language does not seem to have any significant impact on their confidence in Latin vocabulary, with most students reporting 3s. Given the significant number of students reporting 2s and 1s, vocabulary is an area that needs work in Latin courses. One point of particular interest in these results comes from students in Intermediate Latin in the round of surveys administered in Spring 2017, the students' second semester of Intermediate Latin, a point where some longitudinal comparison is possible between Fall 2016 – Follow Up 2 and Spring 2017 – Follow Up 3. These students had been using Vocabulary Boards throughout the Fall semester, and there was a definite shift upwards for three of the five students returning surveys.

Finally, students were asked to rate their sense of the helpfulness of the Vocabulary Boards on a 5-point scale. The results are summarized below.

**Figure 5**

Usefulness of the Vocabulary Boards	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Intermediate Latin</b>					
Fall 2016 - Initial	0	6	2	0	1
Fall 2016 – Follow Up 1	0	6	2	0	1
Fall 2016 – Follow Up 2	1	1	2	0	0
Spring 2017 – Follow Up 3	1	0	4	0	0
Fall 2017 – Initial	1	2	1	0	0
Fall 2017 – Follow Up	3	0	1	1	0
Spring 2019 - Initial	0	1	3	1	0
<b>Advanced Latin</b>					
Fall 2016 - Initial	1	1	0	0	1
Fall 2016 – Follow Up 1	1	1	0	0	1
Fall 2016 – Follow Up 2	1	0	0	0	0
Spring 2017 – Follow Up 3	1	0	0	0	0
Fall 2017 – Initial	2	1	0	1	0
Fall 2017 – Follow Up	2	0	0	0	0
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>

Certain trends emerge when analyzing the above data. At the start of the year, upper-level students are more likely to find the Vocabulary Boards beneficial study tool based on the frequency of returning 5s on the surveys, but it is clear that the majority of students at the intermediate and advanced levels find the board a helpful study tool (reporting 4s or 5s).

Given the discussion at the beginning of this article about the transition in language fluency from lexically to visually dominant, I would suggest that this tendency of upper-level students to report 5s more frequently reflects their increased ability to visualize Latin vocabulary not as words on a page, but as representing conceptual ideas. As one advanced Latin student noted in a comment on the surveys,

*Pairing words with pictures helps get past the hurdle of memorizing the definition. When I see a word from the board in the text, I don't slow down by trying to remember an English word to associate it with, I just jump*

*directly to understanding what the word means. I also remember the words longer.*

When coupled with a review of the Vocabulary Board in class, this added value for students gets amplified. On an initial survey, the same advanced Latin student noted,

*I've found that association with a picture or concept helps cement definitions more than memorizing words and synonyms. The exercise of going over them in class and determining how people's chosen pictures relates to the word also helps. I remember those moments weeks later when I would have otherwise forgotten a simple pair of words on a page. It's also a big help that the vocab boards are created by us from the current reading.*

While instructors could create visual vocabularies for the students to use as a study tool, there is a clear added benefit for the students in selecting an image for themselves that reflects their conceptual meaning of the word. The chance to discuss how the image reflects that conceptual meaning provides students with additional opportunities to affix the Latin word and the image in their mind, associate it with a social moment with classmates, and thus, ideally, convince their brains that this piece of information is important for them to retain.

Student comments on end-of-course evaluations also suggest that students do gain quite a bit from using the Vocabulary Boards, and these comments have become increasingly positive as I have further honed the use of these within the context of my own Latin courses. In the early years, when students had not studied words through a lexical list first, they reported that images on the boards were sometimes misleading or confusing. It became clear that students needed some rudimentary instructions on how to use the tool so that they could better focus their eyes on the part of the image that was important for the meaning of the word. Without such training, students may have benefited just as much, if not more, from simply looking up words in the back of their textbook.

When I provide students with vocabulary lists to study before making their posts to the Vocabulary Boards and also encourage them to use the boards as a way to review Latin vocabulary in advance of regular vocab quizzes, the student engagement with the boards fundamentally shifts. Students begin to compete to try to find the most interesting image

that captured the meaning of a Latin word, and this makes our weekly review of the boards more engaging. In an end of course survey, one intermediate Latin student commented, “Sometimes there would be words that I just couldn’t remember the definition, but by having a picture it was able to help more than expected.” Another noted, “Vocab boards have helped as they force me to look and study the vocab, but also given a more fun and interesting reference to use to study and remember the vocab for the tests.” Because the students have invested themselves into the creation of these boards, they are thinking about the vocabulary in a more engaging fashion. Laughing and joking about the cultural references students that work into their submissions amplify the enjoyment of studying vocabulary.<sup>33</sup>

There were still, on occasion, moments when a student selected an image that was less than ideal. Here is where sharing the Vocabulary Boards as part of class becomes essential. When no one else in the class is able to identify the meaning of the word through the selected picture, I turn to the student to tell the class the meaning of the word, and I ask them if they can talk through their own understanding of the connection between Latin word, image, and English meaning. I find this helpful in two ways. On the one hand, it helps the rest of the class see the Latin word’s meaning clearly. On the other hand, it forces the student who posted the problematic picture to slow down and process their own understanding of their choice. For the whole class, the process, as one student commented on an end of class survey, “keeps the [vocabulary] practice regular and enforced,” and I would emphasize that it does so in a way that students find helpful and enjoyable. As another student from the same semester commented on the end of course survey, “I greatly appreciated looking at the images because it helped me think about the vocab terms in the ways that I understand English words (by images, etc.)

I also looked forward to going over the vocab boards each week.” The boards are not simply another hurdle to jump in a Latin class, but rather an engaging aspect of learning that students look forward to.

---

<sup>33</sup> It is possible that the use of the Vocabulary Boards helps reduce student stress about vocabulary acquisition as well, and, as Partrick (2015, 111) discusses, stress is a major obstacle to language acquisition. The opportunity to personalize Greek or Latin vocabulary can help lessen the distance between students and the target language, reducing the stress caused by anxiety around that distance.

More recently, I have begun to talk to students early in the Fall semester of my Latin courses about my precise reasoning for using the Vocabulary Boards. I talk to them about the research noted above concerning the ways that native speakers access vocabulary in fundamentally different ways than those still acquiring the language (primarily visual versus primarily lexical). Ideally, students take to heart the message that they must learn to visualize Latin words as a crucial marker of a deeper level of fluency in the language, and comments from end-of-course evaluations have reflected this way of thinking. One student explicitly noted that this discussion made them see the boards as more valuable for their study of Latin. Another student wrote, “[The boards have] been extremely helpful when I begin studying for vocab quizzes. When I am studying on Quizlet sometimes the pictures associated with each word from vocabulary boards pop into my head and helps me remember the word better.” This suggests to me that the boards have a positive impact. These students are seeing Latin words, coupled with visually meaningful images for them drawn from their worldview. They have begun to make the Latin language a living language in their minds in ways that I do not think they would do as readily if they were thinking about the language primarily through the lexical lens.

While the surveys provide a window into students’ perceptions of the value of the Vocabulary Boards, they are limited in that they are just that, students’ perceptions of the value. As a way to test the ongoing impacts of the vocabulary boards, I gave students a quiz covering the first seven weeks of vocabulary (roughly 150 words). The quiz contained twenty items. Of these, five items were from the current week’s list that students chose to post to the board, two were from the current week, but not on the board, eight were from previous weeks that students had posted to boards, and five were from previous weeks that were not on the board. I broke student results apart based on whether a majority of the students gave the correct English definition, gave the incorrect definition, or were split 50/50. The results are summarized below.

**Figure 6**

	Majority Correct	Split	Majority Incorrect
<b>Current Week - Board</b>	5	0	0
<b>Current Week - Not</b>	0	2	0
<b>Older - Board</b>	5	1	2
<b>Older - Not</b>	2	1	2

Of these twenty items, ten of the twelve items that the majority of students answered correctly appeared on a vocabulary board at some point, including all of the items from the most recent board. Of the items which at least eighteen out of twenty students answered correctly, all four items were words that appeared on a board, including at least one item from the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of class. Of the thirteen items that had appeared on a board, the majority of students answered ten correctly where the majority only answered correctly two of the seven items that never appeared on a board (*fides* and *bellus*).

As a follow-up, I gave a second quiz covering the last 7 weeks of vocabulary (roughly the same amount as was covered by the first quiz), and the proportion of items from the current week versus previous weeks as well as proportions of items that appeared on boards to not appearing on boards was the same. The results are summarized in the table below.

**Figure 7**

	Majority Correct	Split	Majority Incorrect
<b>Current Week - Board</b>	4	0	1
<b>Current Week - Not</b>	1	0	1
<b>Older - Board</b>	4	0	4
<b>Older - Not</b>	1	1	3

These results align with those from the previous quiz. On this quiz there were five items (*cognoscere*, *eripere*, *gaudium*, *nasus*, and *pectus*) that sixteen of eighteen students answered correctly. Of these, three were items from the most recent list of vocabulary that students had posted on a board, and the other two were from previous weeks that had been posted to a board. Again, the majority of students answered correctly only two of the seven items that had never appeared on a board (*crudelis* and *gratus*).

These results are consistent with the various studies summarized by Xu that look at the impact of various kinds of annotations on incidental L2 vocabulary acquisition through reading (Xu 315). With the exception of Al-Seghayer's study, in which all annotations used either simple L2 text or a combination of L2 text with video or picture, the combination of text and picture, regardless of the language of the text, proved superior to the use of text or

picture alone.<sup>34</sup> Of particular interest for this paper, Yoshii and Flaitz tested subjects using annotations with either L2 text and picture, simple L2 text, or pictures. The results of the annotations that used only text or pictures were similar, but the annotations that combine L2 text and pictures outperformed. Keeping in mind the results of the two quizzes, as limited a study as they are, the combination of Latin text with image seems to provide a clear benefit for students, one echoed by a student comment from one of the Vocabulary Board surveys:

*Since we started doing the vocab quizzes, one way I've been studying has been to go through each picture on the board and read out the word and its parts. After doing that multiple times, I try to do the same thing, trying to recite the words by just focusing on the picture. It's incredibly helpful for remembering definitions; I still remember words from several months ago because of the picture and our exercise of going through them at the beginning of class, compared to words I looked up last week in a dictionary and already forgot.*

If we as instructors want students to improve in their language abilities, then we need to give them effective tools for studying vocabulary so they can achieve a high threshold for making reading comprehension an easy process. Based on the results of the studies noted above and the limited results of my study on the use of Vocabulary Boards in my classroom, these boards show great promise.

For all the positives of the Vocabulary Boards, there is one crucial limitation that I should note. Students need to post the entire dictionary form of the Latin word above the image, and they need to provide the principal parts of words on the vocabulary quizzes. One student noted, "I like finding a word for the vocab board, and they are helpful when studying for the weekly vocab quizzes. I do not think they are helpful in learning the principle parts of a word, but they are helpful in remembering the meaning." The student clearly finds the exercise of posting to the boards interesting and useful for learning the

---

34 Xu (2010) summarizes the results of Chun and Plass (1996), Kost, Foss, and Lenzini (1999), Al-Seghayer (2001), Yoshii and Flaitz (2002), Yeh and Wang (2003), and Yoshii (2006). Jones and Plass (2002), looking at vocabulary recognition following a listening exercise accompanied by annotations, similarly found that students receiving dual-mode annotations outperformed those receiving single-mode or no annotations.

core meanings of words, and so I read their point about the principal parts not as a lack of effort in studying the words through the Vocabulary Board. If the student simply disliked the exercise in general, then it would stand to reason that this same student was not paying close attention to the finer features of the boards, but here there is a student who actively engages in the creation and use of these boards, one whom one might expect would benefit from all of the information available on them.

### Looking to the Future

While I have focused my discussion on the use of Padlet as a platform for asynchronous creation of visual vocabularies by students, other platforms that I have not had a chance to explore in-depth might achieve similar results, especially given the increased limitations of the free version of the Padlet platform. Here I will briefly explore three particular tools and attempt to articulate my sense of the strengths and limitations of these for effective vocabulary instruction. I am particularly interested in the balance between ease of generating visual vocabularies outside of classroom time and the ability to create visually engaging materials.<sup>35</sup>

[Pear Deck](#) shows great promise here. As a Google extension, it allows for teachers to make use of all the asynchronous collaboration that the Google platform enables. An instructor could create a Google slide deck with clear instructions for students to develop slides that feature an image and the principal parts of a word from the vocabulary list. When presenting the slides, instructors can use a feature in Pear Deck that asks students to post answers, whether open-ended or multiple choice. This feature creates space for all students to answer simultaneously while hiding the class' answers until all have had enough time. Students can then assess their own personal vocabulary retention in comparison to others in class so as to, ideally, adjust study habits accordingly.<sup>36</sup>

Pear Deck has also created a feature, Vocabulary Factory, that could be of great use for instructors willing to dedicate class time to the creation of the visual vocabularies. The feature is full of fun animation throughout the process, providing subtle positive

---

35 As I am particularly thinking about vocabulary instruction for intermediate and advanced language students, creating visual vocabularies outside of class preserves class time for vocabulary review and reading/discussion of Greek and Latin texts.

36 Of less importance from a student learning perspective, Pear Deck also allows the sharing of slide shows that enables instructors to tag the presentation based on content area, grade level, and where appropriate Common Core standards that the presentation hits.



reinforcement. Instructors preload a tab-delimited vocabulary list featuring a term and definition. The program then divides participants into teams in order to turn the vocabulary list into a series of flashcards. In pairs, students need to use the word in a sentence and to draw on their device an illustration of the meaning of the word. Once students have created their cards, they send them to the “Quality Control” room where instructors can display submissions for the class to decide whether the card provides an accurate illustration and example sentence. If approved, the card is sent into a file that can easily be exported to Quizlet for student use in studying vocabulary.

All of these Pear Deck features rely on the assumption that all students in the course have access to a device that can efficiently utilize the platform. Here, I find two main problems. We all know the challenge of keeping students, and admittedly sometimes ourselves, on task when accessing a device during a presentation. More importantly, while it is my experience that the great majority of students bring such devices to classes regularly, I am always sensitive to the ostracization that happens for students who do not have access to such tools. This is especially important as we seek to expand engagement with Classics, reshaping the field from one that privileges a certain kind of student.

[GimKit](#) allows instructors and students to collaboratively create a bank of questions, called a “kit.” An instructor can then set up a game in which students race to answer as many questions correctly. Students earn “cash” for use on the GimKit platform when answering questions correctly and lose cash for incorrect answers. Races can either be set up to last a certain amount of time or until the class collectively has reached a certain cash threshold. Kits can be shared, leading to the potential creation of a community of teachers sharing resources.

While GimKit enables collaborative creation between students and teachers, I have a few significant reservations. First, the platform seems to preference text, but as the studies explored in this article have shown, the combination of text and image is of great pedagogical value. Second, the competitive aspect of GimKit, which looks and feels much like Kahoot, is double-edged. While some students might revel in the race, competitive activities in classrooms do routinely disfavor female students, as Niederle and Vesterlund have shown.<sup>37</sup>

---

37 See Niederle and Vesterlund (2011) for a general discussion of gender and competition.

[Adobe Spark Post](#) strikes me as a potentially great tool for the creation of visual vocabularies. The online program allows for easy searching of free images that are visually engaging. Students and instructors can then layer text onto the image itself, positioning the text wherever they feel most appropriate. Doing so could help students draw attention to the most pertinent aspect of the image itself, lessening the guesswork that is sometimes necessary when using the Padlet format. Finally, the instructor can go through the slides and add an audio recording of the words themselves. In doing so, instructors would provide three points of reference for the students to think about the word (lexical, conceptual, and aural). One can then play the slideshow, saying the English meaning of the word out loud following the reading of the Greek or Latin word.

Here, I see two potential drawbacks. Firstly, Adobe Spark Post seems best suited for an individual to create the whole presentation. While the platform does allow collaboration, only one person can edit the file at a time. With a group of 15-20 students, timing conflicts may cause undue frustration with the creative process, diminishing the enjoyment of the learning activity. Instructors could assign different students in different weeks to create a slideshow, distributing the work across the class, but this would lack the personal touch of the whole class contributing to one common project. As I have found in my discussions with students, they often appreciate seeing how others conceptualize a Latin word, and they find value in seeing what others have produced.

Secondly, the pacing of the slides is fixed. If a slide has a voice narration, the length of the narration determines how long the slide will be presented. For each slide, the viewer first sees simply the image. The text then scrolls onto the screen as the voice comes in, disappearing again at the end of the recording. Instructors thus need to leave a few seconds of silence at the end of the recording in order to create time on the slide for students to read the Greek or Latin word and vocalize for themselves the English meaning. Without a narration, creators can adjust how long each slide will appear, but when viewing the presentation, the only way to advance slides more quickly is using the slider bar under the video. Students might find the deliberate pacing frustrating for words that they easily know, and reordering items in the list is not possible without changing the presentation.

Whatever the platform, we as instructors of Greek and Latin need to make intentional vocabulary instruction a routine part of courses at all levels. While students' grammatical challenges are real and important for us to help them navigate, we can easily get too focused on these. If we can lessen the mental bandwidth that vocabulary takes up

as students try to navigate Homer's description of the death of Hector, Caesar's arguments about who was responsible for the Civil War, or Catullus' ruminations about whether to love or hate Lesbia, then we put them in place to focus more on the way these authors organize their thoughts. Students can focus more on how the endings on nouns and verbs help them see the roles of various words within the thought, and ideally, they can then approach the passages more at the level of thoughts, rather than loosely joined words or sentences. They can read with greater ease, and this, ideally, opens more classroom time for thoughtful engagement with the ideas presented in these texts, not just making sure they can slog through a translation.<sup>38</sup>

Combined with vocabulary lists thoughtfully constructed through analysis of frequently used words, the Vocabulary Boards outlined in this article have proven very useful for my own teaching.<sup>39</sup> They provide the instructor with a student-driven learning

38 And we, as language instructors, do well to heed the advice of Major (2018) in reimagining our curricula to capitalize on the opportunities to help students find meaningful connections between courses in their studies, especially connections to areas of studies outside of Classics. Similarly, Gruber-Miller (2018) emphasizes in his evaluation of Latin education in light of the Standards for Classical Language Learning the need for those of us in Classics to think more broadly about the liberal arts. As he suggests, "This ability to make connections— across languages, across cultures, and across disciplines—and to apply what one has learned to authentic tasks is critical for preparing students (and future citizens) to understand the complexity of real world challenges and to bring multiple approaches to bear on solving them." (20)

39 As noted above, lists such as the Dickinson College Core Vocabularies or Major's "Core Greek Vocabulary for the First Two Years of Greek" provide useful vocab lists for the languages in general. While Logeion can provide a full sense of the use of a word, looking up each word used by a particular author, may be cumbersome. Thanks to an advanced student of mine, Mark Kimpel, I have also begun exploring ways to make more meaningful vocabulary lists assisted through computer technologies. On his own in preparation for a course on Catullus, Mark introduced me to a process he used to start building a vocab list for himself. He downloaded the texts available through the [www.thelatinlibrary.com](http://www.thelatinlibrary.com) into [Classical Language Toolkit](#) (CLTK). He then used CLTK methods with Python to perform the following on the whole Latin corpus available at The Latin Library and Catullus' corpus in particular: normalizing the corpus (e.g., making sure that consonantal *i* or *u* were consistent); writing all words in lower case; removing non-alphabetic characters; removing enclitics; lemmatizing words to their dictionary form; and finally exporting the document as text files. He then imported both corpora in a computer program called [R](#) to do the following: eliminate Roman numerals; make a table of all lemmata in the Catullus corpus by the number of the poem the lemmata are found in; make an ordered, decreasing table of the total occurrences of each lemma in the Latin corpus; identify lemmata that occur in at least X poems of Catullus and are NOT in the top Y lemmata of the Latin corpus; and finally make a table by poem number of the lemmata that remain from the sorting in the previous step. Instructors may choose based on students' level of language proficiency how much recurrence across poems (X) would be appropriate as well as

tool. They create a space for students to share the ways in which they make meaning of Greek or Latin words, utilizing the memes and images from popular culture that students immerse themselves in on a daily basis. The boards leave the students with memories of the experience of reviewing the words in class as well as the images themselves. For students, I believe, the words have become more than simply a lexical list that they need to learn for just another class. Instead, they have taken on significance for the students, imbued with the kinds of dynamics that they had for those ancient native speakers who deployed them to talk about politics, war, the good life, and love. In other words, they have recaptured some of the life they once had.

### WORKS CITED

- Al-Seghayer, K. "The Effect of Multimedia Annotation Modes on L2 Vocabulary Acquisition: A Comparative Study." *Language Learning & Technology*. 5.1(2001): 202-232 .
- Asher, J. *Learning Another Language through Actions*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Sky Oaks Productions, 2009.
- Brown, M. *Goodnight, Moon*. Harper and Brothers, 1947.
- Carpenter, S. and K. Olson. "Are Pictures Good for Learning New Vocabulary in a Foreign Language? Only if You Think They Are Not." *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 38.1 (2012): 92-101.
- Chochola, J. and D. Sprague. *A Latin Picture Dictionary for Everyone: Lingua Latina depicta*. L. Koller, illus. Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 2017.
- Coady, J. and T. Huckin, eds. *Second Language Acquisition: A Rationale for Pedagogy*. Cambridge, 1997.

---

how much base vocabulary students might be expected to know. For example, with intermediate students, one might choose to only look at words that recur in 3-4 poems that are not among the top 500 most common Latin words across the corpus used as a baseline. This will produce more words for instructors to choose from for manageable vocabulary lists, but it also would leave room for that band of words that are not hyper-abundant nor hyper-rare. With more advanced students who should have a broader vocabulary base, the same process might look to words that recur in at least 2-3 poems that are not among the top 1000 most common Latin words.

- Chun, D. and J. Plass. "Effects of Multimedia Annotations on Vocabulary Acquisition." *The Modern Language Journal*. 80(1996): 183-198.
- Cowan, N. "The Magical Mystery Four: How Is Working Memory Capacity Limited, and Why?" *Current Directions in Psychological Science*. 19(2010): 51-57.
- Delatte, L., E. Evrard, S. Govaerts and J. Denooz. *Dictionnaire fréquentiel et index inverse de la langue latine*. Laboratoire d'Analyse Statistique des Langues Anciennes, 1981.
- Diederich, P. "The Frequency of Latin Words and Their Endings." Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1939. [Digitized by Carolus Raeticus](#) in 2011.
- Elley, W. "Vocabulary Acquisition from Listening to Stories." *Reading Research Quarterly*. 24(1989): 174-187.
- Eyraud, K., G. Giles, S. Koenig, and F. Stoller. "The Word Wall Approach." *Forum: English Teaching*. 38.3(2000): 2-11.
- Fliessbach, K., Weis, S., Klaver, P., Elger, C. E., & Weber, B. "The Effect of Word Concreteness on Recognition Memory." *NeuroImage* 32 (2006): 1413-1421.
- Gruber-Miller, J. "The Standards as Integrative Learning." *Teaching Classical Languages*. 9.1(2018): 19-38.
- Johnson, K. *The Classical Language Toolkit*, 2019. Accessed at [cltk.org](http://cltk.org)
- Jones, L. "Testing L2 Vocabulary Recognition and Recall Using Pictorial and Written Test Items." *Language, Learning, & Technology*. 8.3 (2004): 122-143.
- Jones, L. and J. Plass. "Supporting Listening Comprehension and Vocabulary Acquisition in French with Multimedia Annotations." *The Modern Language Journal*. 86 (2002): 546-561.
- Jonides, J., R. Lewis, D. Nee, C. Lustig, M. Berman, and K. Moore. "The Mind and the Brain of Short-Term Memory." *Annual Review of Psychology*. 59 (2008): 193-224.

- Kost, C., P. Foss, and J. Lenzini. "Textual and Pictorial Glosses: Effectiveness of Incidental Vocabulary Growth When Reading in a Foreign Language." *Foreign Language Annals* 32(1999): 89-113.
- Krashen, S. "The Input Hypothesis" in *Current Issues in Bilingual Education*. J. Alatis, ed. Georgetown University, 1980. 144–158.
- Krashen, S. *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. Longman, 1985.
- Kroll, J. and E. Stewart. "Category Interference in Translation and Picture Naming for Asymmetric Connections between Bilingual Memory Representations." *Journal of Memory and Language*. 33(1994): 149-174.
- Lado, R. B. Baldwin, and F. Lobo. *Massive Vocabulary Expansion in a Foreign Language Beyond the Basic Course: The Effects of Stimuli, Timing, and Order of Presentation*. US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1967.
- Laufer, B. "The Lexical Plight in Second Language Reading: Words You Don't Know, Words You Think You know, and Words You Can't Guess" in Coady and Huckin, eds. *Second Language Acquisition: A Rationale for Pedagogy*. Cambridge, 1997.
- Laufer, B. and D. Sim. "Measuring and Explaining the Reading Threshold Needed for English for Academic Purposes Texts." *Foreign Language Annals*. 18(1985): 405-411.
- Long, M. "Input, Interaction, and Second Language Acquisition." Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, unpublished, 1980.
- Long, M. "Linguistic and Conversational Adjustments to Non-Native Speakers." *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 5 (1983): 177–193.
- Long, M. "Input and Second Language Acquisition Theory" in *Input in Second Language Acquisition*. S. Gass and C. Madden, eds. Newbury House, 1985. 377–393.

- Major, W. "It's Not the Size, It's the Frequency: The Value of Using a Core Vocabulary in Beginning and Intermediate Greek." *CPL Online*, 2008. 1-24.
- Major, W. "Recontextualizing the Teaching of ancient Greek within the New *Standards for Classical Language Learning*." *Teaching Classical Languages*. 9.1 (2018): 54-63.
- Martin, R. and T. He. 2004. "Semantic Short-Term Memory and Its Role in Sentence Processing: A Replication." *Brain and Language*. 89(1): 76-82.
- Mayer, R. and V. Sims. "For Whom Is a Picture Worth a Thousand Words?: Extensions of a Dual-Coding Theory of Multimedia Learning." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 86.3 (1994): 389-401.
- Miller, M. "What College Teachers Should Know about Memory: A Perspective from Cognitive Psychology." *College Teaching*. 59.3(2011): 117-122.
- Muccigrosso, J. "Vocabulary in Latin Instruction." *Classical World* 97.4 (2004): 409-433.
- Nation, I. *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Niederle, M. and L. Vesterlund. "Gender and Competition." *Annual Review of Economics* 3 (2011): 601-630.
- Paivio, A. "Mental imagery in associative learning and memory." *Psychological Review* 3 (1969): 241- 263.
- Paivio, A. *Imagery and verbal processes*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1971.
- Paivio, A. *Mental representations: A dual coding approach*. Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Patrick, R. "Making Sense of Comprehensible Input in the Latin Classroom." *Teaching Classical Languages*. 6.1 (2015): 108-136.

- Potter, M. and L. Lombardi. "Regeneration in the Short-Term Recall of Sentences." *Journal of Memory and Language*. 29 (1990): 633-654.
- R Core Team. *R: A language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, 2018.  
Accessed at [www.R-project.org](http://www.R-project.org)
- Ray, B. and C. Seely. *Fluency through TPR Storytelling*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Blaine Ray Workshops, 2008.
- Snodgrass, J., B. Wasser, M. Finkelsteing, and L. Goldberg. "On the Fate of Visual and Verbal Memory Codes for Pictures and Words: Evidence for a Dual Coding Mechanism in Recognition Memory." *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*. 13 (1974): 27-37.
- Thrush, J. and R. Thrush. "Microcomputers in Foreign Language Instruction." *The Modern Language Journal*. 68 (1984): 21-26.
- Xu, J. "Using Multimedia Vocabulary Annotations in L2 Reading and Listening Activities." *CALICO Journal*. 27.2 (2010): 311-327.
- Yeh, Y. and C. Wang. "Effects of Multimedia Vocabulary Annotations and Learning Styles on Vocabulary Learning." *CALICO Journal* 21.1 (2003): 131-144.
- Yoshii, M. "L1 and L2 Glosses: Their Effects on Incidental Vocabulary Learning." *Language Learning & Technology*. 10.3(2006): 85-101.
- Yoshii, M., & Flaitz, J. "Second Language Incidental Vocabulary Retention: The Effect of Picture and Annotation Types." *CALICO Journal*. 20 (2002): 33-58.



## Appendix A

### Catullus Vocabulary

#### 32, 50, 69, 71, 76, 77

<i>amīcitia</i> –ae	f.	friendship
<i>dīvus</i> –ī	m.	god
<i>nāsus</i> –ī	m.	nose
<i>ops opis</i>	f.	wealth; power
<i>pectus pectoris</i>	n.	chest
<i>pestis pestis</i>	f.	plague, affliction
<i>vestis vestis</i>	f.	clothes
<i>crūdēlis crūdēle</i>		cruel
<i>dulcis dulce</i>		sweet
<i>iūcundus</i> –a –um		pleasant
<i>sanctus</i> –a –um		holy, sacred
<i>aspiciō -spicere -spexī -spectum</i>		look upon
<i>caveō cavēre cāvī catum</i>		beware
<i>ēripiō -ripere -ripuī -reptum</i>		take away, steal
<i>exerceō exercēre exercuī exercitum</i>		exercise, ply
<i>iaceō iacēre iacuī iacitum</i>		lie, recline
<i>ōrō ōrāre ōrāvī ōrātum</i>		pray, beseech
<i>pereō perīre perī peritum</i>		perish, die
<i>tegō tegere texī tectum</i>		cover; protect
<i>cur</i>		why
<i>nequiquam</i>		in vain, to no avail

#### 57, 74, 80, 89, 90, 91, 93

<i>fās</i> (indeclinable)	n.	divinely right
<i>fās esse</i> (+inf)		to be right
<i>gaudium</i> –ī	n.	joy
<i>hōra</i> –ae	f.	hour
<i>macula</i> –ae	f.	stain, blemish
<i>patruus</i> –ī	m.	uncle
<i>verbum</i> –ī	n.	word
<i>albus</i> –a –um		white
<i>ambo</i> –ae –ō		both

<i>ater atra atrum</i>	black
<i>fidus –a –um (+dat)</i>	faithful, loyal
<i>grātus –a –um</i>	pleasing, favorable
<i>hībernus –a –um</i>	wintry
<i>mirus –a –um</i>	marvelous, wonderful
<i>mollis molle</i>	soft, mild
<i>nēfandus –a –um</i>	unspeakable, abhorrent
<i>urbānus –a –um</i>	of the city
<i>valens valentis</i>	sturdy, healthy

<i>cognoscō cognoscere cognōvī cognitum</i>	get to know; (in the perfect) know
<i>nesciō -scīre -scīvī -scītum</i>	not know
<i>quiescō quiescere quēvī quētum</i>	rest, be still
<i>rēsideō -sidēre – sēdī —</i>	persist; remain seated
<i>spērō spērāre spērāvī spērātum</i>	hope
<i>vōrō vōrāre vōrāvī vōrātum</i>	devour, gobble up

**16, 21, 94, 105, 114, 115**

<i>arvum –ī</i>	n.	(tilled) field
<i>divitiae –ārum</i>	f.	riches
<i>finis finis</i>	m.	end; (pl.) territory
<i>fructus –ūs</i>	m.	crops, produce; profit
<i>insidiae –ārum</i>	f.	trap, ambush
<i>lepos lepōris</i>	m.	char, grace, wit
<i>mare maris</i>	n.	sea
<i>palūs palūdis</i>	f.	swamp
<i>prātum –ī</i>	n.	meadow
<i>saltus –ūs</i>	m.	country estate
<i>sumptus –ūs</i>	m.	cost, expense

<i>minax minācis</i>	threatening
<i>praeceps praecipitis</i>	headlong; sudden
<i>pudicus –a –um</i>	modest

<i>dēsīnō dēsīnere dēsīnī dēsīnitum</i>	cease, stop
<i>experior experīrī experitus sum</i>	try out
<i>fallō fallere fefellī falsum</i>	trick, deceive, mislead
<i>haereō haerēre haesī haesum</i>	stick, cling
<i>taceō tacēre tacuī tacitum</i>	be silent
<i>superō superāre superāvī superātus</i>	surpass

*frustrā*

in vain, to no avail

**63**

*furor furōris* m.  
*līmen līminis* n.  
*lītus lītoris* n.  
*nox noctis* f.  
*silva –ae* f.  
*sinus –us* m.  
*somnus –ī* m.

madness, rage  
 threshold  
 shore  
 night  
 forest  
 breast; bosom, refuge; bay, gulf  
 sleep

*indomitus –a –um*  
*nimius –a –um*  
*niveus –a –um*

untamed; violent  
 excessive  
 snowy

*canō canere cecinī cantum*  
*cieō ciēre cīvī citum*  
*decet decēre decuit (+inf)*  
*doleō dolēre doluī dolitum*  
*fugiō fugere fūgī fugitum*  
*furō furere — —*  
*lībō lībāre lībāvī lībātus*  
*pateō patēre patuī —*  
*soleō solēre solitus sum*  
*tango tangere tetigī tactus*  
*vagōr vagārī vagātus sum*

sing  
 move, set in motion, rouse  
 be suitable, be fitting  
 suffer pain, grieve, hurt  
 flee  
 be crazy, rage  
 pour a libation  
 lie open  
 be in the habit, be accustomed  
 touch  
 wander

*prope*

near, nearby

**66**

*coma –ae* f.  
*fluctus –ūs* m.  
*gaudium –ī* n.  
*lītus litoris* n.  
*medulla –ae* f.  
*sanguis sanguinis* m.

hair  
 wave  
 joy  
 shore  
 marrow  
 blood

*castus –a –um*

pure, chaste

<i>clārus –a –um</i>	bright, clear; famous
<i>dulcis dulce</i>	sweet
<i>jūcundus –a –um</i>	pleasant
<i>maestus –a –um</i>	sad, gloomy
<i>saevus –a –um</i>	savage, wild
<i>ēripiō -ripere -ripuī -reptum</i>	snatch away
<i>iungō iungere iunxī iunctum</i>	join
<i>oblīviscor oblīvī oblītus sum (+gen)</i>	forget
<i>optō optāre optāvī optatum</i>	wish for
<i>restituō restituere restitui restitūtum</i>	restore
<i>sedeō sedēre sēdī sessum</i>	sit
<i>tradō tradere tradidī traditum</i>	hand down, hand over
<i>tueor tuērī tutus sum</i>	look at, observe
<i>vix</i>	scarcely, hardly

**61.124-228**

<i>foris foris</i>	f.	door
<i>līmen līminis</i>	n.	threshold
<i>pūdicitia –ae</i>	f.	modesty
<i>senex senis</i>	m.	old man
<i>sīdus sīderis</i>	n.	star
<i>torus –ī</i>	m.	bed, marriage bed
<i>brevis breve</i>		short, brief
<i>cānus –a –um</i>		greyish-white, whitened
<i>iners inertis</i>		lazy, idle
<i>tremulus –a –um</i>		trembling
<i>caveō cavēre cāvī catum</i>		beware
<i>iūvō iūvāre iūvāvī iūvātum</i>		help
<i>licet licēre (+dative and infinitive)</i>		be allowed
<i>lūdō lūdere lusī lusum</i>		play
<i>pergō pergere perrexī perrectum</i>		proceed
<i>heri</i>		yesterday
<i>hodiē</i>		today
<i>penitē</i>		deep down inside

**61.1-123**

<i>carmen carminis</i>	n.	song
<i>collis collis</i>	m.	hill
<i>complexus -ūs</i>	m.	embrace
<i>coniūnx coniūgis</i>	m./f.	spouse
<i>flōs flōris</i>	m.	flower
<i>genus generis</i>	n.	kind, type, race
<i>gremium -ī</i>	n.	lap
<i>iūdex iūdicis</i>	m.	judge
<i>marītus -ī</i>	m.	husband
<i>mēns mentis</i>	f.	mind
<i>mūnus mūneris</i>	n.	duty; gift
<i>rūpēs rūpis</i>	f.	cliff
<i>specus specūs</i>	m..	cave
<i>integer integra integrum</i>		untouched, unblemished
<i>laetus -a -um</i>		happy
<i>niveus -a -um</i>		snowy
<i>roscidus -a -um</i>		dewy
<i>tenerus -a -um</i>		tender
<i>cingō cingere cinxī cinctum</i>		bind
<i>colō colere coluī cultum</i>		inhabit
<i>implicō (1)</i>		entwine, entangle
<i>moror morārī</i>		delay
<i>pellō pellere pepulī pulsum</i>		drive; strike
<i>quatiō quaterere quassum</i>		shake
<i>queō quīre quīvī</i>		be able

**39, 41, 43, 49**

<i>cūra -ae</i>	f.	care, concern
<i>dens dentis</i>	m.	tooth
<i>digitus -ī</i>	m.	finger
<i>grātia -ae</i>	f.	good will, favor; (pl.) thanks
<i>lingua -ae</i>	f.	tongue; language
<i>morbus -ī</i>	m.	illness
<i>nāsus -ī</i>	m.	nose
<i>nepōs nepōtis</i>	m.	grandson
<i>pēs pedis</i>	m.	foot
<i>quisquis quidquid/quicquid</i>		whoever

<i>bellus</i> –a –um	pretty, handsome
<i>pius</i> –a –um	dutiful, upright
<i>arbitror</i> (1)	observe, judge, reckon
<i>attingō</i> -tingere -tigī -tactum	touch upon, mention
<i>lavō</i> lavere lāvī lautum	wash
<i>lūgeō</i> lūgēre luxī luctum	mourn
<i>maneō</i> manēre mansī masnum	remain
<i>moneō</i> monēre monuī monitum	warn
<i>nōlō</i> nōlle nōluī	not wish
<i>poscō</i> poscere poposcī —(+double acc)	demand (X from Y)
<i>soleō</i> solēre solitum	be accustomed

<i>nimis</i>	too much
--------------	----------

**84, 85, 86, 92, 104, 107, 109**

<i>amicitia</i> –ae	f.	friendship
<i>auris</i> auris	f.	ear
<i>lux</i> lūcis	f.	light
<i>sāl</i> salis	m.	salt; wit
<i>ambo</i> –ae –ō		both
<i>assiduus</i> –a –um		constant, persistent
<i>candidus</i> –a –um		bright, brilliant, gleaming
<i>cārus</i> –a –um		dear; expensive
<i>commodus</i> –a –um		convenient, timely; beneficial
<i>fēlix</i> fēlīcis		fruitful; lucky, prosperous
<i>formōsus</i> –a –um		good-looking, buxom
<i>grātus</i> –a –um		pleasing
<i>iūcundus</i> –a –um		pleasant, delightful
<i>venustus</i> –a –um		lovely, attractive, charming
<i>fiō</i> fierī factus sum		happen; become, be made
<i>metuō</i> metuere metuī metūtum		fear; (w/ abl.) fear danger (from)
<i>nesciō</i> -scīre -scīvī -scītum		not know
<i>optō</i> (1)		wish
<i>spērō</i> (1)		hope
<i>taceō</i> tacēre tacuī tacitum		be silent
<i>fortasse</i>		perhaps

*postquam*  
*umquam*

after  
ever

### 51, 70, 72, 75, 87

*fidēs fidē*

f.

faith, loyalty

*beātus –a –um*  
*cupidus –a –um*  
*dulcis –e*  
*levis –e*  
*molestus –a –um*  
*tenuis –e*

blessed  
desirous, eager  
sweet  
light, insignificant  
troublesome, annoying  
slim, slender, slight

*diligō diligere dīlexī dilectum*  
*nūbō nūbere nūpsī nūptum (+dat)*  
*perdō perdere perdidī perditum*  
*rideō ridēre rīsī rīsum*  
*tegō tegere texī tectum*

love, cherish, be fond of  
get married  
squander, ruin, destroy  
laugh  
cover; protect

### 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, and 58

*bāsiū –ī* n.  
*dēliciae –ārum* f.  
*gremiū –ī* n.  
*ocellus –ī* m.  
*nepōs nepōtis* m.  
*saeclū –ī* n.

kiss  
delight  
lap  
eye  
grandson  
age, generation

*lepidus –a –um*

charming

*audeō audēre ausus sum*  
*cernō cernere crēvī crētum*  
*fleō flēre flēvī flētum*  
*invidēō –vidēre –vīdī –vīsum (+dat)*  
*lūdō lūdere lusī lusum*  
*mordeō mordēre morsī morsum*  
*pereō perīre perī peritum*  
*requīrō –quīrere –quisīvī –quisītum*

dare  
distinguish; perceive  
weep, cry  
envy  
play  
bite  
vanish, perish, be gone  
look for, ask about





## Why Learn Latin? Motivation for Learning a Classical Language<sup>1</sup>

**JOSHUA W. KATZ**

**UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN**

**KIMBERLY A. NOELS**

**UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA**

**AMANDA R. FITZNER**

**CARLETON UNIVERSITY**

### ABSTRACT

Few studies have examined why people learn classical languages, and none have grounded learners' reasons within theories of motivation for language learning. We conducted interviews with 12 advanced Latin learners and teachers to investigate why they chose to learn this classical language. A thematic analysis of the interview transcripts revealed nine themes. Some themes were consistent with Self-Determination Theory, including "intrinsic interest" (intrinsic motivation), "sense of prestige" (introjected regulation), and "program requirements" (external regulation), whereas other themes paralleled aspects of Gardner's Socio-Educational Model (SEM; e.g., "transferable language benefits" is consistent with the instrumental orientation). Some themes posited by extant motivational models were not evident in the transcripts, or necessitated a reinterpretation of extant constructs (e.g., the SEM's integrative orientation). Other themes that have not been addressed in modern language models pertain specifically to the learning of classical languages like Latin. For example, some participants suggested that learning Latin instills a disciplined or "methodical approach to learning," particularly for people with certain personality characteristics. The results of this study are discussed in terms of contemporary theories' capacity to describe motivation to learn classical languages and the implications of the findings for language pedagogy.

Learning new languages has been argued to be associated with a host of benefits, including cultural enrichment, cognitive development, social and educational advantages, and practical opportunities. Given these desirable outcomes, a significant concern of many language researchers and educators is how best to support learners to invest the time, energy, and dedication necessary to learn a new language. Despite significant research dedicated to the study of language learning motivation, few studies have been conducted concerning

---

<sup>1</sup> The authors are grateful to Dr. Kelly MacFarlane, the editor, and the reviewers for their insightful and constructive feedback on an earlier version of the manuscript. This research was funded by a Roger S. Smith Undergraduate Researcher Award from the University of Alberta to the first author.

the motivation of people to learn classical languages. Seeing as there exists a perception that classical languages like Latin and Ancient Greek are no longer widely used, they differ significantly from modern languages and may not necessarily attract the same students that modern languages do. The purpose of this study is to form a classification of reasons why people elect to study one classical language (i.e., Latin) and to consider how this typology corresponds with some current theories concerning motivation to learn modern languages. Our ultimate aim is to extend the discussion of language learning motivation beyond modern languages to the classical languages as well.

### ***The Socio-Educational Context of Latin Learning***

At one time, the Latin language was commonly taught in schools. During the 1923-24 school year, more American secondary students (30% of students in grade ten or higher) were enrolled in Latin than in all other foreign language courses combined (American Classical League 16). Today, many individuals view Latin as a “funny sounding, attention-getting, joke language,” and corresponding with this opinion, there has been a significant decrease in the number of Latin courses being offered and the number of students taking those courses, particularly in America (Ball and Ellsworth 77). In their 2011 survey of schools, Pufahl and Rhodes (265) found that, of those American secondary institutions that offered foreign language courses, the number that offered Latin decreased from 20% to 13% between 1997 and 2008. According to a recent report released by the American Councils for International Research (11), this number is now at 8.51%. At the university level, Goldberg, Looney, and Lusin (3) found that in the U.S., 16.2% fewer students took Latin in 2013 than in 2009.

The situation does not differ much outside of the United States. In Europe, an increasing number of countries are seeing fewer schools offering the subject. In Wales, for example, only 11% of secondary schools offered Latin as of 2015, while “teachers [reported] a variety of threats to the sustainable provision of Latin,” primarily cuts to Latin courses in schools (Bracke, Learning Latin 3). Belgium, France, and Malta, too, are witnessing declines in the amount of Latin being offered (Bracke, Bringing Ancient 35). According to Evelien Bracke, the only location where Latin education is not in serious jeopardy is in England, where 25% of secondary schools and 2% of primary schools offer courses and/or programs in this language (Bracke, The Role 2).

With few exceptions, it would thus appear that people are less interested in learning Latin than they used to be.<sup>2</sup> A number of reasons may partially explain this trend; however, the most discernible appears to be perceptions of the overall utility of the language. Students are more likely to pursue activities that produce immediate practical benefits to the exclusion of those that do not (Ordine 94). Unfortunately, courses like Latin, which do not possess readily appreciable positive outcomes, are deemed to be “without practical application” and incur diminished enrollment rates (Bracke and Bradshaw 1).<sup>3</sup> In line with the idea that Latin is of little practical value, even famed classicist Mary Beard (7) expressed how the only reason to learn Latin is to be able to read period texts. Adding to the problem, language and classics programs are being eliminated across North America as universities struggle to obtain funding to support more popular programs, meaning that it is harder now, more than ever, for people who might want to learn the language to enroll in Latin classes (Foderaro; Bradshaw).

### *Studies of Motivation to Learn Latin*

Unfortunately, few studies have explored Latin learners’ rationales for studying the language. A pair of studies from the 1920s conducted by Grise and Swan examined motivation to learn Latin among fourth-year Latin learners at the high school level and fifth-year learners in university (as cited in the American Classical League [ACL] 73-75). Some of the more common answers reported by respondents included Latin being a requirement for college admission, perceived benefits of transferring linguistic and metalinguistic knowledge to English and other modern languages, genuine enjoyment of the language, and perceived cognitive benefits associated with learning Latin. More recently, a large-scale investigation named the National Latin Survey (NLS; Goodman), was conducted with the goal of discerning what motivates middle and high school students and teachers to learn and/or teach Latin. The results from over 10,000 students revealed that the most frequently held reasons included, “learn vocab for SATs” (29.90% agree; 47.33% strongly

2 This downward trend is not specific to Latin, though. According to the Modern Language Association, over 650 foreign language courses were cut between 2013 and 2016 (Johnson).

3Although not evident in the themes for motivation, which will be described below, many of our participants claimed that Latin was “useless” as well. Take participant I, for example, who said, “If I’d first gone in and I only wanted to learn things if [they] had a practical implication, I probably wouldn’t have done Latin.”

agree,) “learn how to translate well” (40.31% agree; 36.24% strongly agree), and “improve my English skills” (34.49% agree; 41.64% strongly agree). Taken together, the results from these studies are similar in that they identify a desire to improve language skills, but differ in other respects (e.g., the NLS did not include an item for cognitive benefits, which was one of the more commonly cited responses in the Swan and Grise studies; ACL 73-75). While these studies are insightful, they do, however, have several limitations.

An essential methodological limitation of the previous investigations of Latin motivation is that these studies have provided minimal opportunities for respondents to freely express their reasons for learning Latin; such open-ended questions are important for avoiding assumptions about respondents’ observations and experiences and thereby tapping information that could otherwise go missing (O’Cathain and Thomas 2). Seeing as little is known thus far about Latin motivation, an important first step before creating closed-ended questionnaire items is to ask open-ended questions that can offer a broad picture of diverse perspectives. Unfortunately, the previously mentioned studies only included a small number of open-ended questions. For example, the NLS was primarily built around questions with rating-scale response options; although it did possess a short space for participants to report additional, not-otherwise mentioned motivations, the results of this question have not been released. In addition, the studies cited in the American Classical League (73-75) report are merely referred to as being based on “questionnaires.” One study did use an open-ended question to explore motivation to learn Latin, though. Hahn (34) interviewed the parents of home-schooled children enrolled in Latin and included an item on motivation. Parents were asked, “Why did you include Latin in your homeschool?” Commonly provided answers included: “English grammar” (146 mentions by participants), “vocabulary” (145 mentions), and “logic/critical thinking” (110 mentions). Although these parent-teacher insights are relevant, this study did not directly ask the learners their motives.

The other important limitation of these studies is that they have primarily focused on lower to intermediate-level learners, excluding those advanced-level learners like Latin instructors who engage with Latin regularly. The NLS, for example, only focused on Latin learners in grade school (Goodman). Although the Grise (ACL 73-74) and Swan (ACL 74-75) studies did focus on intermediate-level Latin learners (i.e., those who had been learning the language for four and five years, respectively), no study has explored the motivations

of advanced-level Latin learners.<sup>4</sup> This limited focus on lower-level learners is unfortunate because advanced, or “good language learners,” including those who become teachers, can provide insights into particular personal and social dynamics that contribute to successful language learning. According to Naiman et al., “the good language learner is someone who actively involves himself [sic] in the language learning process, either right from the beginning or later; he also finds ways to overcome obstacles, whether linguistic, affective or environmental; he monitors his performance; he studies, practices, and involves himself in communication” (39). We might also expect that advanced learners are more likely to be vested in Latin and, therefore, will possibly exhibit different and/or more diverse reason(s) to learn Latin than lower-level students. Given that the advanced Latin learners in this study are successful, they can be described as “good language learners.” Thus, the present study aims to fill a gap in the research literature on Latin learning motivation by attending to the motivation of advanced learners.

In sum, little is known about what motivates people to learn Latin; few studies have delved into this issue. Given the limitations of previous research, the first purpose of this study is to formulate a typology of some of the reasons why people, particularly advanced learners of Latin, enroll in Latin courses. The method consists of open-ended questions, the answers to which provide qualitative data (i.e., textual, rather than numeric). The second goal of this study is to contextualize Latin motivation within the theoretical frameworks of language learning motivation. Thus, it is necessary to describe some of the more popular theories of language learning motivation that could be applied in the Latin context.

### *Contemporary Theories of Language Learning Motivation*

Although little research exists on motivation to learn Latin, a sizeable literature does exist concerning learning modern languages. Much of this research is informed by one of four theoretical frameworks (McEwon et al. 20). The longest established framework, Gardner’s Socio-Educational Model (SEM) of language learning, maintains that motivation is a complex construct, including the intensity of desire and effort one puts into learning the language and an orientation, which is the reason one desires to learn the language (Gardner). Although Gardner points out that there can be many orientations (see Clément and Kruidenier), two orientations have been the focus of much research. The

---

<sup>4</sup> Although the NLS did survey teachers, these results have yet to be released.

instrumental orientation refers to reasons that pertain to pragmatic ends, such as obtaining a course grade or facilitating travel. The integrative orientation refers to an “openness to other cultural groups in general and a willingness or ability to adopt features of the other language group” (Gardner 85); an individual who exhibits an integrative orientation is one who wishes to learn a language in order to interact and possibly identify with the target language group (Masgoret and Gardner 126-127). According to the SEM, the orientation(s) of the learner, alongside attitudes towards the learning situation, is an essential predictor of the intensity of effort the learner will invest in learning, and ultimately linguistic outcomes (MacIntyre et al. 132).

Other theories, particularly Self-Determination Theory (SDT; Ryan and Deci), classify orientations as forms of regulation that vary in the extent to which the reason for engaging in the activity originates from the person’s interests and/or value system or originates from the circumstances or other people who impose the activity on the learner. This broad distinction is referred to as intrinsic vs. extrinsic motivation. A person who is intrinsically motivated finds the activity inherently interesting and satisfying, whereas an extrinsically motivated person carries out an activity to get some benefit or avoid a “punishment” from it (Ryan and Deci 55). Furthermore, extrinsic motivation is described on a continuum from regulation by other people or the circumstances (“external”), to self-imposed demands to meet internalized and/or socio-normative obligations (“introjected”), to voluntarily choosing to learn the language to achieve valued ends (“identified”), to an “integrated” orientation, in which the activity is interwoven in the person’s values and sense of self. Over the last 20 years, Noels and her colleagues have demonstrated how these forms of motivation pertain to effort and persistence in learning a new language (Noels et al., *Why Are You* 57-58).

SDT maintains that there are three fundamental psychological needs that must be met to sustain intrinsic motivation and support self-determined extrinsic motivation (i.e., identified and integrated regulations; Ryan and Deci 57). These needs include: autonomy, the perceived ability to determine one’s activities and behaviors; relatedness, a perceived social connection to others; and competence, the perceived ability to master challenges in a given domain. Based on the degree to which these needs are satisfied, the quality and intensity of motivation for an activity may differ. For example, Ryan and Deci (58) claim that the fulfillment of autonomy, competence, and relatedness are vital for people to feel

intrinsic motivation towards an activity (i.e., activities that people engage in because they are genuinely interested in them and find them rewarding), or to integrate extrinsically motivated behaviors into the self-concept.

Other theories, particularly those developed in the context of learning of English as a second or foreign language, have focused on the importance of imagined selves and communities. The L2 (second language) motivational self-system model, as proposed by Dörnyei, differentiates between the ideal- and ought-L2 selves (Dörnyei 13). The former refers to the language capabilities that an individual would like to have in an ideal world, whereas the latter refers to what language traits an individual feels he/she ought to have as specified by general expectancies. According to Dörnyei (13-14), “the ideal sense has usually been interpreted in the literature as the individual’s own vision for him/herself, while the ought self [describes] someone else’s vision for the individual.” By imagining a future ideal self that includes knowing and using a second language, an individual may be motivated to engage in second language learning. Coming from a different theoretical background, Norton (8) emphasizes the importance of an imagined community to which the language learner can belong, one that merits the learners’ investment of time and energy. Pavlenko and Norton (669) assert that “language learners’ actual and desired memberships in imagined communities affect their learning trajectories, influencing their agency, motivation, investment, and resistance in the learning of English.”

These four theories have usefully guided a good deal of research on language learning motivation. However, their utility in the Latin context may not be readily evident. For instance, the notion of an integrative orientation, in which one desires contact with the target language community, may not be relevant in the case of classical languages, where the target language community ceased to exist hundreds of years ago (except in some religious, academic, or aficionado circles). It may be more appropriate to frame orientations for learning a classical language in terms of the extent to which the reason is controlled by other people or determined voluntarily by the learner, as in SDT. Learners might envision themselves as fluent users of Latin; however, it is unclear what such an ideal-self means in the context of a language that has no living community. With this being said, it is also possible that a community of Latin learners, comprised of those who strongly identify with the Latin language, does exist. It is also possible that none of these frameworks can adequately describe Latin learners’ experiences, and a new framework,

or at least a modified framework, specific to classical languages is necessary. Importantly, these four theories are each quite complex, incorporating aspects of the social context, the learning situation, intergroup dynamics, and developmental processes. In contrast, the focus of this study concerns one aspect of motivation, namely the reasons, or orientations, for why students learn Latin.

### ***Purpose***

The primary purpose of this study is to extend the understanding of the diverse reasons that people choose to learn Latin. Accordingly, we employed a semi-structured interview so that participants would have the opportunity to express their reasons and not feel compelled to answer in line with predetermined options. In order to extend findings from previous studies, this study also focused on high-level Latin learners. This study was conducted in a Canadian context.

### ***Method Approach***

Due to the limited information on the issue at hand, a thematic analysis was employed to identify key themes or categories of responses, based on dialogue with participants. This analysis was conducted in accordance with the guidelines provided by Braun and Clarke (see Table 1; Braun and Clarke 87), although an extra step was added at the end, during which participants were asked to review the transcripts of their interviews and the manuscript to ensure that their responses were satisfactorily coded and discussed.



*Table 1: Adaptation of Braun and Clarke's Guide to Thematic Analysis*

Phase	Description of the process
1. Familiarize oneself with the data	Transcribing data (if necessary), reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas.
2. Generate initial codes	Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code.
3. Search for themes	Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme.
4. Review themes	Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (Level 1) and the entire data set (Level 2), generating a thematic 'map' of the analysis.
5. Define and name themes	On-going analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme.
6. Produce the report	The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis.
7. Review with respondents	Checking with participants to ensure that they feel their responses have been accurately represented.

### *Participants and Procedure*

Twelve participants were recruited via snowball sampling<sup>5</sup> (66.7% male,  $M_{age} = 39.58$ ,  $SD_{age} = 4.11$ ; nine of the participants were Caucasian). In order to ensure that as many relevant themes as possible were elicited, participants were recruited until saturation, which is defined as “the point at which the data collection process no longer offers any new or relevant data” (Dworkin 1319). Previous research has found that if the group is fairly homogeneous, data saturation is usually obtainable within the first 12 participants (Guest et al. 79).

All of the participants had graduated with or were currently enrolled in postsecondary degree programs. As the focus of this study was on more advanced Latin learners, only people who had at least two years of experience studying Latin in a formal language course were invited to participate. The mean age at which the participants started learning Latin was 15.08 years ( $SD = 3.23$ ). Most started to learn Latin when they enrolled in a formal course, but two of the participants initially taught themselves the language before enrolling in courses. A majority of participants learned Latin at a public institution (six of the ten participants who responded to this question), and of those who were instructors, most taught at public institutions (all but two, who taught at private schools). All of the participants had at least two full academic years of experience learning/using Latin, and the average number of Latin courses taken was 13.27 ( $SD = 10.49$ , min = 2, max = 30,  $N = 11$ ; one participant did not respond to this question and simply wrote “countless” where space was provided). Accordingly, the sample can be said to consist of advanced Latin learners.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> A classics professor who was an acquaintance of one of the authors was contacted and provided contact information for other potential participants. All other participants were recruited through acquaintances of the research team. Only participants who were considered advanced-level Latin learners were selected. As a minimum, this meant that the participant had taken at least two full-year Latin courses in total.

<sup>6</sup> For the purposes of this study, a Latin learner is defined as someone who has undertaken formal Latin education, primarily through formal courses in school. There is considerable debate over whether and where to draw the line between a language “learner” and “user”; for the present purposes we have used only the term “learner,” because virtually everyone learns Latin after their native language.

The majority reported that, as students, they were exposed to the grammar-translation method of teaching Latin, although some also learned using a combination of grammar-translation and other methods like the Cambridge and living Latin methods. Of those who were Latin instructors, most also taught using the grammar-translation method, although some tried to incorporate elements of the living Latin approach. To some extent, this emphasis on grammar-translation approaches might be due to the fact that these advanced-level learners had been learning Latin for a relatively long period of time; they were more likely to be products of the traditional grammar-translation approach rather than contemporary methods such as the living Latin approach.

At the time of the interviews, seven of the participants were currently engaged with the Latin language in some capacity. The sample consisted of three former Latin students at the high school level who were no longer taking Latin, four current university Latin instructors, two university professors who did not teach Latin but who used it for their own research (i.e., a history and a philosophy professor), and three high school Latin teachers, of which only one was still working at a school that offered Latin at the time of the study.

### *Materials and Procedure*

Face-to-face, semi-structured interviews were conducted in a quiet public locale convenient for the respondent. General topics of inquiry and potential follow-up questions were prepared and introduced by the first author, but otherwise the conversation was directed by the participant, with the exception that the interviewer tried to keep the conversation in line with the research interests (see Appendix A for a list of the main guiding questions). General topics of inquiry were based on previous research (i.e., past studies on Latin motivation such as the NLS), pilot testing questions,<sup>7</sup> and discussion among the researchers. The interview script included questions concerning initial motivation for and expectations about learning Latin, experiences learning Latin, perceptions of Latin, continued motivation for learning Latin, and (in the case of Latin instructors) experiences teaching Latin. While there is a breadth of potential questions that the researchers could have asked, the primary purpose of this study was to get a sense of participants' reasons for learning the language, and questions were selected with this goal in mind. The main focus of the interview was on participants' personal experiences learning Latin, but was

---

<sup>7</sup> Pilot testing consisted of close-ended questionnaires given to 33 university-level Latin learners.

not limited to just this perspective; participants were also asked why anyone else they knew was studying Latin and, in the case of teachers, why their students were studying the language. Upon arriving at the designated meeting location, participants were reminded of the purpose of the study and asked for permission to record the contents of the interview for later transcription. At this point, participants filled out the demographic questionnaire. The interview itself took an hour to complete. Upon completion of the interviews, participants were debriefed, thanked for their time, and given an honorarium.

### *Data Analysis*

During the interview process, notes were made by the first author after each interview in order to both direct future interviews and to track any noticeable initial trends in the interview. Upon completion of the interviews, the researchers transcribed the recordings for easier analysis. The researchers then closely read over all of the transcriptions and referred to the interview notes, thereby ensuring full immersion in the data (Braun and Clarke 87). Transcriptions were returned to participants later to ensure that participants felt that the transcriptions were accurate representations of themselves; the same was done with the manuscript itself. Ten participants agreed to review the documents; no one suggested substantive revisions.

Because the main goal of this study was to identify a diversity of reasons for learning Latin, the data were analyzed using thematic analysis. The goal of this analysis was to identify key themes (i.e., general overarching categories that are representative of the differing responses to a research question) pertaining to the participants' rationales for studying Latin, as well as other people's reasons, if known, in the transcriptions. Themes were not determined by the frequency with which a particular response occurred (i.e., a response that is seldom found may be nonetheless considered a theme; a frequently occurring response need not be considered a theme), but rather by the distinctiveness of the response (Joffe and Yardley 67). It is also important to note that themes do not simply emerge from the data; instead, they "must be actively sought out" (Taylor and Ussher 310). That is to say, in thematic analysis, the researchers create the themes. Here, thematic analysis was conducted following an adaptation of the aforementioned outline provided by Braun and Clarke (87).

After the researchers had fully immersed themselves in the data, initial codes were generated from the transcriptions using NVivo. Codes, in essence, are what make themes and can best be described as labels (Tuckett 81). Here, each code provided a specific snapshot of a reason why participants chose to learn Latin (e.g., “interest in stories and myth,” “good at languages,” and “unique as language”). On their own, each code does tell somewhat of a story, but it is not until they are combined with similar codes into larger themes that a true underlying rationale emerges. Thus, upon creating codes, they were combined to establish themes indicative of more all-encompassing motives for learning Latin. These themes were then assessed and reworked until a definitive picture emerged, at which point themes were given names. All of the researchers were involved in the aforementioned process of generating codes and themes; this predominantly involved individual readings of the transcriptions and larger group discussions.

### ***Findings***

The thematic analysis yielded nine different themes that we feel encompass the different motives reported by participants: “intrinsic interest,” “transferable language benefits,” “mastery and achievement,” “methodical approach to learning,” “interest in languages,” “program requirements,” “unique aspects of Latin,” “learning things for own sake,” and “sense of prestige.” Again, it is important to note that these themes were not formulated with the frequency of occurrence in mind; rather, themes were dictated depending on whether or not they offered a rationale for why participants studied Latin that differed from the other themes (see Table 2 for a summary of which participants referenced which themes). The following categories are ordered such that themes that were referenced by more participants come before those that were referenced by fewer participants (see Table 2).

**Table 2. Themes cited across participants. The number in parentheses indicates the number of participants who cited that particular theme.**

Theme (Total Number of Participants who Referenced a Given Theme)	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII
Intrinsic Interest (12)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Transferable Language Benefits (12)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mastery and Achievement (11)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Methodical Approach to Learning (11)	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Interest in Languages (10)	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X
Program Requirement (9)	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X		X
Unique Aspects of Language (9)	X	X	X		X	X			X	X	X	X
Learning Things for Own Sake (8)	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X		
Sense of Prestige (7)		X	X	X			X	X		X	X	

### *Intrinsic Interest*

The first theme, expressed by all participants, entailed a genuine interest in the content covered in the Latin course. For some participants, interest in the content took the form of an interest in the Latin language itself.

*Everyone in the class, myself included, was there because [they] wanted to be. Because we actually wanted to study Latin. (IX)*

*Overall, just hearing the word Latin releases endorphins for me....  
So Latin in a way is like a drug. (XI)*

Other responses did not so much indicate an interest in Latin; rather, they communicated an interest in various aspects of the closely associated Roman culture from which the language originates (e.g., mythology and stories, history, etc.).

*So what was I interested in?... Ancient mythology in general. (VII)*

*In studying it, I could also learn a lot more about ancient Rome.  
(IX)*

*Usually there would be some aspect of ancient culture that had really kind of gotten them hooked. (VII)*

According to some of the participants, interest in Roman culture was such a profoundly motivating reason that they were willing to continue learning Latin despite poor performance in previous courses.

*Some who weren't that proficient in language or Latin and... didn't really get a high mark... [enjoyed] the class because the class does not only focus on Latin... but also focuses on the Roman culture, Roman mythology, and Roman history. (XI)*

Expanding upon the notion of interest in Latin, a handful of participants reported that learning Latin served as a vehicle through which they could feel a closer connection with the people of ancient Rome. At its basis, this desire seemed to stem from the same underlying interest in the subject matter that motivated other participants (i.e., interest in ancient Rome), albeit expressed differently.

*I thought... as I was studying the language, I was getting more at the air these people breathed. It's like digging my fingers in the soil that they were walking on, or breathing the same air they were breathing.... It was as close as I could get to touching them without touching buildings they'd erected. And I didn't know how to get any closer. (II)*

*In a way, by learning Latin, [it] transported me.... In a strange way learning Latin allowed me to time travel. (XI)*

### **Transferable Language Benefits**

All participants discussed, to some extent, how studying Latin produces transferable benefits in terms of using other languages. That is to say, by learning Latin, one can improve one's ability in a different language without focusing one's efforts on that second language. This propensity should not come as a surprise given Latin's position as a parent tongue for many contemporary languages. It is important to note, however, that not all participants expressed language benefits as an initial motivator to learn the language; whereas some interviewees anticipated language-related outcomes, others discovered (or rationalized) this potential after already beginning to learn Latin.

The first specific area where participants reported experiencing transferable benefits was in terms of the Romance languages, which are the direct offspring of Latin.

*Latin's perceived as a foundational language and is a foundational language for a lot of Romance languages. (I)*

*It does also help you learn French, Spanish, and Italian. (VII)*  
*I've never studied Italian, but I can read an Italian newspaper*



*without too much trouble. It's just because, you know, it's so similar to Latin. (IX)*

Although not as directly related to Latin as the Romance languages, some interviewees also expressed how Latin shares a noteworthy connection with German that makes the language easier to learn should one have a background in Latin. Specifically, both languages use case endings to specify the different usages of nouns (i.e., nominative, vocative, accusative, genitive, dative, and ablative).

*When I took a semester of German, it didn't scare me because I was like, oh it declines just like Latin. Aha. (X)*

*When we got to the part about case endings in German... we didn't spend any time getting hung up... because we dealt with it thousands of times in Latin before. (II)*

Yet another transferable language benefit reported by participants pertains to English, which derives a majority of its vocabulary from Latin (Holmes and Keffer 47). Most of the participants who focused on transfer effects to English emphasized improved vocabulary and a better understanding of grammar rules.

*Latin itself helps improve your grammar because you need a very strong grammar base for Latin. (XI)*

*I tell my students when you learn Latin you acquire a superpower because you come across words you've never seen before, but because you know the prefixes and the different roots and stems... you can figure out the meaning of many words in English. (XI)*

*It makes you understand grammar in the abstract. It's good for English vocabulary building. (VI)*

*With the lower emphasis on fundamentals of grammar in a lot of English teaching these days... we end up just teaching students what's the subject of the sentence, what's the object of the sentence... how do parts of speech work. (VII)*

Finally, a handful of interviewees discussed how their decision to enroll in Latin was motivated by their desire to enter the medical field; although, not necessarily the case with new vocabulary today, a substantial quantity of words utilized in medicine were coined with Latin in mind (e.g., the 1886 English word neologism “contraception” derives its origin from the Latin verb “contra,” to be against or opposed to; Banay 20; Wulff 187). Unlike the other transferable benefits within this theme, which did not always serve to initially motivate people to learn the language, participants who mentioned improved medical vocabulary cited it as a primary reason why they studied Latin in the first place.

*When I'm reading anatomy or more medical textbooks... I can understand where the English word comes from. I can understand the Latin names or the classifications. (V)*

*It will help you... when you're studying sciences, when you study medicine, when you study law. All these have words and expressions directly from Latin. (XI)*

*You know your parents want you to be doctors. You know what doctors can use? Latin. (X)*

### ***Mastery and Achievement***

Most participants reported scoring among the top students in their Latin classes; this academic success in Latin encouraged them to pursue further study.

*By... the first year I was in university, I could outtalk my instructors in Latin grammar. (VI)*

*I was very good. I was one of the best Latin students in that course.... That's who ends up your Latin teacher, right. (VII)*

A number of the instructor-participants took this a step further by explaining how in their experience as teachers, the students who are more likely to continue taking Latin beyond the introductory course(s), tend to be those who obtain higher grades.

*It tends to be the ones who are really good at it and enjoy it [who continue taking Latin]. (XII)*

*Generally, if they have time in their program and, especially, if they get really good grades in Latin 101, they want more. Those A's are a mighty carrot. (III)*

One interviewee also noted how he was inspired to learn Latin, in part, because of a previously discovered aptitude for language learning, which differs from the above instance of achievement in that, here, competence in a specific domain made one want to expand their engagement to a different, but related activity.

*I had done quite well in [Ancient] Greek, so I expected similar in Latin. (XII)*

More generally, participants expressed how overall language competence can lead to higher levels of achievement in Latin, or to a greater liking for the language.

*I think... people... [who] were good at French liked it. (II)*

*You need to have the combination of intrinsic interest in the subject matter with a certain amount of language ability. (VII)*

*It's pretty easy to tell the kind of people who have a real knack for it.... Some people just are good at this kind of thing and some people aren't. (VI)*

While many participants claimed that achievement served as a motivating factor to learn Latin, one participant demonstrated how success may not necessarily be the most important factor based on their persistence in Latin study after initial failure.

*I took Latin in my first year and failed it miserably.... But I was stubborn and so I took it again the next year. So I retook first year Latin as a night class and did very well. Got an A. (X)*

### ***Methodical Approach to Learning***

Traditionally, Latin study does not include much of an oral component; instead, language learners focus more on reading and translation. Regardless of whether this practice is true of contemporary pedagogy, it makes sense that individuals who believed that they would exhibit aptness for Latin might demonstrate a greater interest in and the ability for the language. In line with this reasoning, multiple participants referenced how Latin favors those who have aptness for memorization.

*I think it's a fairly structured method with a lot of memorization of grammar. (IV)*

*People who could memorize liked it. (II)*

A number of participants also referenced how people with a mathematical or scientific approach to learning tended to excel in the language. What exactly defines a “mathematical thinker” is unclear, but participants commonly described such people, quite literally, as those who are strong in the math and sciences. In part, the notion that mathematical thinkers tend to do well in Latin seemed to come about because participants learned Latin through the grammar-translation approach; whether active Latin learners would make similar assertions remains unclear.

*I'm in mathematics, so that's just kind of the way I like to think about things. Start from the foundation and build up.... It's an expression. (I)*

*The ones that did very well and the ones that continued [learning the language] tended to be really mathematical thinkers.... If someone was finding the beauty and art in math, they were finding the beauty and art in playing with Latin. (X)*

Further evidence for specific processes that are involved in the study of Latin comes from participant responses in which they likened reading the language to solving a puzzle. In the context provided by these participants, Latin is considered a challenge that one engages in—this notion, in itself, might be reason enough to learn the language.

*It's like putting together a puzzle. (VIII)*

*It's almost like doing a jigsaw puzzle where things fall into place in a very organized sort of way. (III)*

*It's more of a... puzzle to be solved or a challenge to be met. (IV)*

Extending the idea of Latin as a challenge, a small number of participants also mentioned how studying the language is beneficial for the mind, primarily because it is so difficult.

*I didn't have any clear goals for it aside from just sort of a general kind of mental calisthenics. Exercising the brain. I think learning any language is really good for that, but particularly when it's something [where] the structure's quite different. (X)*

*It helps create a sense of discipline when it comes to studying because you need to be disciplined in order to study Latin. (XI)*

### **Interest in Languages**

A number of participants discussed how a general interest in languages spurred on their decision to learn Latin—all participants reported having studied at least two other

languages other than English (LOEs; including other “dead languages;” i.e., Ancient Greek;  $M=3.25$ ,  $SD=.97$ ). While this theme, like the aforementioned category, “intrinsic interest”, does involve interest, the two were deemed to be separate motivational orientations; the first focused on Latin-specific interest, whereas participants who expressed this theme cited a more general fascination that encompassed Latin.

*I learn languages as a hobby. So I've taught myself any number of languages that I can read. (VI)*

*I've always loved languages. I've loved etymology since I was a kid. And I like seeing the patterns in the language. (II)*

*I think it was just a fascination I've always had with words and with language in English. (IX)*

### **Program Requirements**

This theme highlights the fact that people learn Latin on account of school requirements, which was the case for many of the interviewees, albeit participants' experiences differed in the degree to which the language, itself, was mandatory. At one extreme, as expressed by both students and teachers, Latin is a required course at some junior high schools and high schools.

*All students... have to take an introductory course at least and are very much encouraged to take Latin 20. (V)*

*I was actually made to take it because it was part of our curriculum. So I didn't really have much choice in the matter. (VIII)*

Transitioning to a university setting, participants no longer stated that Latin was a requirement for all students. Rather, the language may be compulsory depending on what major, minor, etc. a student has declared (e.g., classics).

*In the second year of my university career I declared a major in classics and Latin was one of the requirements for the completion of that degree. (XII)*

*I had a Master of Arts in classics.... So I needed... three or four years of Latin and [Ancient] Greek. (II)*

Additionally, for students in select programs that use Latin in some capacity (e.g., theology), taking a course(s) in the language may not necessarily be required, but may still be considered advantageous.

*I get a fair number of theology students.... Latin is a pretty standard thing to do if you're a Catholic seminary student. (III)*

Furthermore, according to some of the university-level instructor-participants, students also enrolled in post-secondary Latin courses in order to fulfill their various program distribution requirements. For instance, certain students are/were required to take an LOE from a list of languages, including Latin. While program requirements certainly play a significant role in terms of motivating students to take a language, it is also evident that additional motivating factors must come into play in order for a student to choose Latin from a predetermined list of potential courses. To this extent, perhaps "program requirements" does not serve as a standalone motivation for learning Latin. As a note, "program requirements" are composed of both Latin language requirements and LOE requirements on account of their similarity.

*I was just registered as a BA, so [I] needed six [language] credits. (X)*

*There is the language other than English component.... Perhaps they needed an LOE. (III)*

### **Unique Aspects of Latin**

Interviewees discussed how Latin has an appeal in that it is unique compared to other modern LOEs. It is this uniqueness, in its various forms, that compels some people to

study the language. One such distinctive aspect, which several participants referenced, was the flexibility associated with word order in Latin. For example, the phrase, “the teacher teaches the students” can be written many ways that are functionally equivalent: “magistra docet discipulos,” or “discipulos magistra docet.”

*It's a passage... around the fall of Troy when snakes are coming out of the water and Virgil describes the snakes using... more 'S' sounds. And [it's] like serpentine in the passage.... Independent word order is something that English doesn't have. (I)*

*I like the fact that it's an inflected language and you can move words around in a sentence for rhetorical emphasis.... In English, you know, we have a certain fairly fixed word order and so on, but you actually do neat things in Latin. (IX)*

At the same time, Latin is a language that adheres to a relatively strict set of rules, with few exceptions (e.g., there are few irregular verbs that do not follow one of the main conjugation patterns). Some participants found this regularity to be an appealing facet of the language.

*I like the fact that it's really structured. That's how I like thinking about things. To me, the language makes sense. (I)*

*I like the fact that the pronunciation is uniform. In English we have so many kinds of irregular pronunciations and rules. You couldn't expect to know [them] as a new learner. (II)*

For all of the language's differences, though, there is one idiosyncrasy that stands out among the rest: Latin is commonly perceived as being a “dead language” and, as such, there is a belief that there is typically no spoken component associated with it (see Coffee; Gascoyne; Hunt; Rasmussen for a discussion of oral Latin instruction). For students, especially those who do not enjoy speaking in class, this can be particularly attractive.

*Latin is great because, in general, you don't do little dialogues, and skits, and play acting. How do I go to the drugstore and buy head medication? (III)*



*The thought is amongst classicists that Latin is appealing precisely because [the students] don't have to speak it.... Some students hate that kind of thing... and don't want to be involved in that kind of stuff. (VI)*

*There are a number... who look at Latin who realize it's a dead language. I won't have to talk in class. (XII)*

### **Learning Things for Their Own Sake**

Participants who expressed this theme were similar in that they placed significant value on learning and education itself. In other words, a topic that one studies does not need to serve a greater purpose; studying Latin for the sake of studying Latin is a legitimate motivation.

*I think studying for its own sake is the most valid thing. Anything for its own sake is the most valid thing a person can do.... There's a satisfying feeling in knowing what something means and not being ignorant about it. (II)*

*I consider learning things in general to be important for me. Like as an important part of my identity. And I consider Latin to be a subset of that. An important aspect of a good education. (I)*

*The value in learning Latin is learning Latin. (X)*

In some instances, participants attributed the idea of learning something for the sake of learning to those of a more intellectual background. Included under this category are those who become Latin/classics professors in order to continue working with that which they enjoy (i.e., Latin and/or the Roman culture).

*You have an intellectual background that puts Latin and education above some, say, sports options.... People that know Latin are gonna be of a more intellectual scholarly disposition than people that don't. (V)*

*It's the kind of thing that you do if you are a typical academic aspiring type.... There aren't a whole lot of obvious practical things that you do with Latin, so I think you get a lot more people who are in it for the life of the mind.... Most of the people in my Latin and Greek classes wanted to be academics.... If you really love it, you want to do more. And that means grad school. (III)*

### ***Sense of Prestige***

The final theme that was created from the transcripts explains how people learn Latin because of the sense of prestige associated with it.

*They also saw it in a way as being a little bit prestigious.... 'I know Latin, oh.' (X)*

While seven of the participants referred to this notion, few (three) identified it as a motivator for themselves, personally; for the rest of the interviewees who addressed this issue, the prestige associated with Latin was attributed to other individuals, either generally or in specific. Regardless of who the speaker was, he/she expressed similar ideas in terms of where this prestige stems. Firstly, participants referenced the small number of Latin learners in contemporary society and the relative difficulty of actually finding a place to learn the language.

*The seeds are there for that kind of idea that if fewer people than before do it, then maybe it makes someone a better person. (II)*

*It's a language that very few people speak. And it creates a sense of wonder—the fact that I'm one of the chosen ones... to speak a language that nobody else [speaks]. You become a member of the private club when you learn Latin. (XI)*

*I would say [the people who know Latin would] be high status in the sense that it's not really offered everywhere. (VIII)*

Secondly, interviewees expressed how Latin is associated with higher levels of education, and that being more educated is associated with belonging to a higher social class.

*They were all people who had money and who were... cultivated in various ways.... They all knew some [Latin].... I think it was just considered a good idea to study Latin because it was part of what educated people were supposed to know. (IV)*

Thirdly, participants associated knowing Latin with belonging to a high-status group (i.e., someone who studies Latin either wants to associate him/herself with high-status people, or he/she already belongs to a perceived “upper class” and feels compelled to learn the language). Several individuals further extended this notion by identifying racial trends in the enrollment rates of Latin classes.

*We had a lot of prominent people in the class. Or children of prominent people, rather. (IV)*

*No, I wouldn't say it was terribly diverse.... It is still an upper middle-class Anglo-Saxony kind of pursuit. (III)*

*It's got that... Cambridge, Oxford kind of flair to it.... You do see it as kind of like an old White dude... thing, in a way where it's sorta tapping into that old school social hierarchy nobility kinda stuff. (X)*

Also worth noting, some participants (one of whom studied Latin in the United Kingdom) expressed how the language is connected with a higher level of education and the upper class more so in Britain and Europe than elsewhere.

*It is, furthermore, a language that was used—and continues, to some extent, to be used—as a marker [of] class privilege and... in general, a hierarchical society all over Europe. (VII)*

*The Brit education, for a long time, emphasized Latin and Greek, for partly arbitrary cultural reasons, to a huge degree.... If you wanted to get into good secondary schools, knowing Latin and [Ancient] Greek was important.... There certainly is a perception in Britain that knowing Latin is a part of class and privilege. (VII)*

Directly contrasting the idea that Latin is a language studied for the purpose of prestige, some participants claimed that through learning Latin, they sought to enter/remain in groups of like-minded “cool” people.

*I thought, ‘this is fun. This is what cool nerdy people do....’ Somebody who likes obscure things. Somebody who has interests about topics that are not what everybody on every street corner is fond of. (III)*

*I felt a kind of kinship with them I guess because it seems like a very rare thing now for anyone to be interested in. (II)*

### **Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to explore advanced-level learners’ motivations to learn Latin. A qualitative method involving extensive, open-ended interview questions was employed in order to elicit in-depth responses about participants’ experiences and rationales for learning Latin. Thematic analysis of the interviews revealed nine themes or categories that represent different reasons for learning the language. The themes included motifs that have already been identified in previous research on motivation for learning classical and modern languages. They also included themes that have not been identified in previous research, pointing to ways in which classical language learning can inform modern language learning. This discussion begins with an overview of these themes, followed by a consideration of the study’s limitations and future research directions, and ends with some implications for teaching classical and modern languages.

Studies on motivation to learn Latin have identified numerous reasons why people choose to learn the language, and the respondents in the investigation at hand also articulated

some of these reasons. The most commonly cited theme in this study, and one that has been found in every study of Latin motivation thus far, is the theme called “intrinsic interest.” This theme is indicative of one who has an interest in Latin itself or in the history and culture associated with learning Latin. The process of learning the language (and/or about the culture) is invigorating and satisfying, in and of itself. Previous investigations have yielded similar results. For instance, both Grise and Swan found that one of the most common reasons for learning Latin was because students liked the language, especially specific authors, while the NLS found some rationales for enrolling in Latin that also expressed enjoyment in learning the language, including “Latin is just awesome” and “I like ancient mythology” (ACL 73-75; Goodman). In investigations of modern languages, this theme is also commonly described as intrinsic motivation (Noels et al., *The Development*) or as positive attitudes towards learning the language (Noels et al., *Perceptions of Teachers’ 31*). Similar to this theme, we also created a theme called “interest in languages.”

Another theme identified in previous research is “transferable language benefits”, reflecting the notion that knowledge of Latin can facilitate the acquisition of modern languages that are derived from Latin, including specialized vocabulary in English. This theme corresponds with the potential pragmatic gains characterized by the instrumental orientation in the SEM (Gardner 12). It also corresponds with identified regulation in SDT; that is, the form of regulation in which learning a language facilitates obtaining a personally valued goal. For instance, we found participants who expressed how, by learning Latin, they might more easily learn medical terminology, which might assist them in a valued career in that field. Whereas other studies usually differentiate between subtypes of this orientation (Rosenbaum 288-291), we have chosen to combine benefits to English, benefits to LOEs, and learning Latin to learn specialized terminology all under one umbrella term because they all speak to the common desire to attain a valued, personal goal (in this case, greater linguistic knowledge) through learning Latin.

In line with past research, participants also cited the theme of meeting “program requirements.” Many of our participants either studied or taught Latin at universities where there was a requirement to learn a language other than English and/or were enrolled in classics programs, which dictated that one take classical language courses. This theme parallels the SEM’s notion of an “instrumental orientation” (Gardner 12), in which one learns the language to achieve a utilitarian goal. It is also indicative of external regulation

as described by SDT, whereby one learns the language because of pressures or rewards imposed by other people or by outward circumstances (Ryan and Deci 61). It is noteworthy that this reason was not among the most cited responses in the NLS (Goodman); given that the participants in that study were in high school, where Latin might not have been a requirement; it might be that this orientation only becomes salient in contexts where the learners' autonomy is at issue.

Turning now to those themes that have only been glossed over in prior studies of Latin motivation, the theme "sense of prestige" was also evident in the interviews. While the NLS did report a related, lesser-cited response reflecting the desire to "be different from other kids" (Goodman), in the present study, prestige was linked to a sense of a belonging with a highly educated, high-status community, rather than just a desire to be unique. Similarly, one participant repeatedly referenced "cool nerdy people," referring to a group of like-minded individuals who study Latin and suggesting a sort of community associated with learning Latin. Thus, in contrast with modern languages, which are tied to speech communities of native speakers, the Latin community is more vaguely defined, or, perhaps even, self-defined. Although a speech community could emerge from "Living Latin" courses and immersion camps (Lloyd), the community is perhaps better described as one of affinity, comprised of members who share a common interest or goal. Another possibility is that Latin learners define the group to which they belong for themselves and do not depend on other outside criteria to define it for them. This theme perhaps best corresponds with Dörnyei's concept of a unique ideal L2 self, or with Norton's notion of an imagined community—that is, an idealization of a community to which the learner belongs and within which the learner is valued (Kanno and Norton 241). It also arguably reflects Gardner's (16) concept of the integrative orientation (i.e., people learn a language in order to interact with the language community). This theme could also be considered with reference to the need for relatedness, as articulated by SDT (i.e., participants want to continue to interact with those whom they feel a connection with; Ryan and Deci 64).

We also created a theme called "mastery and achievement". The closest any previous study has come to referencing this theme is to say that participants found Latin easier than their other subjects (ACL 74-75; Goodman). Here, we similarly found that participants continued to learn Latin because they found that they were capable of doing well in it. In terms of SDT, this theme is directly representative of the competence

component (Ryan and Deci 58); that is, when people feel they are competent at an activity, they engage more actively in the activity for more self-determined reasons (i.e., intrinsic motivation and/or identified or integrated regulation). It also reflects Clément's notion of linguistic self-confidence, which he suggested has motivational implications for language learning and willingness to communicate outside the language classroom (Sampasivam and Clément 25).

Some other themes were alluded to in past studies, but not to the same extent that they were touched upon here. For example, "methodical approach to learning" entailed various aspects that were not referenced in either of the studies from the 1920s or the NLS (ACL 73-75; Goodman). Grise found that 47% of participants "believed that the study [of Latin] furnished good mental training" (one of the codes within the larger category of "methodical approach to learning"), however, other aspects of this theme were not covered in his study (ACL 73). The same can be said for "unique aspects of Latin," where the only overlapping code within our study and another study is the lack of an oral component. Interestingly, these themes do not fit well within any of the theories of motivation described above; this is perhaps because they are unique to the Latin language. Moreover, these themes may be unique to the grammar-translation approach to teaching/learning Latin.

Lastly, we created one theme that has not been mentioned in previous research on Latin learning. Latin was not just important in terms of what many of our participants did professionally, but also in terms of their self-concepts. Take Participant I, for example, who said that "[he considers] learning things in general to be... an important part of [his] identity" (i.e., the integrated regulation component of SDT; Ryan and Deci 62). Here, we also have evidence of the volitional and autonomous action described by SDT; that is, people are deciding to enroll in Latin classes of their own accord. While there is evidence of this theme in the case of SDT (i.e., the theme is not completely novel), this theme has yet to be mentioned in terms of the previous literature of Latin motivation and is new in this context. We called this theme "learning things for own sake."

In sum, the themes or orientations articulated by the participants reflected the four motivational theories to different extents. Pragmatic reasons, including attaining course credit and facilitating understanding of other languages and jargons, correspond with Gardner's instrumental orientation, and the desire to belong to a group of Latin

users was arguably in line with Gardner's notion of an integrative orientation, although Norton's more general construct of desiring to join an "imagined community" seems to better capture the participants' sentiments given the more abstract nature of the group relative to specific speech communities. Dörnyei's "ought-self" (and SDT's introjected regulation) was most apparent in the theme "sense of prestige," but also present in the theme "transferable language benefits." Despite the mention of the ought-self, none of the participants elaborated on their ideal-self. That is not to say that it did not come up in the interviews, though. All of the participants were asked the following question: "In an ideal world where you can be an ideal version of yourself, to what extent would that incorporate Latin?" (see Appendix A). Every participant indicated that they would like to incorporate Latin into their ideal-self to some degree. While this lack of variability may be expected in these advanced Latin learners, it underscores that these participants value Latin. Finally, all of SDT's various forms of regulation (or "orientations"), with the exception of amotivation, were reflected in the above themes. The themes "unique aspects of Latin" and "methodical approach to learning" do not easily fit into one of the motivations described by SDT or the other theories.

In addition, it is worth noting that there were a number of potentially troubling perceptions about the Latin language. For instance, some participants believe that Latin is elite and prestigious. Such a belief might discourage some people from studying the language, however it is also possible that this identification as a distinctive, even "geeky," group might encourage a sense of community among people who value this relatively esoteric knowledge and practice. Further, multiple participants claimed that Latin attracts learners who believe that Latin courses do not require learners to speak up in class as is the case in foreign language courses. Although a teacher-fronted, grammar-translation pedagogy might appeal to a shy language learner, given the rise of active Latin, Latin classes might involve more face-to-face communication than this belief suggests. Whether or not these perceptions correspond with the actual practice in the classroom is beside the point; what is important is that these perceptions exist about the language. Accordingly, future endeavors to address these perceptions could provide potential learners with an accurate sense of what Latin courses are like; this might, in turn, attract more, or perhaps different, people to the study of this classical language.



### ***Limitations and Future Directions for Research***

There are several limitations to this study that point to directions for future research. Because the study at hand was focused on advanced-level Latin learners and qualitative in nature, the scope was necessarily small. Thus, more qualitative studies are needed to represent groups with other experiences learning Latin (e.g., introductory-level learners, people who dropped out, immersion camp participants, clergy, etc.). Future studies should also verify whether or not the themes identified in the present study, especially those that have not been identified elsewhere in the motivation literature, are generalizable to a larger group of learners. This replication can be done using larger-scale quantitative surveys, as was done in the case of the NLS study of lower-level students (Goodman).

Furthermore, given that most studies of Latin motivation have been centered in the United States (Bracke and Bradshaw 2), it would also be important to investigate motivation in other countries where Latin plays a role in educational, religious, and professional institutions and traditions. The present Canadian study is one step to broadening this perspective, but a systematic comparative study across several countries where Latin is taught, including Canada, USA, UK, Italy, and other nations, would provide greater insight into cross-national variations in the link between personal meaning and motivation for learning Latin, on the one hand, and the ideological positioning and practical utility of Latin, on the other hand.

Another limitation is that the information gathered in the present study was limited to self-reports of motivation. Self-reports of diverse motivational constructs have been shown to be important predictors of many educational and social outcomes related to modern language learning (see Lamb et al., for an overview). Nonetheless, it is essential to examine how motivational constructs, such as the self-reported motivational orientations, predict active and autonomous engagement in learning Latin (e.g., participation in class; homework completion; continuation and attrition) and Latin literacy and oral skills. As part of this endeavor, it would be important to adopt longitudinal and/or experimental (intervention) designs to determine whether, for example, motivation assessed earlier predicts Latin competence later in time, or vice versa. Longitudinal studies would also provide insights into motivational trajectories and how they are affected by contextual and personal dynamics (cf., Noels et al., *The Development*).

### ***Practical Applications***

Understanding the reasons why students study Latin and connecting these reasons to different theoretical frameworks can help teachers support their students' motivation and language learning success. For instance, some students will come to the Latin classroom with an intrinsic interest in the language and culture, and according to SDT an instructor can help maintain this interest by structuring the course and communicating with the student in a manner that fosters the learner's sense of autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Kusurkar et al. 978). Autonomy is supported by providing opportunities to engage in personally meaningful activities; competence by providing structured feedback and challenges to develop mastery; and relatedness by establishing a classroom climate in which each member feels valued and cared for (Kusurkar et al. 979-981).

Undoubtedly, not all students share this intrinsic interest, and some are more concerned with completing a requirement or attaining another goal apart from enjoying the process of learning Latin. To promote a more self-determined (extrinsic) orientation, teachers might emphasize how knowing Latin offers benefits that the student might find important (thereby supporting autonomy inside and outside the Latin classroom). Given the sense of distinctiveness and connectedness that comes from engaging with others who share an interest in Latin, teachers could also help students to realize this sense of community and envision their ideal Latin-self.

### ***Conclusion***

The purpose of this study was to determine why people study Latin. By conducting a series of interviews with advanced-level Latin learners, we have corroborated some results of past studies of Latin motivation but have also identified new themes. Moreover, the themes that we found demonstrate how theories of language learning motivation can be used to explain motivation to learn Latin. It is our hope that this study will spark increased interest in motivation to learn classical languages from a social psychological vantage point.

**WORKS CITED**

- American Classical League. *The Classical Investigation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1924. Print.
- American Councils for International Education. [\*The National K-12 Foreign Language Enrollment Survey Report\*](#). 2017. 13 Sept. 2018.
- Ball, Robert J., and J. D. Ellsworth. "The Emperor's New Clothes: Hyperreality and the Study of Latin." *The Modern Language Journal* 80.1 (1996): 77-84. Print.
- Banay, George L. "An Introduction to Medical Terminology." *Bulletin of the Medical Library Association* 36.1 (1948): 1-27. Print.
- Beard, Mary. *Confronting the Classics: Traditions, Adventures and Innovations*. London: Profile Books. 2013. Print.
- Bracke, Evelien "Bringing Ancient Languages into a Modern Classroom: Some Reflections." *Journal of Classics Teaching* 16.32 (2016): 35-39. Print.
- . "Learning Latin in Wales: Report on Research and Practice." *CWCH: Cymru Wales Classics Hub*, 30 Nov. 2015. <http://cymruwalesclassicshub.weebly.com/learning-latin-in-wales-report.html>. Accessed 13 Sept. 2018.
- . "The Role of University Student Teachers in Increasing Widening Participation to Classics." *Widening Participation and Lifelong Learning* 18.2 (2016): 111-129. Print.
- , and Ceri Bradshaw. "The Impact of Learning Latin on School Pupils: A Review of Existing Data." [\*The Language Learning Journal\*](#) (2017).
- Bradshaw, James. "[University of Alberta eliminates 20 arts programs](#)." *The Globe and Mail*, 19 Aug. 2013. Accessed 13 Sept. 2018.

- Braun, Virginia and Victoria Clarke. "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3.2 (2006): 77-101. Print.
- Clément, Richard and Bastian G. Kruidenier. "Orientations in Second Language Acquisition: I. The Effect of Ethnicity, Milieu, and Target Language on their Emergence." *Language Learning* 33.3 (1983): 273-291. Print.
- Coffee, Neil. "Active Latin: Quo Tendimus?." *Classical world* 105.2 (2012): 255-269. Print.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán. "The L2 Motivational Self System." *Motivation, Language Identity and the L2 Self*. Ed. Dörnyei, Zoltán and Ema Ushioda. Great Britain: Multilingual Matters. 9-42. 2009. Print.
- Dworkin, Shari L. "Sample Size Policy for Qualitative Studies Using In-Depth Interviews." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 41.6 (2012): 1319-1320. Print.
- Foderaro, Lisa W. "[Budget-Cutting Colleges Bid Some Languages Adieu.](#)" *The New York Times*, 3 Dec. 2010. Accessed 13 Sept. 2018.
- Gardner, Robert C. *Motivation and Second Language Acquisition: The Socio-Educational Model*. New York: Peter Lang. 2010. Print.
- Gascoyne, Richard C. "Latin for Communication: New York State Syllabus." Paper presented at the American Philological Association, 1985. Washington.
- Goldberg, David, Looney, Dennis and Natalia Lusin. "[Enrollments in Languages Other than English in United States Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 2013.](#)" *Modern Language Association*. (2015).
- Goodman, Elliott. "[National Latin Survey.](#)" *National Latin Survey*. June 2014. Accessed 13 Sept. 2018.

- Guest, Greg, Bunce, Arwen, and Laura Johnson. "How Many Interviews are Enough? An Experiment with Data Saturation and Variability." *Field Methods* 18.1 (2006): 59-82. Print.
- Hahn, Christine. "[Latin in the Homeschooling Community](#)." *Teaching Classical Languages*, 4.1 (2012): 26-51. 11 Sept. 2018.
- Holmes, Thomas and Ronald L. Keffer. "A Computerized Method to Teach Latin and Greek Root Words: Effect on Verbal SAT Scores." *The Journal of Educational Research* 89.1 (1995): 47-50. Print.
- Hunt, Steven. "Latin is Not Dead: The Rise of Communicative Approaches to the Teaching of Latin in the United States." *Forward with Classics: Classical Languages in Schools and Communities*. Ed. Holmes-Henderson, Arlene, Hunt, Steven, and Mai Muisé. London: Bloomsbury. 89-108. 2018. Print.
- Johnson, Steven. "Colleges Lose a 'Stunning 651 Foreign-Language Programs in 3 years." *The Chronicle*, 22 Jan. 2019. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Colleges-Lose-a-Stunning-/245526>. Accessed 23 Mar. 2019.
- Joffe, Helene and Lucy Yardley. "Content and Thematic Analysis." *Research Methods for Clinical and Health Psychology*. Ed. Marks, David F. and Lucy Yardley. Thousand Oaks: Sage. 2004. 56-68. Print.
- Kanno, Yasuko, and Bonny Norton. "Imagined Communities and Educational Possibilities: Introduction." *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 2.4 (2003): 241-249. Print.
- Kusurkar, R. A., Croiset, G., and Olle Th. J. Ten Cate. "Twelve Tips to Stimulate Intrinsic Motivation in Students Through Autonomy-Supportive Classroom Teaching Derived From Self-Determination Theory." *Medical Teacher* 33.12 (2011): 978-982. Print.

- Lamb, M., K. Csizér, A. Henry, and S. Ryan (Eds.). *The Palgrave Macmillan Handbook of Motivation For Language Learning*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. In press. Print.
- Lloyd, Mair. "Living Latin: An Interview with Professor Terence Tunberg." *Journal of Classics Teaching* 17.34 (2016): 44-48. Print.
- MacIntyre, Peter D., Potter, Gillian K., and Jillian N. Burns. "The Socio-Educational Model of Music Motivation." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 60.2 (2012): 129-144. Print.
- Masgoret, A. M. and R. C. Gardner. "Attitudes, Motivation, and Second Language Learning: A Meta-Analysis of Studies Conducted by Gardner and Associates." *Language Learning* 53.1 (2003): 123-163. Print.
- McEwon, Maya Sugita, Noels, Kimberly A. and Kathryn Everhart Chaffee. "At the Interface of the Socio-Educational Model, Self-Determination Theory and the L2 Motivational Self-System Models." *The Impact of Self-Concept on Language Learning*. Ed. Csizer, Kata, and Michael Magid. Great Britain: Multilingual Matters. 19-50. 2014. Print.
- Naiman, Neil, Fröhlich, Maria, Stern, H. H., and Angie Todesco. *The Good Language Learner*. Toronto: Multilingual Matters. 1996. Print.
- Noels, Kimberly A., Clément, Richard, and Luc Pelletier. "Intrinsic, Extrinsic, and Integrative Orientations of French Canadian Learners of English." *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 57.3 (2001): 424-442. Print.
- , Clément, Richard, and Luc Pelletier. "Perceptions of Teachers' Communicative Style and Students' Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation." *The Modern Language Journal* 83.1 (1999): 23-34. Print.

- , Pelletier, Luc G., Clément, Richard, and Robert J. Vallerand. "Why are You Learning a Second Language? Motivational Orientations and Self-Determination Theory." *Language Learning* 50.1 (2000): 57-85. Print.
- , Vargas Lascano, Dayuma I., and Kristie Saumure. "[The Development of Self-Determination Across the Language course: Trajectories of Motivational Change and Dynamic Interplay of Psychological Needs, Orientations, and Engagement.](#)" *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* (2019).
- Norton, Bonny. *Identity and Language Learning: Extending the Conversation*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 2013. Print.
- O'Cathain, Alicia and Kate J. Thomas. "'[Any Other Comments?](#)' Open Questions on Questionnaires - a Bane or a Bonus to Research?" *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 4.25 (2004). Web. 11 Sept. 2018.
- Ordine, Nuccio. *The Usefulness of the Useless*. Trans. Alastair McEwen. Philadelphia: Paul Dry Books. 2017. Print.
- Pavlenko, Aneta, and Bonny Norton. "Imagined Communities, Identity, and English Language Learning." *International Handbook of English Language Teaching*. Ed. Cummins, Jim, and Chris Davison. Boston: Springer. 2007. 669-680. Print.
- Pufahl, Ingrid, and Nancy C. Rhodes. "Foreign Language Instruction in U.S. Schools: Results of a National Survey of Elementary and Secondary Schools." *Foreign Language Annals* 44.2 (2011): 258-288. Print.
- Rasmussen, Susan Thornton. "Why Oral Latin?" *Teaching Classical Languages* 6.1 (2015): 37-45. Print.
- Rosenbaum, Eric. "The Application of Transfer Between Foreign Languages." *The Modern Language Journal* 33.4 (1949): 287-294. Print.

- Ryan, Richard M., and Edward L. Deci. "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions." *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 25.1 (2000): 54-67. Print.
- Sampasivam, Sinthujaa, and Richard Clément. "The Dynamics of Second Language Confidence: Contact and Interaction." *Multiple Perspectives on the Self in SL*. Ed. Mercer, Sarah, and Marion Williams. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. 2014. 23-40. Print.
- Taylor, Gary W. and Jane M. Ussher. "Making Sense of S&M: A Discourse Analytic Account." *Sexualities* 4.3 (2001): 293-314. Print.
- Tuckett, Anthony G. "Applying Thematic Analysis Theory to Practice: A Researcher's Experience." *Contemporary Nurse* 19.1-2 (2005): 75-87. Print.
- Wulff, Henrik R. "The Language of Medicine." *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 97.4 (2004): 187-188. Print.



## **Appendix A**

### **Latin Interview Script**

Interview questions are as follows. Potential follow-up questions and probes are not included as those differed depending on the participant.

- How would you describe your experience learning Latin?
- Why did you initially decide to enroll in a Latin class?
- What did you expect learning Latin to be like?
- How did these expectations compare to your actual experiences?
- What motivated you to continue studying Latin?
- (In the case of teachers) What do you find motivates your students to learn Latin?
- To what extent is being a Latin language learner important to your overall sense of self?
- In an ideal world where you can be an ideal version of yourself, to what extent would that incorporate Latin?



## The Thomas Project: Evaluating a Web-Based Latin Research Project for Learners at Multiple Levels

ELIZABETH MANWELL  
KALAMAZOO COLLEGE

### ABSTRACT

This article describes the author's experience in fashioning a research experience for undergraduate Latin students and in evaluating the success of the project in its early stages. The author developed an on-line translation and commentary project for her students, using a medieval encyclopedia, Thomas Cantimpratensis's *Liber de natura rerum*. After addressing the challenges of finding a text and creating the assignment, the article shows how reflecting on such a project can lead to concrete improvements in the student experience. The article outlines the areas of evaluation of the project—rubric, assignment, and student engagement—and summarizes the results of the evaluation to date.

As a professor at a liberal arts college with a senior thesis requirement, I have witnessed the impact that research components can have on students' intellectual growth. For many years I have seen colleagues in the sciences, and social sciences mentor students in their labs and integrate them into their research. Students depart from these experiences not only more knowledgeable about their specific discipline but also more confident about their problem-solving abilities.<sup>1</sup> While these kinds of research opportunities are frequently enjoyed by undergraduate students in the social and natural sciences, they are comparatively less common in the humanities.

---

1 Undergraduate research experiences in sciences and social sciences are a staple of many undergraduate programs today, and their efficacy is attested anecdotally (e.g., Braid) and by a systematic study of outcomes (e.g., Lopatto 2006 and 2010). The Council on Undergraduate Research (<https://www.cur.org/who/organization/mission/>) lists among the benefits of undergraduate research increased retention and the development of "critical thinking, creativity, problem solving and intellectual independence." Moreover, a recent white paper published by CUR details the benefits further: "Research is the ultimate form of active learning. Students learn to conceptualize a problem, generate potential solutions, test them, and revise the question. Skills developed include perseverance, communication within groups, and ability to collaborate with others in ways that will help them work confidently with peers and supervisors in the workforce" (Altman, et al., 4).

One reason for this, in classics specifically, is that language proficiency (in Latin and Ancient Greek, as well as French, German and Italian) can create a barrier to original research. An advanced undergraduate, if she has begun language study in her first or second year of college, may gain sufficient proficiency to complete a major but may still lack the skill required to do original research as we typically conceive of it in classics. Despite this restriction, some professors, including many at liberal arts colleges, have embraced digital media as platforms that can enable students to engage in meaningful original scholarship, even if they possess limited language skills. These students also gain the added benefit of familiarity with digital technology.<sup>2</sup>

In this essay, I set forth my experience in fashioning The Thomas Project (<http://blogs.kzoo.edu/thomasproject/>), a digitally based long-term research project for my students, and the results of my evaluation of the project to date. The project allows students to translate portions of a medieval encyclopedia, which has no English translation, and to provide vocabulary and basic notes to aid others in reading the text. Students not only gain experience working with an unfamiliar prose text but also have opportunities to develop research and collaborative skills. In addition, they are contributing to the field by creating new knowledge that can benefit and be used by others. In the course of this essay, I consider the challenges I faced in finding an appropriate text, identifying an affordable digital platform, and writing an effective prompt. I also detail my evaluation of the project. When I first decided to reflect on the project, I considered what I wanted to know about its efficacy. The following questions guided my process:

- Do students gain tangible and meaningful research experience from the project?
- Is the assignment clear to students?
- Does it feel achievable?
- Is the completed product of sufficiently high quality to call it “original research”?
- How might I improve the project?

Finally, I explore the concrete gains that students make when doing this kind of research. Students not only improved their Latin reading abilities, but they also had a greater sense

---

2 Projects such as Homer Multitext (<https://www.homermultitext.org/>), the Herculaneum Graffiti Project (<http://ancientgraffiti.wlu.edu/hgp/>), Dickinson College Commentaries (<http://dcc.dickinson.edu/student-contributors-0>), and the World of Roman Women (<https://www2.cnr.edu/home/sas/araia/worlds.html>) are examples of digitally-based projects that have provided (in varying ways) undergraduate research experiences for students. On the possible added benefits of digitally-based projects, see Kolowich.

that their translation work was meaningful and that knowledge of Latin was valuable.<sup>3</sup> I believe that this kind of project is scalable to nearly any level (beyond Latin 1) and could be effectively used with secondary school or college students. The engagement that I see in students at lower levels, who are not already committed to continuing their study of Latin, has persuaded me that this kind of project motivates and engages early learners and may encourage them to continue their study of Latin.

### THE PROJECT

The initial question that motivated my project is this: how do I, as a specialist in ancient languages, create opportunities for my Latin students *at all levels* to engage in meaningful original research? One might well question whether this in and of itself is a goal worth pursuing. Let me be clear—I acknowledge that a first-year Latin student is not going to be able to conduct the kind of independent research in classics that a senior major, or a graduate student, or an instructor can do. Nor should that be the goal. However, research suggests that students who see themselves as participants in an intellectual conversation and perceive their work as valuable often demonstrate greater investment in the discipline they are studying.<sup>4</sup> Finding opportunities where students are producers of knowledge can help them hone their Latin skills, while at the same time encourage their collaborative and problem-solving skills, build a sense of resilience in the face of intellectual challenges, and foster a sense of satisfaction when they reach a high bar in their work. The challenge, of course, is to find areas in which students can work toward these skills in a meaningful project, one which is appropriately scaffolded and where all of them can achieve success.

### DESIGNING THE PROJECT

Several years ago, I learned about the Homer Multitext Project, which professors at Furman University and the College of the Holy Cross use to engage students in meaningful original research (Blackwell and Martin). Christopher Blackwell and Thomas Martin assert (and demonstrate) that this is possible for classics students, and that technological

<sup>3</sup> There are numerous ways in which this assignment, especially since it is scalable to various levels of ability, can help build the skills for interpretive reading, articulated in the American Classical League's Standards for Classical Language Learning (9-12).

<sup>4</sup> See above, note 1, and Boyer Commission (especially 15-18).

developments have enhanced their ability to perform original, useful work for an “audience of more than one” (Blackwell and Martin). Since that time, I struggled to find a project that would suit my needs. My school has no special archives and limited support (financial and human) for any such venture. The technology needed to be something I could master easily and would not quickly become obsolete. In addition, I was interested in fashioning a long-term project that could be used by students in upper-level Latin classes, no matter the course topic—yet, it needed to be related to my spheres of knowledge. Consequently, I had real difficulty defining a project—if it related to poetry or the late republic/early principate (my interests), how could it work when I teach prose, the late empire, or things even more far-flung? Finding something sufficiently generic and adaptable, but not too far outside of my comfort zone proved to be my first major hurdle.

I had nearly given up, when fortuitously, in the course of my research during summer 2015, I stumbled upon a medieval encyclopedia of natural phenomena written in Latin, Thomas Cantimpratensis’s *Liber de natura rerum*. Between A.D. 1230 and 1245 Thomas, a priest in what is now Belgium, compiled an encyclopedia, following a model that had been handed down since antiquity. Divided by category (e.g., human anatomy, the soul, quadrupeds, insects, etc.), and drawing on prominent ancient and medieval scholars for its information, Thomas’s *Liber* attempted to categorize and define the natural world. It was the basis for some still later medieval encyclopedias and offered a view of 13<sup>th</sup> century Europe by detailing the confluence of history, science, and faith in entries that reflect what Thomas and his fellows knew or believed they knew about the world around them.

Though there exists a scholarly edition of the complete manuscript (edited by Helmut Boese and published in 1973) and a few translations of various portions into other languages (a section on human anatomy into Dutch, for example), there is no English translation of this work. This struck me as an opportunity: a translation of this text would fill a void in the scholarship. In addition, students would have opportunities to study and contextualize these entries by investigating confusing or obscure references. Moreover, while the Latin is quite straightforward and regular, the entries of the encyclopedia are sufficiently varied in topic, length, and complexity, so that I could find entries that would apply to whatever the course content (see below).<sup>5</sup> Finally, students in our department

---

<sup>5</sup> For example, in a course on Vergil’s *Georgics*, students translated entries on various plants that occur in the poem (e.g., *de platano*, *de salice*, *de tilia*). In a course on fairy tales, by contrast,

are required to do a junior seminar paper of significant length as well as a senior research project, in which they engage in higher-level research that requires them to synthesize and integrate knowledge. Thus, advanced students who work on the project in several classes over a period of years might find that the *Liber* itself leads to a provocative research topic for one of these assignments. By incorporating a unit on the *Liber* in each of my upper-level Latin classes, I believed that I could support a long-term, on-going research project for my students where they are contributing to the production of knowledge through the creation of original translations and commentary.<sup>6</sup>

Once I had identified a text for my students to translate, I had to decide how to structure the assignment to that they could reliably improve their Latin language skills, as well as produce a translation that would be useful to others. First, I looked for models: projects that were user-friendly, possible to replicate using the platforms supported at my institution (mainly [Wordpress](#)), and easy for the students to learn. Given how much work I was going to be asking them to do simply in working with the Latin, I did not want them also to have to learn to code, for example. Of the models I explored, Dickinson College Commentaries offers a format that looks clean and is easily navigable, using multiple tabs for vocabulary, notes, and media (<http://dcc.dickinson.edu/>). Since this was also replicable using a simple Wordpress template, and since it is a fairly straightforward platform for students to use, I structured the site initially as a series of posts where students could easily input data for each of the following tabs: Latin text, translation, vocabulary, and notes.

The next stage was to think about the assignment itself. I wanted to emphasize some critical aspects about process in addition to working on content. It was important to me that students recognize how much intellectual as well as tedious and painstaking labor goes

---

students worked on fantastical creatures (e.g., *de chimera*, *de monocerote*, *de pegaso*).

6 My selection of the *Liber de natura rerum* was a complete accident, but I would recommend looking to the medieval world for texts that still await a translation, accessible commentary, or both. My interests in ancient agriculture and medicine make the *Liber* a great choice for me, and the variety of entries means that students in Latin 102 can complete a 5-line entry, whereas I might have an advanced class complete 30 lines. The Latin is standard, and many of the topics intriguing, which helps with student buy-in. However, there are all kinds of great texts that an instructor might build a project around: saints' lives, fantastic voyages, historical narratives, and, of course, scientific treatises. Great places to start include [digilibLT](#) for late antique prose texts and the [University of Chicago's guide to medieval texts](#). White provides links to all sorts of useful sites related to her work on medieval bestiaries, as well as numerous other genres.

into creating a professional entry. Building opportunities for revision was also important since many students seem (for understandable reasons) to look only for the final correct or acceptable translation. However, scholars quickly learn the joy and pain of revisiting one's work, and I also hoped to cultivate this habit. Finally, of course, I wanted the actual work they produced—typing out the Latin text, its translation, the notes, and vocabulary—to be accurate and thoughtfully done. Therefore, I initially crafted an assignment that allowed students to work in pairs on 25-30 lines of Latin text (see Appendix 1 for the most recent version). Students would need to write a draft of their translation, and then meet with me in person. At this meeting, we could go over stumbling blocks in the translation and identify places where a note or gloss might be particularly useful. Students could then revise and be assured that what they were posting to the site was largely accurate.

Upon designing the assignment, I also developed a rubric to assess how well they achieved the goals of the project: an accurate copy of the Latin text, an accurate and elegant translation of the passage into English, an appropriate set of vocabulary to assist a reader of the Latin text, and a set of notes to answer possible questions about the places, individuals, and events referred to in the text (see Appendix 2).<sup>7</sup> I designed the rubric after examining several sites that are recognized as on-line peer-reviewed publication venues for classical texts and commentaries, such as [Dickinson College Commentaries](#), [The Online Companion to The Worlds of Roman Women](#), and [Suda On Line](#). I also explored other models created by professional classicists or informational technologists, such as the collaborative [Vergil Project](#), [James J. O'Donnell's commentaries on Apuleius's \*Apology\*](#), and [The Confessions of Augustine](#). The rubric categories reflect what I saw to be the salient aspects of these online edited or peer-reviewed venues. Thus, the rubric allowed me to evaluate the extent to which the students achieved a professional, publication-worthy entry with the plurality of points weighted toward an accurate and elegant translation. I distribute the rubric to students along with the assignment, so they can see the breakdown of the project, clearly understand the kinds of work required, and allot their efforts accordingly. It also aids the ease and consistency with which I grade the project.

---

<sup>7</sup> My resources for rubric-based grading were primarily Blumberg, and Stevens and Levi. I used Barkley and Howell Major to think through the use of a rubric, as well as assessment design more generally. The AAC&U offers several excellent publications on rubric construction and use (as well as examples), including a new substantive publication and excellent starting point, *We Have a Rubric for That* (McConnell, et al.).



## EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

To date, I have used the project in six Latin courses: four upper-level, one intermediate, and one beginner 2.<sup>8</sup> Over the first four iterations, I tweaked the assignment in various ways, since I was trying to respond to the needs of each class. Although students in each cohort appeared to enjoy the project, I was unsure whether they were deriving the kinds of benefits from it that I had intended, and those which independent research ideally promotes. As a result, I applied for and was awarded a grant from my institution to assess the success of the project during the summer of 2017, allowing me to revisit these first four iterations of the project. Some basic questions that I hoped to answer about the project included (as stated above):

- Do students gain tangible and meaningful research experience from it?
- Is the assignment clear to students?
- Does it feel achievable?
- Is the completed product of sufficiently high quality to call it “original research”?
- How might I improve the project?

After looking at both qualitative and quantitative measures, I posited that I could discern some basic information about the value of the project for my students. Two documents that shape the experience are under my control: the assignment and the rubric. Therefore, part of my work was to evaluate these against models judged to be successful by professionals who engage in digitally-based translation work, and education specialists who promote and design assessment rubrics. The other piece would be to try to judge the student experience of the project. This would take the form of gleaning specific comments about the project from course evaluations, a survey given to all students who had participated in the project (a quantitative survey, but with a place for qualitative comments after each section), and analyzing the scores for all classes in each iteration of the assignment, while recognizing that my sample is still so small, it is not likely to yield statistically significant results.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> While I originally conceived of this project as one that I would use solely in upper-level Latin classes, it went so well when I piloted it in winter 2016 with an advanced Latin class that I decided to use it again in spring 2016 with my intermediate Latin students.

<sup>9</sup> Although all scores have been high, since I want work of publishable quality, I desire scores as close to 100 as possible.

My hypothesis prior to evaluating the project was that the rubric would require significant revision. I have developed and used rubrics for a handful of classroom projects and departmental student requirements, but I believed that the nature of the project and the likelihood of unanticipated pitfalls would require multiple and extensive reworkings of the rubric. On the other hand, drafting project assignments was something I have done almost every term, with—I thought—a fair amount of success. Therefore, I examined the rubric, using information culled from manuals on student assessment and rubric writing to gauge its ability to reflect student attainment accurately (AAC&U; Blumberg; Stevens and Levi). I also carefully looked at it against several student entries, to make sure that the elements that I thought essential to an entry of professional quality were reflected and were given appropriate weight.

The rubric divides student work into five categories: (1) the Latin text (accuracy of copy), (2) the translation (attention to grammar and syntax, accuracy, mechanics, and elegance), (3) vocabulary (inclusion of appropriate terms, accuracy of the entry and definition), (4) notes (judicious choice of information and accuracy) and (5) partnership (evidence of shared work and successful collaboration). Although the goal of creating a rubric was to be able to offer consistent evaluation of the quality and professionalism of the student work, anecdotal student comments suggest that it proved to be a useful guiding document for them as well. Since I give the rubric to the students when I distribute the assignment, it shapes their work, clearly showing my emphasis on accuracy and detail, especially in translation.

The assignment went through several iterations, based in part on the student population in each class. The first group comprised advanced students whom I divided into pairs. Because of the success of the first group and their enthusiasm for the project, the next term, I tried the assignment with a lower intermediate group. These students worked in teams of three and required more guidance and a more detailed assignment. Advanced students completed the next two sets of submissions, and so I reverted to a less detailed assignment and required fewer drafts and meetings (though I tweaked the assignment each time, either in length or more general guidelines). The final two groups, who completed it after the initial summer 2017 evaluation, were a beginner 2 and a high intermediate/advanced combined class.

Although the assignment changed each time, there were some carry-overs. In each version, I explain who Thomas Cantimpratensis is and the nature of the *Liber* in brief. I define the areas in which they will need to provide work. I cite dictionary resources that may aid them, especially for medieval terminology. Finally, I require at least one meeting with the group. While finding model assignments for this kind of project was not easy, I decided to evaluate this part of the project in two ways. First, I looked at it alongside a tried-and-true model for this kind of project: Ann R. Raia and Judith Lynn Sebesta's [Online Companion to the Worlds of Roman Women](#), also a web-based translation project. In addition, I calculated mean, median, and mode for the scores in each of the four initial iterations of the project, which I thought would at least tell me which set of students was best able to meet the professional-quality bar I set as a standard. I further considered that looking at the version of the assignment that the most successful cohort used might possibly give clues about which version of the assignment was most efficacious.

I also wanted to evaluate the students' experience of the project. Even if I could show by other measures that it is a worthwhile project, it would mean little if students were not invested in it. Thus, I sat down to analyze their perceptions as best I could. Some information I gleaned from student feedback on the course evaluation forms, although students did not consistently comment on the project, making it an imperfect tool for measurement. Instead, I created a survey of the project, so that students could respond to specific questions about their perceptions of the efficacy of the project in three distinct categories: (1) building their language skills, (2) building general academic skills, and (3) contributing to a body of knowledge (see Appendix 3). I developed this survey after the fourth iteration, and although the response rate was low, I now employ it after every class completes the project, as a required component.<sup>10</sup>

To summarize, my evaluation of the project took several steps. I looked at the most recent version of the rubric and examined it alongside models formulated by those who study assessment tools and techniques. I also evaluated the assignment in terms of student outcomes and alongside a model for a similar kind of project, which has had a long life and demonstrable success. Finally, I surveyed students to obtain both qualitative and quantitative measures of their experience of the project.

10 As more students participate in the project, response rates have risen (and my sample size has grown), making information about the impact of the project on students more accurate, and thereby more useful.

## RESULTS

I want to emphasize that at this point, the evaluation of the project is still tentative. To date, I have had a small set of students participate in the project.<sup>11</sup> Student responses to the survey are few, and the differences between the class averages are in no way statistically significant. Nevertheless, the process of systematically evaluating the project was incredibly useful to me and allowed me to craft a much more coherent assignment for my students.

The first piece I evaluated was the rubric, convinced that it was going to be the Achilles heel of this project. Instead, I was pleased to see that the effort I had put into its initial design and occasional revision had produced a tool that I found accurate and efficient in allowing me to evaluate aspects of the students' work that I perceived as crucial, and that communicated to the students the aspects of the project that were essential for its success. Not only did my rubric conform in its essentials to those that I had evaluated as models, but it also reflected an emphasis on task-based learning appropriate to the goals of this assignment. Thus, in various ways, the aspect of the project about which I felt most insecure was on the whole the least problematic part.

By contrast, as a long-time writer of paper-prompts, test questions, and group project assignments, I thought that the assignment prompt was likely the strength of my project. I could not have been more wrong. The chart below (Figure 1) details the student participation and raw outcomes for all six classes, including the first four sets, which were the subject of the summer 2017 study. As is evident, there were numerous variables in each set of students who participated in the project. Four sets comprised advanced level students, whereas individuals at the intermediate level were still learning the subjunctive and its uses, for example, while amid their work on the project, and the beginner 2 students had not yet learned it. In addition, there were far more intermediate students, and they were assigned to larger groups and worked with a comparatively small section of text. While the size of the advanced level classes was more or less consistent, the number of lines they translated, the amount of time they had to complete the assignment, and the percentage of their final grade that it comprised varied in each iteration.

11 For the period of the initial evaluation (the first four iterations), forty-three students participated. However, the number of distinct individual participants is somewhat lower (thirty-three), since several students participated in the project in two or three different courses. The number of participants is now up to fifty-nine (representing forty-six distinct individuals).

Figure 1: Project participation by term

Term	Course	Number of Students	Lines translated	Average score
Winter 2016	Latin 475 (Fairy Tales)	8 (2 per group)	30	92
Spring 2016	Latin 201 (Intermediate)	21 (3 per group)	7	93
Winter 2017	Latin 415 (Catullus)	7 (2 per group, 1 individual)	25-30	91
Spring 2017	Latin 425 (Vergil's <i>Georgics</i> )	7 (two pairs, one trio)	25-30	91
Fall 2017	Latin 425 (Aulus Gellius)	7 (two pairs, one trio)	10	92
Winter 2018	Latin 102 (Beginner 2)	9 (3 per group)	5	94

One consolation was that overall, students performed very well on the assignment, generally meeting my expectations, with occasional understandable errors in translation, syntax or grammar (see Figure 1). However, what was most interesting to me—though not statistically significant—was that at the time of the initial study, the class that had performed best was the least experienced group. This was true even when compared with advanced students who also translated a seven-line section of text.

The greatest difference between the two classes was that I intentionally created a more detailed assignment for the intermediate students, one that required multiple drafts of pieces of the project (i.e., translation, notes, and vocabulary), multiple due dates for each piece, and two meetings with me to go over stumbling blocks and ensure their success. By scaffolding this assignment more deliberately, requiring separate due dates for each portion of the assignment, and having meetings at various points to help guide and correct their work, the end product was, unsurprisingly, of a higher quality than that of their more experienced peers, to whom I gave much less direction and for whom I required only one preliminary draft of the translation prior to the final submission.

When I set my assignment side-by-side with an example assignment for the *Online Companion to the Worlds of Roman Women*, I found that the latter had several advantages over mine in precisely these same ways.<sup>12</sup> It required students to do a good deal of basic research upfront and complete multiple drafts of the work and emphasized that, as an edited work, the submissions need to be of superior, professional quality. I heavily relied on the initiative of my students, without offering them the kind of staged guidance that I offered to my intermediate students or that the *Companion* assignment required of collaborators.

The results of the survey were likewise not statistically significant (with only a 30% response rate in summer 2017, now up to 41%), yet the data offer some useful information (see Appendix 3). Students overwhelmingly agreed that the project helped them build their Latin skills in multiple ways (with scores on four questions pertaining to the utility of the project in Latin skill-building ranging from 3.9 to 4.8 out of 5). Students rated the project's ability to improve their general academic skills somewhat lower overall (4.1 to 4.6 out of 5). In particular, students rated lowest the project's assistance in building their research skills. Finally, in terms of their sense of the project as being a meaningful exercise in the building of new knowledge, student responses ranged from 3.9 to 4.6 out of 5.<sup>13</sup>

Perhaps most illuminating were the individual comments. While most were overwhelmingly positive, the negative ones were of particular interest, as I wanted to remedy the deficits I had already observed in the assignment. The student comments here offered some guidance about what might be improved. One comment in the section on general academic skills stood out:

*I think the one thing that is difficult with this project is finding outside information about different names referenced in the text. It would be cool to study some of the names that come up in class, even if just for a little bit.*

---

<sup>12</sup> I had the great good fortune to hear Ann Raia present a paper, "Students Teaching Students: Implementing Goals for Undergraduate Research, Active Learning, and Collaboration," at the CAMWS annual meeting at Waterloo, Ontario in April 2017, just prior to evaluating my own project. Dr. Raia generously provided her audience with a sample assignment for the *Companion*, which I used in evaluating my own assignment (see above, n. 10).

<sup>13</sup> Student averages from the summer 2017 evaluation are slightly different, but vary little from subsequent survey submissions, except that perceptions of their value of the work have improved.

And a comment on the section on personal impact also gave me pause:

*Aside from other students at K, in our class and previous classes, I don't really comprehend the community of other students and schools working on this project. Perhaps more emphasis on this community would yield more positive results in this section. I valued this project for helping me grow as a student of Latin. Not much thought was given to the fact that this was my first publication and contribution to Latin scholarship and academia. Upon reflection, this element of the project is really inspiring, but while I was working on the project, these ideas weren't present in my mind.*

It is evident from these comments that not all students understood what was at stake in completing this assignment, nor was I doing an adequate job contextualizing the project prior to students engaging in their group activities. Indeed, the comment above suggests that this particular student did not understand that students in other Latin classes contribute to this project, or perhaps thought that students at other institutions participate as well.

## REFLECTION

Consequently, one of the concrete results of this review has been a much more detailed assignment (see Appendix 1). While the actual time that the assignment takes to complete has not substantially increased, I have spread the work over several weeks and made it a greater percentage of the overall course grade. We begin our study by devoting a substantial part of a class to background work—some of which they prepare ahead of class, and some of which I bring that day. This material varies depending on the sections of the *Liber* we will work on, but might include botanical information, examples of medieval bestiaries or star maps. This work frequently becomes the basis of contextual notes for the entries. I have built more and smaller pieces of the assignment to be due prior to the final submission, and students have two meetings with me and submit drafts at various points. During the meetings, I frequently assign other tasks, which are tailored to each group

and their selection. I may show students how to search through Lewis and Short, find the section on uses of the ablative in Allen and Greenough, or review conditional clauses. The work we do in the group meetings is tailored to the needs of the particular group, which will vary based on their skill level and the content of their Latin entry. Although this portion is individualized, I believe that it improves the quality of the submissions, helps students provide more detailed and relevant notes, and gives students a sense that they are building concrete skills and engaging in worthwhile work while doing it.<sup>14</sup>

In addition, I spend time in the early stages explaining the way that classicists and medievalists generate knowledge and the various kinds of gaps that still exist. I hope that, again, by doing more work upfront, I can show students early on why their work is new and potentially valuable, encouraging them to invest time and effort in the project.

Since the initial evaluation of this project, I have been able to use the project twice more: with a group of high intermediate students and with a Latin 102 class. Provided that the students have already learned indirect statement and relative clauses, I have found that they are well able to successfully complete the project (with, of course, careful selection of texts from the *Liber* on my part). Students are generally excited to participate in the project and see their efforts as being valuable and contributing to a growing body of knowledge. Given that our school is very small, classics majors and minors often contribute to the project multiple times throughout their college careers, and now ask what portion they will translate in the current course. More advanced students can work on a lengthy portion of the *Liber* and flex their Latin muscles. However, less experienced students are possibly more invested. Although they may only be fulfilling their language requirement and do not plan to read Latin ever again, they believe that the work they accomplish as part of this project is meaningful. Anecdotally, students perceived the project as giving significance to a class they otherwise saw merely as required.

If I revisit the questions I posed at the outset, I find that many of the goals I have for the project do seem to be achieved by my students: they largely feel the experience to be meaningful on multiple levels, and see themselves engaged in original research. Moreover, based on the application of the rubric to the entries, the submissions are largely

---

<sup>14</sup> Anderson describes similar outcomes in group translation work that he assigned to intermediate-level students.



of high quality, requiring minimal editing on my part. The results have shown that if given an assignment with more intentional structure and smaller steps, students are likely to continue to see it as achievable. Also, I believe that students have found the new assignment even clearer, with logical and achievable steps that will lead them to a straightforward and successful result (as the scores of the two most recent classes attest).

Moreover, the information I have gathered and will continue to gather can help me make further modifications that may help students find greater success. These data can help me refine more detailed aspects of the project, such as the ideal length for each passage, specific areas that may need focused refinement, and the amount of time students optimally need to complete the assignment. Moreover, other issues I have not yet thought of may come to light by continuing to evaluate the project and review the results.

Other aspects of the project are harder to capture, but comments from some of the students encourage me to think that this project may have even more far-reaching accomplishments. Most tantalizing are the impressions of students and myself about collaboration, an aspect of the project—like the assignment and the rubric—over which I have some control. Students remarked on the difficulty of the work, and the necessity to apply their skills in what felt like a high-stakes situation. Yet, it is also clear they largely felt supported in the process. One such student comment captures this best:

*I had been assigned group projects in the past, but none seemed like they were working toward a meaningful goal like this one was. Because we were both so interested in the project, my partner and I worked hard on scheduling time to work on it and working together instead of simply working on separate parts and sticking them together as most group projects turn out to be. It has made me dread group projects less, and has helped me with finding good ways to work with others on common goals other than the simple divide and conquer method.*

---

Likewise, my own impression of the work is that although I call students into meetings with me, what we are actually engaging in is collaboration. We frequently pore over

definitions of words together, suggest possible translations back and forth, and discuss what a reference might mean. Since the topics of translation are often obscure and frequently fantastical, none of us may have an easy answer. What is the natural state of a unicorn? How are palm trees propagated? I may help them with an ablative of comparison, but if they have prepared well, they will know whether Thomas's entry conforms to what we currently know about botany or astronomy (or cryptozoology). These small meetings are the places where we often start scouring reference books or Googling wildly. We debate the pros and cons of a translation, the value of a literal translation versus a more colloquial one. This is also a project that makes me vulnerable to my students in many ways, where I must acknowledge my academic deficits. Yet, this also opens space for my students to see themselves on par with me, and that the knowledge that they generate can be original and valuable.

In sum, the effort to engage in an evaluation of this project was not unlike the effort expended to set up the initial project. It required research, backward design, and analysis. Yet, the effort expended has been well worth it. The detailed (and on-going) feedback I receive from my students has permitted me to improve the project for them and prompts me to ask new questions of the project itself.<sup>15</sup>

### WORKS CITED

Altman, Joanne, Tsu-Ming Chiang, Christian S. Hamann, Huda Makhluf, Virginia Peterson, and Sara E. Orel. [\*Undergraduate Research: A Roadmap for Meeting Future National Needs and Competing in a World of Change\*](#). Washington D.C.: Council on Undergraduate Research, 2019.

---

<sup>15</sup> I am exceptionally grateful to all those who helped me get this project off the ground and evaluate its effectiveness. I owe special thanks to Carolyn Zinn and Josh Moon who helped me with the technology, Charlene Boyer Lewis and Patrik Hultburg who encouraged me and supported my application for a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Grant, and my colleagues at Kalamazoo College for their excellent comments and feedback when I presented my preliminary findings at the 2017 Teaching Colloquium. The perceptive comments of the two anonymous reviewers and editor John Gruber-Miller have made this a much better—and, I hope, useful—paper. Any errors and infelicities are, of course, my own. My most heartfelt appreciation goes to my students, who jumped into this project without reservation. I always learn so much from each of you and am so very grateful for the inspiration you give me and the community we create together.

American Classical League and Society for Classical Studies Joint Task Force on Standards for Classical Language Learning. [\*Standards for Classical Language Learning\*](#). Rev. ed. Draft. Hamilton, OH: American Classical League, 2017.

Anderson, Peter. "Next Year?: Evaluating a Model for Second-Year College Latin." *Classical Journal* 99.4 (2004): 433-438.

Association of American Colleges & Universities. *VALUE Rubric Development Project*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges & Universities, 2009.

Barkley, Elizabeth F. and Claire Howell Major. *Learning Assessment Techniques*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2016.

Blackwell, Christopher and Thomas R. Martin. "[Technology, Collaboration, and Undergraduate Research](#)." *Digital Humanities Quarterly* 3.1 (2009).

Blumberg, Phyllis. *Assessing and Improving Your Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2014.

Boese, Helmut, ed. *Thomas Cantimpratensis, Liber de natura rerum*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1973.

Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University, Stony Brook, NY. *Reinventing Undergraduate Education: A Blueprint for America's Research Universities*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1998.

Braid, Malcolm. "The Undergraduate Research Experience: Is It Really Worth It?" *Bios* 71.3 (2000): 96-98.

Gloyn, Liz. "Ovid and his *Ars*: Preparing a Commentary for the *Online Companion to the Worlds of Roman Women*." [Teaching Classical Languages 6.1](#) (2015): 1-17.

Kolowich, Steve. "[Behind the Digital Curtain](#)." *Inside Higher Ed*, 27 January 2012. Web 29 March 2018.

Lopatto, David. "[Undergraduate Research as a High-Impact Student Experience](#)." *Peer Review* 12.2 (2010).

---. "Undergraduate Research as a Catalyst for Liberal Learning. *Peer Review* 8.1 (2006): 22-25.

McConnell, Kate, Terrel Rhodes, Erin Horan and Bethany Zimmerman. *We Have a Rubric for That*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2019

Stevens, Dannelle D. and Antonia J. Levi. *Introduction to Rubrics*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Sterling, VA: Stylus Press, 2013.

White, Cynthia. "The Digital Humanist's Renaissance: *verba volant, scripta manent, digita sunt*." [Teaching Classical Languages](#) 9.1 (2018): 95-110.

## Appendix 1: Assignment (Revised)

Translation Project: [The Thomas Project](#)

For our project you'll be dividing into teams to translate entries from Thomas Cantimpratensis' *Liber de natura rerum*, a medieval encyclopedia that has never been translated into English—until now! Your work will constitute a part of this large, on-going and valuable enterprise. The work you do should be your very best, since it will be available for all the world to see and use.

The selections you will be working on come from a chapter “On Quadrupeds” (*de Quadrupedibus*). Your goal is to create a publishable entry—something as complete, correct and professional as the text we are using for class.

I include this project in my classes, so that student can achieve the following:

- improved translation skills, by translating with peers and revising your translations twice;
- improved understanding of Latin grammar and syntax, by problem solving as you translate;
- ability to consult a reference grammar, to identify tricky grammar and syntax;
- ability to consult a Latin dictionary, to identify pertinent definitions;
- improved research skills, by creating contextual notes;
- improved ability to collaborate successfully with a peer on a multi-stage project.

For your entries you will need to do a few things:

(1) First, you and your partners need a little background knowledge. Read about Thomas Cantimpratensis here:

<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14693c.htm>

<http://bestiary.ca/prisources/psdetail1798.htm>

(2) Find out what you can about:

- Pliny the Elder\*

And take a look at a [manuscript](#).

Take notes on what you learn. We will talk about all of this in class on **Friday, February 23rd**.

(4) Your group will be required to meet with me at various stages and provide at that meeting completed assignments. This is to ensure that your work is moving in the right direction, that you are making progress at various stages in order to complete the work in a timely way. You should send me a preliminary translation by Monday, February 26th. We will meet early in the week to discuss any problems with your translation.

(5) When you go to enter your materials you will have four sections. You will be required to enter: (a) the Latin text, (b) an English translation, (c) vocabulary and (d) notes. For a model, please look at the entry on *De monocerote*. The format should be followed precisely.

(6) About vocabulary and notes: you will want to look at all the vocabulary you wrote down and any confusing constructions that you figured out, and enter that information for your readers.

- Vocabulary should be in alphabetical order (not in the order it appears), and should conform to a dictionary entry.
- Do not include vocabulary that appears in the [DCC core vocabulary list](#), but do include everything else.
- Notes should show the potentially confusing construction in italics, followed by a colon and then an explanation of the construction, case, etc.
- There is currently no tab for images, but if you think we should have one, let me know. It is easy enough to add. For any images we put up we need to make sure we are not violating copyright, so they would need to be freely available.

(7) You are ready to enter your data! This will mean entering the Latin text, the English translation, vocabulary and notes. You will want to proofread this work more than once—it will be on the internet for all to see, with your name attached to it!

- To access the website you will use your K id.
- We will have a tutorial session next week, so that you can see what the site looks like, how to enter data, how the tabs work, etc.

That's it! I will grade it by using the rubric I gave you, and determining how well you mastered the skills required to create a professional-quality entry.

**Projects due Thursday, March 15<sup>th</sup> at 5 p.m.**Groups must meet the following requirements:

By Friday, February 23rd	Complete your initial research
By Monday, February 26th	Complete and submit to me an initial translation of your entry
By Friday, March 2nd	Meet with me as a group to go over your translation and discuss resources for further work
By Monday, March 5 <sup>th</sup>	Complete and submit to me a revised translation of your entry, with notes and vocabulary
By Friday, March 9th	Meet with me as a group to go over your translation and discuss final revisions
By Tuesday, March 13 <sup>th</sup>	Submit draft of all work completed thus far (should include revised translation, vocabulary and notes)
Thursday, March 15 <sup>th</sup>	Final submission on-line

## Some helpful preliminary resources for you:

William Whitaker's Words	<a href="http://www.archives.nd.edu/words.html">http://www.archives.nd.edu/words.html</a>
Logeion	<a href="http://logeion.uchicago.edu/">http://logeion.uchicago.edu/</a>
Mediae Latinitas Lexicon	Reference / 1st Floor (PA2890 .N54 2002)
Oxford Classical Dictionary	Reference/1 <sup>st</sup> Floor (DE5.O9 2012)
Allen and Greenough (grammar)	<a href="http://dcc.dickinson.edu/allen-greenough/">http://dcc.dickinson.edu/allen-greenough/</a>
Gildersleeve and Lodge (grammar)	On Reserve (PA2087 .G5 1997)

AND the *-ae* ending of the 1<sup>st</sup> declension often appears in our text as *-e*! Watch out for that!

*\*NB:* the subjects for preliminary research vary depending on the entries I have chosen for them to work on.

## Appendix 2: Rubric

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Comments
<b>Latin Text (5)</b>						
Accuracy of the text	Latin text is typed with no discernable errors.	Latin text is typed with only a couple minor errors.	Latin text is typed with several errors, but they are of little significance.	Latin text is typed with multiple errors.	Latin text is unreadable because of the volume of errors.	
<b>Translation (50)</b>						
Evidence of attention to grammar and syntax	Translation accurately reflects the Latin grammar and syntax.	Translation has only a couple errors in conveying the Latin grammar and syntax.	Translation has only a several errors in conveying the Latin grammar and syntax, but is overall quite readable.	Translation has multiple errors in conveying the Latin grammar and syntax.	Translation has so many errors in conveying the Latin grammar and syntax, that it is hard to tell how it reflects the original.	
Accuracy of translation	Translation accurately reflects the meaning of the Latin.	Translation misses the meaning of the Latin except in a couple of instances.	Translation misses the meaning of the Latin in several places, but is overall quite readable.	Translation misses the meaning of the Latin in multiple places, making it difficult to read.	Translation misses the meaning of the Latin in so many ways, that it is hard to tell how it reflects the original.	
Accuracy of English mechanics	Translation is completely free of English mistakes in spelling, mechanics and grammar.	Translation is almost completely free of English mistakes in spelling, mechanics and grammar.	Translation has several English mistakes in spelling, mechanics and grammar, but is overall quite readable.	Translation has many English mistakes in spelling, mechanics and grammar, that hinder its readability.	Translation has so many English mistakes in spelling, mechanics and grammar, that it is virtually unreadable.	
Elegance	Translation reads elegantly and smoothly.	Translation reads well, with only one or two infelicities.	Translation feels slightly awkward in more than two places.	Translation feels stilted, and doesn't sound like English.	Translation is so strange that it is virtually unreadable.	
<b>Vocabulary (20)</b>						
Inclusion of terms that are appropriate	Vocabulary chosen reflects terms that students would find unfamiliar.	Vocabulary chosen mostly reflects terms that students would find unfamiliar.	Vocabulary chosen reflects some terms that students should know and misses a few other important ones.	Vocabulary is chosen in a random way that makes little sense.	Vocabulary is chosen in a random way that makes little sense, and very few words are glossed.	



Accuracy of dictionary entry and definition	Definitions are in the standard format and reflect an accurate and appropriate meaning.	With one or two exceptions definitions are in the standard format and reflect an accurate and appropriate meaning.	Definitions are mostly in the standard format and reflect an accurate and appropriate meaning.	Many definitions do not conform to the standard format and their meanings are inaccurate.	Definitions almost completely fail to reflect the standard format and meanings are nonsensical.	
<b>Notes (20)</b>						
Judicious choice of information	Notes point to unusual features of the text and provide helpful additional information.	Notes point to unusual features of the text and provide helpful additional information with one or two exceptions.	Notes mostly point to unusual features of the text and provide helpful additional information, but miss something crucial.	Most of the notes make little sense, are inaccurate or gloss items that require no explanation.	It is completely unclear why certain items are glossed and others are not. It feels random.	
Accuracy of information	The information provided in the notes is completely accurate and well documented.	The information provided in the notes is completely accurate and well documented with one or two exceptions.	The information provided in the notes is mostly accurate and well documented.	Much of the information provided in the notes is inaccurate and poorly documented.	The information provided in the notes is completely inaccurate, undocumented, and appears made up.	
<b>Partnership (5)</b>						
Successful collaboration with your partner	You and your partner both contributed equally to the project and fully collaborated.	You and your partner both contributed nearly equally to the project and collaborated well.	You and your partner had a problem either in amount of work contributed or ability to collaborate well.	You and your partner had multiple problems either in amount of work contributed or ability to collaborate well.	You and your partner were unable to share any work or collaborate.	
<b>Total</b>						

### Appendix 3: Survey Questions and Preliminary Results (From the first six iterations of the project)

#### Latin Skills:

This project improved my ability to read Latin.

strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neutral (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)	Average
0	0	0	15	9	4.4

This project improved my ability to translate Latin.

strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neutral (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)	Average
0	0	0	4	20	4.8

This project improved my understanding of case usages.

strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neutral (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)	Average
0	0	1	12	11	4.4

This project improved my understanding of dependent clauses.

strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neutral (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)	Average
0	0	4	18	2	3.9

Please share any comments about the impact of the project on your Latin skills.

#### General Skills

This project improved my problem-solving skills.

strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neutral (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)	Average
0	0	1	7	16	4.6

This project improved my collaborative skills.

strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neutral (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)	Average
0	0	0	12	12	4.5

This project improved my research skills.

strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neutral (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)	Average
0	0	6	9	9	4.1

This project improved my critical thinking skills.

strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neutral (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)	Average
0	0	4	6	14	4.4

Please share any comments about the impact of the project on your general skills.

### **Perceptions of the Work**

I believe that I contributed to the creation of new knowledge.

strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neutral (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)	Average
0	0	7	12	5	3.9

It is important that my work will be viewed by others.

strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neutral (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)	Average
0	0	4	10	10	4.3

I worked hard because I viewed this work as a publication.

strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neutral (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)	Average
0	0	3	3	18	4.6

I am glad I had the chance to do original scholarship.

strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neutral (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)	Average
0	0	2	5	17	4.6

Please share any comments about your perceptions about your work on the project.

